

Special City Council Meeting
March 28, 2016

1. Agenda Only

Documents: [AGENDA ONLY 03-28-16.PDF](#)

2. Agenda And Packet

Documents: [AGENDA AND PACKET 03-28-16.PDF](#)

ETHAN K. STRIMLING (MAYOR)
BELINDA S. RAY (1)
SPENCER THIBODEAU (2)
EDWARD J. SUSLOVIC (3)
JUSTIN COSTA (4)

DAVID BRENERMAN (5)
JON HINCK (A/L)
JILL C. DUSON, (A/L)
NICHOLAS M. MAVODONES, JR. (A/L)

AGENDA
SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 28, 2016

The Portland City Council will hold a Special City Council Meeting at 5:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, City Hall. The Honorable Ethan K. Strimling, Mayor, will preside.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

ROLL CALL:

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Community Development Block Grant Annual Allocation Committee
Presentation; and City Manager Presentation

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Order 197-15.16 (Tab 1) Order Approving Revisions to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Allocation Process Re: Elimination of the Child Care Voucher Set-Aside – Sponsored by Jon P. Jennings, City Manager.

At the October 19, 2015 City Council Meeting, the City Council approved a \$90,000 childcare set-aside in the CDBG allocation process. When the Allocation Committee scored all of the applications, however, the Milestone Homeless Outreach and Mobile Engagement (HOME) team and the Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter (both of which were not funded by the Committee) scored higher than the Catherine Morrill Day Nursery Childcare Voucher Program, which received the \$90,000 childcare set-aside. The City Manager's CBDG funding recommendations, however, partially fund the Home team and the Teen Shelter, as well as provide sufficient funding to Catherine Morrill. As a result, the City Manager is requesting that the City Council eliminate the child care set-aside in order to allow for all applicants to compete on an equal playing field now and in the future.

Five affirmative votes are required for passage after public comment.

RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolve 6-15/16
(Tab 2)**

Resolution Adopting the 2016-2020 Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Five-Year Consolidated Plan and Fiscal Year 2017 Annual Action Plan Including Appropriations for Community Development Block Grant Program, HOME Program, and Emergency Solutions Grant Program and Certifications Pertaining Thereto – Sponsored by Jon P. Jennings, City Manager.

This Resolution adopts the 2016-2020 HUD five-year consolidated plan and fiscal year 2017 annual action plan and appropriates funds to the identified programs.

The 2016/2017 Housing and Community Development Program will report in the Annual Action Plan to HUD a total budget of \$3,958,645 funded by a Community Development Block Grant allocation of \$1,791,448 plus \$114,500 in program income, along with \$120,000 in CDBG Housing Program Income; a HOME Consortium Program Grant allocation of \$828,140; HOME Program income of \$205,000; Lead Safe Housing Program Income of \$269,774; local Housing Trust Funds of \$468,551; and an Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Allocation of \$161,232.

The CDBG Annual Allocation Committee, appointed by the City Council, reviewed each application and made funding recommendations. They are given an opportunity to make a presentation to the Council at this meeting, and citizens may comment on the City's plan for the use of CDBG, HOME and ESG funds. The City Manager also reviewed the Committee's recommendations and has submitted his own funding recommendations to the City Council.

As required by the City's citizen participation process, two (2) public hearings are held each spring to consider the City's Housing and Community Development Program proposal for the ensuing year. This year the first public hearing was held on March 14, 2016 and the second will be held on March 28, 2016. The public hearings allow an opportunity for citizens to comment on the City's 2016-2020 HUD 5-Year Consolidated Plan.

This item must be read on two separate days and two public hearings must be held in order to comply with federal regulations. The first reading and public hearing on this item was on March 14, 2016. Five affirmative votes are required for passage after public comment.

ETHAN K. STRIMLING (MAYOR)
BELINDA S. RAY (1)
SPENCER THIBODEAU (2)
EDWARD J. SUSLOVIC (3)
JUSTIN COSTA (4)

DAVID BRENERMAN (5)
JON HINCK (A/L)
JILL C. DUSON, (A/L)
NICHOLAS M. MAVODONES, JR. (A/L)

AGENDA
SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 28, 2016

The Portland City Council will hold a Special City Council Meeting at 5:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, City Hall. The Honorable Ethan K. Strimling, Mayor, will preside.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

ROLL CALL:

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Community Development Block Grant Annual Allocation Committee
Presentation; and City Manager Presentation

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Order 197-15.16 (Tab 1) Order Approving Revisions to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Allocation Process Re: Elimination of the Child Care Voucher Set-Aside – Sponsored by Jon P. Jennings, City Manager.

At the October 19, 2015 City Council Meeting, the City Council approved a \$90,000 childcare set-aside in the CDBG allocation process. When the Allocation Committee scored all of the applications, however, the Milestone Homeless Outreach and Mobile Engagement (HOME) team and the Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter (both of which were not funded by the Committee) scored higher than the Catherine Morrill Day Nursery Childcare Voucher Program, which received the \$90,000 childcare set-aside. The City Manager's CBDG funding recommendations, however, partially fund the Home team and the Teen Shelter, as well as provide sufficient funding to Catherine Morrill. As a result, the City Manager is requesting that the City Council eliminate the child care set-aside in order to allow for all applicants to compete on an equal playing field now and in the future.

Five affirmative votes are required for passage after public comment.

RESOLUTIONS:

**Resolve 6-15/16
(Tab 2)**

Resolution Adopting the 2016-2020 Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Five-Year Consolidated Plan and Fiscal Year 2017 Annual Action Plan Including Appropriations for Community Development Block Grant Program, HOME Program, and Emergency Solutions Grant Program and Certifications Pertaining Thereto – Sponsored by Jon P. Jennings, City Manager.

This Resolution adopts the 2016-2020 HUD five-year consolidated plan and fiscal year 2017 annual action plan and appropriates funds to the identified programs.

The 2016/2017 Housing and Community Development Program will report in the Annual Action Plan to HUD a total budget of \$3,958,645 funded by a Community Development Block Grant allocation of \$1,791,448 plus \$114,500 in program income, along with \$120,000 in CDBG Housing Program Income; a HOME Consortium Program Grant allocation of \$828,140; HOME Program income of \$205,000; Lead Safe Housing Program Income of \$269,774; local Housing Trust Funds of \$468,551; and an Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Allocation of \$161,232.

The CDBG Annual Allocation Committee, appointed by the City Council, reviewed each application and made funding recommendations. They are given an opportunity to make a presentation to the Council at this meeting, and citizens may comment on the City's plan for the use of CDBG, HOME and ESG funds. The City Manager also reviewed the Committee's recommendations and has submitted his own funding recommendations to the City Council.

As required by the City's citizen participation process, two (2) public hearings are held each spring to consider the City's Housing and Community Development Program proposal for the ensuing year. This year the first public hearing was held on March 14, 2016 and the second will be held on March 28, 2016. The public hearings allow an opportunity for citizens to comment on the City's 2016-2020 HUD 5-Year Consolidated Plan.

This item must be read on two separate days and two public hearings must be held in order to comply with federal regulations. The first reading and public hearing on this item was on March 14, 2016. Five affirmative votes are required for passage after public comment.

*Order 197-15/16
Tab 1 3-28-16*

ETHAN K. STRIMLING (MAYOR)
BELINDA S. RAY (1)
SPENCER R. THIBODEAU (2)
EDWARD J. SUSLOVIC (3)
JUSTIN COSTA (4)

**CITY OF PORTLAND
IN THE CITY COUNCIL**

DAVID H. BRENERMAN (5)
JILL C. DUSON (A/L)
JON HINCK (A/L)
NICHOLAS M. MAVODONES, JR (A/L)

**ORDER APPROVING REVISIONS TO THE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ALLOCATION PROCESS
RE: ELIMINATION OF THE CHILD CARE VOUCHER SET-ASIDE**

ORDERED, that the Community Development Block Grant allocation process shall be revised to eliminate the child care voucher set-aside of \$90,000.

MEMORANDUM
City Council Agenda Item

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Planning and Urban Development Department

DATE: March 22, 2016

DISTRIBUTION: City Manager, Mayor, Anita LaChance, Sonia Bean, Danielle West-Chuhta, Nancy English, Julie Sullivan

SUBJECT: Order Approving Revisions to the CDBG Allocation Process

SPONSOR: Jon P. Jennings, City Manager

I. SUMMARY OF ISSUE

At the October 19, 2015 City Council Meeting, the City Council approved a \$90,000 childcare set-aside in the CDBG allocation process. In the Allocation Committee's scores, the Milestone HOME team as well as the Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter both scored higher than the Catherine Morrill Day Nursery Childcare Voucher Program which received the childcare set-aside. There was not enough funding available, however, for the Milestone HOME team and Teen Shelter requests. As a result, the City Manager is hereby requesting that the City Council eliminate the childcare set-aside in order to allow for all applicants to compete for funding on an equal playing field.

II. REASON FOR SUBMISSION

The HUD regulations require that two public hearings be held on the CDBG allocations, and that local rules be adopted for the allocation process. However, HUD does not dictate the content of the local rules. The City Council has adopted specific local rules, and thus any revision to the rules requires Council review and approval.

III. INTENDED RESULT

The CDBG allocation rules would be revised and the Child Care Voucher set aside would be eliminated.

IV. FINANCIAL IMPACT

The elimination of the child care voucher set aside will allow for partial funding to be provided to the HOME team and the Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter. In addition the one application eligible for the set aside, Catherine Morrill, will still receive funding. In fact, Catherine Morrill will receive slightly more CDBG funding than they received last year.

V. RECOMMENDATION

Council approval of the removal of the child care voucher set-aside from the CDBG Allocation Process rules.

Order 91-15/16

Passage: Passage: 7-0 (Marshall recused, Duson absent) on 10/19/2015 Effective 10/29/2015

MICHAEL F. BRENNAN (MAYOR)
KEVIN J. DONOGHUE (1)
DAVID A. MARSHALL (2)
EDWARD J. SUSLOVIC (3)
JUSTIN COSTA (4)

CITY OF PORTLAND
IN THE CITY COUNCIL

DAVID H. BRENNERMAN (5)
JILL C. DUSON (A/L)
JON HINCK (A/L)
NICHOLAS M. MAVODONES, JR (A/L)

**ORDER APPROVING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT POLICY GOALS FOR THE
2016-2020 HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FIVE-YEAR CONSOLIDATED
PLAN AND REVISIONS IN THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT
ALLOCATION PROCESS**

ORDERED, that the City's Community Development policy goals for the Housing and Urban Development 2015-2020 Consolidated Five-Year Plan are hereby approved in substantially the form attached hereto; and

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that revisions in the Community Development Block Grant process containing the following elements are hereby approved:

1. Allocation of points for High Priority and Priority activities, as specified in the attached chart;
2. Targeted neighborhood investment strategy beginning with the Bayside Neighborhood;
3. Public infrastructure set-aside of up to 60% of the funding available to City programs; and
4. Childcare voucher set-aside of \$90,000.

FIVE-YEAR HUD CONSOLIDATED PLAN

During the 2016 budget recommendation process, then Acting City Manager Sheila Hill-Christian explained that all resources, regardless of their source, should be used when making strategic decisions regarding the City's service priorities. For this reason, the City of Portland's HUD Consolidated Plan has identified needs and goals that align with the 2014 City Council Common Goals and Objectives. These Common Goals were designed to guide the City Council in their policy decisions and City Departments in their goals and operations. Eight goals were identified including: Promote Housing Availability, Increase Transportation Initiatives, Economic Development, Prevent and End Homelessness, Advance an Environmental Program, Improve City Services, Implement TIF Program, and Intergovernmental Collaboration. The priorities that will be incorporated in the HUD Consolidated Plan will address the first five of the Council Common Goals.

The Five-Year HUD Consolidated Plan defines four areas of need with a corresponding goal. These goals are designed to address the funding priorities for the CDBG, HOME and ESG Programs for the next five years.

NEEDS and GOALS

Based on analysis of available data, reports, studies, including City Council goals, and after two community meetings to solicit feedback from residents and service providers, the staff created four Community Development Policy Goals and Priorities which are described below. Each goal includes two categories of priority for eligible activities: "High Priority" and "Priority". Examples of the types of activities that would be included under each priority are noted on the attached chart.

- **NEED:** Neighborhood Investment and Infrastructure

Description: Public infrastructure, safety and mobility are key components to improving the livelihood of Portland neighborhoods. There is significant need throughout the target neighborhoods to build sidewalks where none exist, improve accessibility through ADA compliance, increase the use of bicycles as a mode of transportation, and redevelop streetscapes to create shared streets for cars, bikes, and pedestrians that integrates with the fabric of the neighborhood.

Basis for Relative priority: In 2014 the Portland City Council identified two goals that identified this need. 1) Develop a transportation system that advances healthy living, minimizes environmental impacts, and promotes the local economy by advancing opportunities for mass transit, bicycle use and walking. 2) Advance environmental program that safeguards our natural resources, promotes a healthy lifestyle and supports a sustainable economy.

- **GOAL:** Create strong, safe, accessible and vibrant neighborhoods

Description: Invest in infrastructure to improve neighborhood assets and build strong, safe, accessible and vibrant neighborhoods. Improve accessibility through ADA compliance, build sidewalks and trails to improve connectivity, increase the use of bicycles as a mode of transportation, and redevelop streetscapes to create shared streets for cars, bikes, and pedestrians that integrate with the fabric of the neighborhood. Support programs that increase safety in neighborhoods for residents and visitors.

This proposal includes a specific neighborhood focus for CDBG investment and prioritizes the Bayside Neighborhood as the first CDBG Targeted Neighborhood.

- **NEED:** Housing Availability

Description: In 2014 Portland contracted with the Greater Portland Council of Governments to complete a study entitled *2030 Workforce Housing Demand Study*. The report, released in January 2015, found that current housing production is not meeting the housing needs of Portland. The City Council has made a goal to promote housing availability in all segments of the housing market while insuring a suitable balance of housing opportunities among those sectors.

Basis for Relative priority: In 2014 the Portland City Council identified the following goal to address this need: provide increased availability in all segments of the housing market while insuring that there is suitable balance of housing opportunities among those sectors.

- **GOAL:** Increase housing availability & affordability

Description: Increase housing availability and affordability to all Portland residents regardless of income, race, ethnicity, and family size. Encourage housing development by removing barriers to traditional urban housing types while ensuring the inclusion of workforce housing in significant development projects.

- **NEED:** Economic Opportunity

Description: Portland has a well-developed employment support system with many established providers. However, the system is fragmented, providers work in silos, there is insufficient funding to cover needs of potential workers, and career planning and financial stability are often prioritized less than job placement. Employment retention support is scarce and turnover results in economic uncertainty for employees and higher costs for employers.

Basis for Relative priority: In 2014 the Portland City Council identified the following goal: Promote Economic Development in the City in a manner that provides for increased property values, diversification across industry sectors and high paying jobs. Specifically, as it relates to

HUD programming and objectives the Council further identified the need to advance work on the "Minority and Women-owned Business Development Initiative" and secure City Council approval to invest CDBG funds in workforce development.

- **GOAL:** Create economic opportunities to transition people out of poverty

Description: Invest in Portland businesses to enable them to expand to create jobs. Invest in persons wanting to create microenterprises. Engage job seekers in a continuum of services to increase their professional capacity, financial stability, and ability to maintain employment. Focus on difficult to employ populations including homeless, new Americans and single parent head of households. Combine resources and build partnerships between public and private entities to provide opportunities to transition Portland residents out of poverty to sustainable employment and financial stability.

- **NEED:** Address the Needs for Growing Homeless Population

Description: The shelter system in Portland is beyond capacity. Staff and local organizations struggle to deal with overflow strategies to meet increasing need. Data suggests most persons who are homeless stay at the shelter less than three weeks. Homeless Prevention and Rapid Rehousing are key components to help reduce shelter usage and homelessness. Additionally increased case management is needed for those who have mental illness and substance abuse issues to help them navigate the service delivery system.

Additionally the State of Maine will be reducing funding support and increase documentation and requirements for those staying at the shelter, making it more difficult to serve those in the most need.

Basis for Relative priority: In 2014 the Portland City Council identified the goal to: Prevent and end homelessness in the city of Portland by continuing to implement the recommendations of the Homelessness Task Force, including retooling the emergency shelter system to create centralized intake process and evaluate steps to improve efficiency, prevent homelessness and rapidly rehouse those who become homeless to avoid long term stays in the shelters, and increase case management for persons with mental illness and substance abuse to help navigate the service delivery system.

GOAL: Prevent and reduce homelessness

Description: Prevent individuals and families from becoming homeless and entering into the shelter system. Rapidly rehouse those who enter the shelter system. Provide necessary resources to assist vulnerable population's transition out of homelessness, including housing opportunities for chronically homeless or long-term stayers.

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

The City of Portland's priority in allocating federal resources has always been to focus on the areas of the jurisdiction with the most need and the goal has been to direct the majority of resources into these areas. Traditionally, these areas have been known as "CDBG eligible areas". Staff would like to begin to use the term "CDBG targeted areas". The term "CDBG targeted areas" will identify areas in which CDBG investment would be focused or targeted. This recommended approach would not eliminate projects in other areas of the City but would encourage the focus in the areas of Portland with the most need. Projects in other areas would have to be determined eligible, based on a review of the American Community Survey income data for the service area of the project. As noted above, the Bayside Neighborhood is proposed as the first area of focus. This neighborhood is outlined on the attached map.

The HCD office is also considering the benefits of creating a HUD Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA) to help increase investment in the neighborhoods with the most need.

ALLOCATION PROCESS

Staff will review CDBG applications to determine if a program or activity qualifies as a "High Priority" or "Priority". Staff will then assign 11 points for "High Priority" activities and 7 points for "Priority" activities. This will give the "High Priority" activities a 4 point advantage in the allocation process. The CDBG application scoring matrix will be revised as noted below to allow for the assignment of points for "High Priority" or "Priority" activities in the Goal, Priorities & Community Need category.

SCORING MATRIX	POSSIBLE POINTS
Guiding Principles: measurable community impact, diversity and inclusiveness, priority to lower incomes, consistent with city goals, plans, or initiatives	30 points
Capacity to deliver, including financial need, leveraged funding, experience providing service, readiness to proceed, and financial stability	25 points
Goal, Priorities & Community Need	33 points
Partnership/Collaboration, points distributed based on highest submitted documentation (MOA, LOS or Outreach) • Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) • Letter of Support (LOS) • Demonstrated Outreach	MOA maximum of 12 points LOS maximum of 9 points Outreach maximum of 6 points

ALLOCATION RESTRICTIONS

Currently, the CDBG allocation process includes the following funding restrictions:

Social Services

Minimum Grant Request: \$10,000

Maximum Grant Request: \$150,000

Maximum Cumulative City Request: 45% of funding available for Social Services can go to the City Programs

Social Services Set-aside: Community Policing \$150,000

Development Activities

Minimum Grant Request: \$10,000

Maximum Grant Request: No more than 30% of the previous year's allocation amount or \$250,000, whichever is less.

Maximum Cumulative City Request: 85% of funding available for Development Activities can go to City Programs.

Within the maximum cumulative City requests in the Development Activity category, staff is proposing a set-aside that would allow for up to 60% of the funding available to City programs, be designated for public infrastructure improvements in targeted neighborhoods, beginning with the Bayside Neighborhood.

At the September 30, 2015 HCDC meeting, the Committee voted 3-0 to add a childcare voucher set-aside in the amount of \$90,000.

NEED	GOAL	PRIORITY IMPACT LEVEL
Neighborhood Investment & Infrastructure: <i>Description:</i> Public safety and mobility are key components to improving the livelihood of Portland neighborhoods. There is a significant need throughout the targeted neighborhoods to build sidewalks where none exist, improve accessibility through ADA compliance, increase the use of bicycles as a mode of transportation, and redevelop streetscapes to create shared streets for cars, bikes, and pedestrians that integrates with the fabric of the neighborhood. <i>Basis for Relative priority:</i> In 2014 the Portland City Council identified two goals that identified this need: 1) Develop a transportation system that advances healthy living, minimizes environmental impacts, and promotes the local economy by advancing opportunities for mass transit, bicycle use and walking; and 2) Advance environmental programs that safeguard our natural resources, promote a healthy lifestyle and support a sustainable economy. Resource: City of Portland <i>Capital Improvement Plan Sustainable Portland Report</i>	Create strong, safe, accessible and vibrant neighborhoods: <i>Description:</i> Invest in infrastructure to improve neighborhood assets and build strong, safe, accessible and vibrant neighborhoods. Improve accessibility and livability through age-friendly designs and ADA compliance. Build sidewalks and trails to improve connectivity, increase the use of bicycles as a mode of transportation, and redevelop streetscapes to create shared streets for cars, bikes, and pedestrians that integrate with the fabric of the neighborhood. Support programs that increase safety in neighborhoods for residents and visitors.	Including but not limited to: HIGH PRIORITY • Community policing • Public infrastructure in targeted neighborhoods (CDBG targeted neighborhood beginning with the Bayside Neighborhood) • Accessibility/ADA compliance • Alternative modes of transportation PRIORITY • Park and recreation facilities • Tree planting • Non-profit rehab • Community centers • Historic preservation

NEED	GOAL	PRIORITY IMPACT LEVEL
Housing Availability: <u>Description:</u> In 2014 Portland contracted with the Greater Portland Council of Governments to complete a study entitled <i>2030 Workforce Housing Demand Study</i>. The report, released in January 2015, found that current housing production is not meeting the housing needs of Portland. The City Council has made a goal to promote housing availability in all segments of the housing market while insuring a suitable balance of housing opportunities among those sectors. <u>Basis for Relative priority:</u> In 2014 the Portland City Council identified the following goal to address this need: provide increased availability in all segments of the housing market while insuring that there is suitable balance of housing opportunities among those sectors. Resources: <i>2030 Workforce Housing Demand Study</i> 2002 Housing Plan <i>Report of the Task Force to Develop a Strategic Plan to Prevent & End Homelessness in Portland, Nov. 2012</i>	Increase housing availability & affordability: <u>Description:</u> Increase housing availability and affordability to all Portland residents regardless of income, race, ethnicity, and family size. Encourage housing development by removing barriers to traditional urban housing types while ensuring the inclusion of workforce and age-friendly housing in significant development projects.	Including but not limited to: HIGH PRIORITY • Construction of new housing • Adaptive reuse for housing • Rehabilitation of existing housing • Housing Retention PRIORITY • Rental assistance • Environmental testing and remediation • Energy efficiency/weatherization • Fair housing activities • Heating and fuel assistance • Tenant landlord counseling services • Legal services

NEED	GOAL	PRIORITY IMPACT LEVEL
Economic Opportunity: <u>Description:</u> Portland has a well-developed employment support system with many established providers. However, the system is fragmented, providers work in silos, there is insufficient funding to cover needs of potential workers, and career planning and financial stability are often prioritized less than job placement. Employment retention support is scarce and turnover results in economic uncertainty for employees and higher costs for employers. <u>Basis for Relative priority:</u> In 2014, the Portland City Council identified the following goal: Promote Economic Development in the City in a manner that provides for increased property values, diversification across industry sectors and high paying jobs. Specifically, as it relates to HUD programming and objectives, the Council further identified the need to advance work on the "Minority and Women-owned Business Development Initiative" and secure City Council approval to invest CDBG funds in workforce development. Resources: <i>Portland Economic Development Vision and Plan</i> Portland Community Chamber of Commerce: <i>Portland's Economic Scorecard 2014-2015</i> Muskie School of Public Service: <i>The State of Infant Pre-K Childcare in Portland, Maine 2015</i> GPCOG <i>2014-2018 Economic Development Action Plan</i>	Create economic opportunities to transition people out of poverty: <u>Description:</u> Invest in Portland businesses to enable them to expand to create jobs. Invest in persons wanting to create microenterprises. Engage job seekers in a continuum of services to increase their professional capacity, financial stability, and ability to maintain employment. Focus on difficult to employ populations including homeless, new Americans and single parent head of households. Combine resources and build partnerships between public and private entities to provide opportunities to transition Portland residents out of poverty to sustainable employment and financial stability.	Including but not limited to: HIGH PRIORITY • Job creation • Microenterprise assistance • Career advancement services • Education • Job training • GED attainment • ESL • Job retention support services • Childcare vouchers • Housing counseling • Transportation assistance PRIORITY • Façade improvements • Financial stability services • Budgeting • Financial planning • Tax preparation

NEED	GOAL	PRIORITY IMPACT LEVEL
Address the Needs for Growing Homeless Population: <u>Description:</u> The shelter system in Portland is beyond capacity. Staff and local organizations struggle to deal with overflow strategies to meet increasing need. Data suggests most persons who are homeless stay at the shelter less than three weeks. Homeless Prevention and Rapid Rehousing are key components to help reduce shelter usage and homelessness. Additionally increased case management is needed for those who have mental illness and substance abuse issues to help them navigate the service delivery system. Additionally, the State of Maine will be reducing funding support and increase documentation requirements for those staying at the shelter, making it more difficult to serve those most in need. <u>Basis for Relative priority:</u> In 2014 the Portland City Council identified the goal: Prevent and end homelessness in the city of Portland by continuing to implement the recommendations of the Homelessness Task Force, including retooling the emergency shelter system to create centralized intake process and evaluate steps to improve efficiency, prevent homelessness and rapidly rehouse those who become homeless to avoid long term stays in the shelters, and increase case management for persons with mental illness and substance abuse to help navigate the service delivery system. Resource: <i>Report of the Task Force to Develop a Strategic Plan to Prevent & End Homelessness in Portland, Nov. 2012.</i>	Prevent and Reduce Homelessness: <u>Description:</u> Prevent individuals and families from becoming homeless and entering into the shelter system. Rapidly rehouse those who enter the shelter system. Provide necessary resources to assist vulnerable population's transition out of homelessness, including housing opportunities for chronically homeless or long-term stayers at homeless shelters.	Including but not limited to: HIGH PRIORITY • Food assistance • Shelter services • Child care vouchers • Mental health services PRIORITY • Housing for long-term shelter consumers • Rental assistance • Substance abuse services • At risk youth services



1:24,000

- 2010 Block Groups
- 2010 Census Tracts
- Block Groups > 51% Low Income
- Bayside Neighborhood

City of Portland

Block Groups > 51% Low Income

Target Area: Bayside Neighborhood

*Resolve 6-15/16
Tab 2 3-28-16*

ETHAN K. STRIMLING (MAYOR)
BELINDA S. RAY (1)
SPENCER THIBODEAU (2)
EDWARD J. SUSLOVIC (3)
JUSTIN COSTA (4)

**CITY OF PORTLAND
IN THE CITY COUNCIL**

DAVID BRENERMAN (5)
JON HINCK (A/L)
JILL C. DUSON, (A/L)
NICHOLAS M. MAVODONES, JR. (A/L)

**RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE 2016-2020
HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FIVE-YEAR CONSOLIDATED PLAN AND
FISCAL YEAR 2017 ANNUAL ACTION PLAN INCLUDING APPROPRIATIONS FOR
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM, HOME PROGRAM,
AND EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANT PROGRAM AND CERTIFICATIONS
PERTAINING THERETO**

WHEREAS, the City of Portland, Maine has determined that there are pressing community and neighborhood needs for further federal assistance for housing and community development activities; and

WHEREAS, the goals and priorities expressed in the 2016-2020 Housing and Urban Development Five-Year Consolidated Plan align with the needs of the City; and

WHEREAS, annual activities for the Consolidated Housing and Community Development Annual Action Plan have been recommended; and

WHEREAS, the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has allocated to the City of Portland \$1,791,448 of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Entitlement Funds, for the program year 2016-2017; the City has also received Community Development funds in the amount of \$114,500 in program income, along with \$120,000 in CDBG Housing Program Income which is subject to the same regulations as the entitlement funds; a HOME Program Grant allocation of \$828,140 and HOME Program income of \$205,000; Lead Safe Housing Program Income of \$269,774; local Housing Trust Funds of \$468,551; and \$161,834 of Emergency Solutions Grant funds; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Portland, Maine, desires to utilize these funds to support housing and community development activities;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Portland, Maine, hereby adopts the 2016-2020 HUD 5 Year Consolidated Plan and Fiscal Year 2017 Annual Action Plan, and the sums of \$ 1,905,948 for the Community Development Block Grant Program, plus \$120,000 in CDBG Housing Program funding, \$1,033,140 for the HOME Program, \$269,774 in Lead Safe Housing Program Income, \$468,551 in local Housing Trust Funds and \$161,232 for the Emergency Shelter Grant Program are hereby appropriated for the purposes approved in the attached Plan and budgets as recommended by the City Manager; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City of Portland, Maine, possesses legal authority to apply for the above referenced Community Development Block Grant Program Funds, HOME Program funds and Emergency Shelter Grant Program funds for the Program Year 2016-2017; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Manager be authorized to:

- 1) Apply for, accept and expend: the Community Development Block Grant Entitlement Funds of \$1,791,448 and to expend \$114,500 in program income and \$120,000 in CDBG housing program income funds; \$828,140 of HOME Program funds and to expend \$205,000 of program income for a total of \$1,033,140; \$269,774 in Lead Safe Housing program income; \$468,551 in local Housing Trust Funds; and \$161,232 of Emergency Shelter Grant funds;
- 2) Officially represent the City of Portland, Maine, in connection with the application, including the execution of contracts on behalf of the City; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City of Portland, Maine certifies that it will comply with all of the attached assurances and provide such additional information as may be required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the foregoing Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Annual Action Plan funds are hereby appropriated pursuant to the Budget attached hereto.



Memorandum

Planning and Urban Development Department
Housing and Community Development Program

To: The Portland City Council

Cc: Jeff Levine, Planning and Urban Development Director
Mary Davis, Housing and Community Development Director

From: Kristin Styles, HCD Program Manager

Date: March 4, 2016

Re: HUD 2016-2020 Five Year Consolidated Plan and Consolidated Annual Action Plan 2016-2017

The Consolidated Annual Action Plan includes budgets for the Community Development Block Grant, HOME Program and the Emergency Solutions Grant. The total amount of funding the City of Portland is expected to receive from the Department of Housing and Urban Development is \$3,100,320, which includes:

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| 1. CDBG \$ 1,791,448 | HUD Allocation 2016-2017 |
| <u>\$ 114,500</u> | CDBG Program Income 2015-2016 |
| \$ 1,905,948 | Total Expected CDBG funds to Allocate for 2016-2017 |

CDBG Funds by Category

\$405,190	Administration and Planning
\$625,397	Social Services
<u>\$875,361</u>	Development Activity
\$1,905,948	Total

Attached you will find a Letter from the City Manager with his CDBG recommendations and back up material.

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| 2. HOME \$ 828,140 | Expected HUD Allocation 2016-2017 |
| <u>\$ 205,000</u> | HOME Program Income 2016-2017 |
| \$1,033,140 | Total Expected HOME funds to Allocate for 2016-2017 |

Attached you will find a Memo to the Mayor and City Council from Mary Davis explaining the Housing Budget.

3. Emergency Solutions Grant:
- | | |
|-----------|------------------------------------|
| \$161,232 | Expected HUD Allocation 2016- 2017 |
|-----------|------------------------------------|

Attached you will find the proposed Emergency Solutions Grant budget.

Portland, Maine



Yes. Life's good here.

Executive Department
Jon P. Jennings, City Manager

February 26, 2016

Members of the Portland City Council:

I am pleased to submit to you my recommendations for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017.

I would like to commend the CDBG Allocation Committee on their hard work and dedication to the City's Community Development Program. I have reviewed the Allocation Committee's recommendations and I acknowledge and commend the difficult scoring decisions that were made by the Committee. The recommendation letter from the Allocation Committee is attached. *[Committee Letter A1]*

The Allocation Committee is required to recommend full funding for applications according to score, which often results in the lowest funded applicant receiving partial funding. Set-asides are the exception to this scoring process. Last fall, the City Council approved a 60% Development Activities set-aside for Public Infrastructure and a \$90,000 Childcare voucher set-aside in the Social Services category; these two set-asides are in addition to the Community Policing set-aside which has remained in place for the past two years. You will notice that my recommendations mostly align with the recommendations of the Allocation Committee. My deviation from the Allocation Committee's recommendations are related to the childcare set-aside and the other needs of the City's budget. My recommendations are outlined below and reflected in the attached spreadsheet. *[City Manager Recommendations A2]*

1. *Social Services.* To put it simply, there are more deserving organizations than there are funds available. Before making my recommendations, I personally read each application, I considered the scores given to each applicant by the Allocation Committee, and I considered the role each of these programs will have on the City's overall budget.

The \$90,000 childcare set-aside forced me to make some very difficult decisions. Looking at the Allocation Committee's scores, the Milestone HOME team as well as the Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter both scored higher than the Catherine Morrill Day Nursery Childcare Voucher Program which received the childcare set-aside. While I agree with the Council that childcare vouchers are an important component, I do not believe they are more important than a food program, shelter program, or a mental health program. Therefore, I would ask the Council to approve a \$40,000 reduction in the current set-aside; this will leave Catherine Morrill with slightly more CDBG funding than they received last year. Moving forward, I would ask the Council to consider removing the childcare set-aside all together. This would allow for all future applicants to compete on an equal playing field.

The Milestone HOME team is an example of where the City's budget affects my recommendations. CDBG funding allows the HOME team program to remain open on Saturdays. If the HOME team program is not available on Saturdays, there will be a direct impact on the City's Police Department. Given the budget constraints in the social service category, it would be difficult to fully fund the Milestone HOME team without eliminating funding from another

organization that scored higher. Therefore, I recommend funding all non-city programs at 90% of the Allocation Committee's recommendation. By making these very difficult cuts, including the \$40,000 reduction in the childcare set-aside, the HOME team will receive \$54,084 and the Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter, which received the same score as Milestone, will receive \$15,000; representing 50% of their original request.

2. *Development Activities.* This year the CDBG Program has an additional \$114,500 in program income. Due to HUD imposed funding caps for social services and administration, these funds may only be applied to development activities. My recommendations align with the recommendations of the Allocation Committee. In addition to the funding recommendations of the Allocation Committee, I am recommending two additions. Our City is in great need of improvements to pedestrian safety and ADA accessible curb ramps, therefore, I am recommending an additional \$101,000 to the ADA Curb Ramps programs to expand the program to include all forms of pedestrian safety. I recommend the remaining program income funds of \$13,500 go to Libbytown Community Gardens. This program has a lot of community support and the funding request is minimal.

The Marginal Way and ADA Curb Ramps projects both qualified for the 60% public infrastructure set-aside. Both programs scored high enough that this set-aside did not affect the funding recommendations of the Allocation Committee, or my own. The current proposal for Marginal way is tied directly to the Back Cove Storage Conduit project. My funding recommendation for this project aligns with the Allocation Committee's recommendation. However, I recommend expanding the scope of this project to allow the Planning and Urban Development and the Public Works Department maximum flexibility in improving the Bayside Neighborhoods' streets and sidewalks and renaming the project 'Marginal Way/Bayside Roadway/Sidewalk Improvements'.

3. *Administration and Planning.* The Planning and Urban Development Department is required to submit a non-competitive application to the Allocation Committee. The Planning and Urban Development Department submitted a request of \$456,579 with the understanding that no more than the HUD imposed administration cap of 20% could be recommended for funding. These funds are used to both administer the program as well as fund long range planning work for the department. The staff have adjusted their budget to meet the FY16-17 cap of \$405,190; therefore I am recommending full funding to administer the program.

I thank you for the opportunity to share my recommendations. As I have stated earlier, all of the programs requesting funds are worthy, unfortunately there is not enough funds to support all of their efforts. I hope you accept my recommendations and join me in commending all of the good work being done in this City.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jon P. Jennings". The signature is stylized with a large, bold "J" and "P".

Jon P. Jennings
City Manager

Portland, Maine



Yes. Life's good here.

Planning & Urban Development Department

February 5, 2016

Jon Jennings, City Manager
 City Hall
 389 Congress Street
 Portland, Maine 04101

Dear Mr. Jennings,

We are pleased to submit the CDBG Annual Allocation Committee's recommended budget allocations for Year 42 of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG).

*On a national level, HUD has not released the 2016-2017 allocations, but we believe the funding will remain level with the previous year's funding.

CDBG ALLOCATION	Year 41 FY 15-16	*Year 42 FY 16-17	Difference in Dollars
Planning and Administration Cap	\$405,113	\$405,113	\$0
Social Service Cap	\$625,270	\$625,270	\$0
Development Activities	\$760,681	\$760,681	\$0
TOTAL	\$1,791,064	\$1,791,064	\$0

As in past years, the need for CDBG funding continues to exceed the amount of funds available. The total funds requested are \$3,524,286 resulting in a gap of \$1,733,222 between CDBG funds available and project requests. As in prior years, we were faced with difficult choices in this year's recommendation process and struggled with which applications to recommend for funding. The Committee stayed focused on the scoring criteria in order to be fair to all applicants.

The following sections of this letter outline our funding recommendations. The first section explains the history and progress Portland's CDBG Program has undergone over the past several years. The second section provides a description of this year's process, how the applications were reviewed and scored, and finally our recommendations for funding.

HISTORY AND CURRENT STATUS OF THE CDBG PROGRAM

Over the last eight years, the CDBG program has undergone significant review. This review resulted in changes to the allocation process as summarized below.

In 2008 the following steps were implemented:

Council Order 70-7/08 (HCD Task Force Ten Point Plan)

- Creation of the CDBG Priority Task Force
- Creation of the CDBG Annual Allocation Committee
- Funded projects are to be completed within two years of award

In 2009 the following steps were implemented:

Council Order 70-7/08 (HCD Task Force Ten Point Plan)

- CDBG Application process is to comply with the City's Purchasing Ordinance
- Council Order 91-08/09 (CDBG Priority Task Force Recommendations)
- Application and scoring reflect the goal of building strong, self sustaining neighborhoods by having applications address the priority impact areas and guiding principles.

In 2010 the final recommendations by the CDBG Priority Task Force were implemented, including:

Council Order 91-08/09 (CDBG Priority Task Force Recommendations)

- \$20,000 minimum request.
- Small grants in the amount of \$7,500 are available to social services for capacity building and to small businesses micro-enterprises for technical assistance
- Social service basic needs set aside for up to 10% of the HUD allocated CDBG grant
- Social service multi-year initiatives requests guidelines defined and encouraged
- Economic development job creation request guidelines defined
- The administration and planning request would be presented to and reviewed by the Committee, but would not be voted upon in a competitive environment

In 2011, the Council further reviewed the program and the implementation of all of the recommendations. Based on this review, the City Council implemented the following changes:

- *Eliminate* the small grants award of \$7,500 made available to social services for capacity building and to small businesses micro-enterprises for technical assistance
- *Eliminate* the social service basic needs set aside, previously set to be up to 10% of the HUD CDBG allocation
- *Lower* the minimum grant request from \$20,000 to \$10,000
- *Create* a maximum grant request per applicant:
 - \$150,000 for Social Service applicants
 - \$250,000 for Development Activities applicants
- *Create* a Maximum Cumulative Grant Allocation for City Applications
 - 45% of funding available for Social Services
 - 85% of funding available for Development Activities
- *Create* an economic development set aside/ cap for job creation for \$100,000
- *Create* a Priority Focus for Program Year 2011-2012:
 - For Social Services additional points can be allocated for applications meeting the Work and Shop priority criteria
 - For Development Activities additional points can be allocated for projects located in Libbytown, Census Tract 20.02

In 2012 there were minor adjustments made to the allocation process

- Based on pressure and direction from HUD we will be paying our grantees based on a cost per unit of service. Each applicant has provided a cost per unit of service. Funded applicants will be submitting funding requisitions and be paid based on the number of units provided and persons served. This does not apply to construction projects.
- Staff will be administering bonus and penalty points on the applications.
- Priority for Social Service applications is child care. Priorities for Development Activities are job creation and projects located in Libbytown or Census Tract 20.02.

Additionally, in 2012 Priority Task Force focused priorities even further:

- To create Sustainable Workforce Development Program(s) that move Portland residents out of poverty into sustained employment and financial stability.
 - 1) Invest in businesses with Portland locations to enable them to expand and create jobs, as eligible by HUD regulations.
 - 2) Provide a continuum of services to increase a Program Participant's professional capacity, financial stability, and ability to maintain employment, through: career advancement services, financial stability and job retention support services.
- Place Program Participant's in newly created sustainable Portland-based jobs.

In 2013 CDBG Working Group determined how to implement the Priorities of the 2012 Task Force:

- Invest 1) in businesses to create net new jobs or 2) to create microenterprise businesses (businesses with less than 5 employees where the owner is LMI Portland)
- Fill 66% of the net new jobs with low to moderate income (LMI) Portland residents.
- Priority will be given to applicants that will hire or serve more LMI Portland residents, homeless persons, New Americans, or single-parent head of households will be given preference
- Set aside \$400,000 (\$300,000 in Development Funds and \$100,000 in Social Service Funds) for the new Workforce Development Initiative now renamed the Employment Development Program.
- Fund at least two applicants
- Funding requests can be for two years
- Tracking of jobs will be for two years after job creation or microenterprise creation
- Success will be evaluated based on return on investment (CDBG investment vs. increase of income of new employees/ business owners)
- The first round of funding will begin in 2014.

2014 Minor adjustments

- Priority for ALL Social Service and Development Activity applications is child care and basic needs. These applications will all receive an additional three bonus points.
- There is a set aside of \$150,000 for Community Policing
- Penalty points were reduced: errors are only 0.25 points, and blanks are not penalized.
- The Employment Development Program received a \$400,000 set aside, including \$300,000 from Development Activities and \$100,000 from Social Services

2015 Minor adjustments

- No Bonus Points
- There was a new "Construction Only" application
- Guiding principles were targeted for Development, Economic Development and Construction applications

2016 Adjustments

- The goals of the CDBG program were recategorized to align with the HCD's new 5 year Consolidated Plan. The new goals are: Neighborhood Investment and Infrastructure, Housing Availability, Economic Opportunity, and Address the Needs of the Growing Homeless Population.

- A Priority Impact Level guide was created to accompany the new goals.
- CDBG applications received a set score of 7 points if the application fell into the 'Priority' category of a goal, or a set score of 11 points if the application fell into the 'High Priority' category of a goal.
- There is a public infrastructure set aside for up to 60% of the maximum cumulative request allotted to the city in the development activities category.
- There is no longer a set aside for the Employment Development Program
- There is a \$90,000 set aside for Childcare Vouchers

THE PROCESS AND REVIEW

CDBG Applications were made available on October 20, 2015. The mandatory applicant's meeting was held on October 21, 2015 at 6:00pm in Room 24 of City Hall. All applications were due on Thursday November 19, 2015 at 2:00pm.

We received fourteen (14) Development Activities applications and seventeen (17) Social Service Applications, along with an Administration and Planning application, for a total of \$3,524,286 in funding requests through our annual request process.

There was a total of \$1,984,999 of Development Activity requests with \$760,681 available, and \$1,082,708 of Social Service requests with \$625,270 available.

The Allocation Committee Review and Funding Methods

Our Committee first met for this funding year on December 10, 2015. The Committee met six (6) times to discuss Administration and Planning, Development Activities and Social Service applications.

The Committee read each application individually prior to the meeting. At the meeting the Committee would discuss each proposal. If questions arose, staff documented the questions and forwarded them to the applicant to answer. The answers were then shared with the Committee.

Applications were organized by score from the highest to the lowest within each category. The City Council has directed the Committee to recommend full funding based on request for all applications; therefore each applicant was awarded full funding, until the funding was exhausted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Administration and Planning Funding

The Committee reviews information regarding Administration and Planning, but does not score the application competitively. Administration funding is essential for operating the CDBG program and reporting to HUD. The Planning & Urban Development Department submitted a budget of \$456,579 with an understanding that the Committee can only recommend up to 20% of the entire CDBG budget be used for Administration and Planning. This year, we are anticipating the 20% cap to be \$405,113.

Organization	Program	Request	Points	Comm. Recomm
Planning & Urban Development Department	Administration	\$456,579	NA	\$405,113

Development Activities Funding

The Committee received Fourteen (14) Development Activities applications including construction and economic development, requesting a total of \$1,984,999 and only \$760,681 is available. The City Council's *85% Rule for Development Activities* is still in place, which specifies that a maximum of 85% of the Development Activity funding can go to fund City applicants, the remaining 15% must go to outside requests. In addition to the *85% rule* a public infrastructure set aside was introduced this year. The Public Infrastructure set aside is 60% of the city's maximum 85% request. The Committee's recommendations fall within these guidelines. The following table outlines the highest scoring applications, their requests and the recommended allocation from the Committee.

Organization	Program	Request	Points	Comm. Recomm.
Portland Housing Dev. Corp	58 Boyd St. Apartments	\$30,000	92.75	\$30,000
Portland Housing Authority	East Bayside Surveillance	\$15,000	91.00	\$15,000
Coastal Enterprises Inc.	Portland Jobs Alliance - EDI	\$135,000	90.50	\$135,000
Living with Peace	The Portland Micros	\$15,000	90.00	\$15,000
Coastal Enterprises Inc.	Portland Microenterprise Assistance Program	\$42,000	87.75	\$42,000
City of Portland Public Works <i>Application #2</i>	*Eligible for set aside ADA Curb Ramps	\$115,000	86.00	\$115,000
City of Portland Public Works <i>Application #3</i>	*Eligible for set aside Marginal Way Master Plan Streetscape Phase 1	\$742,300	84.25	\$408,681*

*If additional funds are available through program income the Committee recommends additional funding for Marginal Way.

Social Service Funding

The Committee received seventeen (17) Social Service applications, including a \$150,000 request from Community Policing which will be funded through a set-aside and an \$89,994 request from Catherine Morrill Day Nursery which will be funded the full set-aside amount of \$90,000. There is \$1,082,708 of Social Service requests with \$625,270 available. The City Council's *45% Rule for Social Services* is still in place, which specifies that a maximum of 45% of the Social Service funding can go to fund City applicants, the remaining 65% must go to outside requests. This rule did not affect the Committee's recommendations this year. The following table outlines the highest scoring applications, their requests and the recommend allocation from the Committee.

Organization	Program	Request	Points	Comm. Recomm
Police Department	Community Policing	\$150,000	Set-aside	\$150,000
Catherine Morrill Day Nursery	CDBG Childcare Voucher Program	\$89,994	Set-aside 89.25	\$90,000
Wayside Food Programs	Direct Service Programs	\$29,000	94.75	\$29,000
City of Portland Social Services Department	Family Shelter- After Hours Program	\$46,850	93.50	\$46,850
Amistad Inc.	Amistad Peer Support and Recovery	\$39,000	93.00	\$39,000
Preble Street	Food Programs	\$50,000	93.00	\$50,000
Preble Street	Resource Center	\$45,000	92.75	\$45,000
Amistad Inc.	Peer Coaching Initiative	\$50,000	92.25	\$50,000
Preble Street	Florence House Women's Shelter	\$30,000	92.00	\$30,000
City of Portland Social Services Department	Oxford Shelter- Housing Assistance for Long Term Stayers	\$47,702	91.13	\$47,702
LearningWorks	English Language Program	\$55,000	89.88	\$47,718

Funding Caps

In past years, the funding caps were set at \$150,000 for social service applicants and \$250,000 for development activities. This year, the funding caps remain the same, with the exception of public infrastructure projects.

SUMMARY

All projects that requested funding would be beneficial to our City, however due to limited dollars, not all were recommended for funding through this program. This is a competitive process; each applicant competed against all other applicants. The projects that are not being recommended for funding scored lower in each of the evaluation categories, and therefore in total points. A spread sheet is attached which provides all scores for each application.

As always, the Committee will continue to look for ways to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and transparency of the program. We welcome comments, suggestions, and feedback both from the Council and the public.

We thank you for your commitment to this program and your patience through its transitions. We hope you are satisfied with the results.

We are especially grateful for our appointments to the Annual Allocation Committee, providing us with the opportunity to participate in this program, and offer our recommendations for your consideration. We look forward to seeing you on March 14th and 28th and hearing your response.

Sincerely,

The CDBG Annual Allocation Committee for Program Year 2016-2017

Maxwell Chikuta, Chair
Annette Rogers, Vice Chair
Wendy Harmon
Matthew Purington

Attachments: CDBG Allocation Committee Funding Recommendations 2016-2017 (spreadsheet)

CDBG Recommendations 2016-2017**Administration and Planning**

Type	Priority	Organization	Program/ Project	Request	Priority Impact/ Goal 33 pts	Guiding Principles 30 pts	Capacity to Deliver 25 pts	Partner/ Collabor 12 pts	Total	Committee Recomm	City Manager Recomm	Council Allocation
1	AP	All	Planning & Urban Dev Dept	CDBG Admin and Planning	\$456,579						\$405,190	\$405,190
				<i>Total Admin & Planning Available</i>	\$405,113				Subtotal:	\$405,190	\$405,190	

Development, Economic Development and Construction

Type	Priority	Organization	Program/ Project	Request	33 pts	30 pts	25 pts	12 pts				
12	CON	HA	Portland Housing Dev. Corp.	58 Boyd Street Apartments	\$30,000	31.75	28.25	22.50	10.25	92.75	\$30,000	\$30,000
13	DA	NI	Portland Housing Authority	East Bayside Surveillance System	\$15,000	31.75	27.75	23.25	8.25	91.00	\$15,000	\$15,000
6	ED	EO	Coastal Enterprises Inc	Portland Jobs Alliance Employment Development Initiative	\$135,000	30.50	26.75	22.50	10.75	90.50	\$135,000	\$135,000
11	CON	EO	Living with Peace	The Portland Micros:Building a microenterprises & new jobs	\$15,000	30.00	27.00	22.75	10.25	90.00	\$15,000	\$15,000
5	ED	EO	Coastal Enterprises Inc	Portland Microenterprise Assistance Program	42,000	30.25	25.25	21.25	11.00	87.75	\$42,000	\$42,000
2	SET	NI	COP Public Works	ADA Curb Ramps, Pedestrian Safety & Related Work	\$115,000	31.25	28.00	21.75	5.00	86.00	\$115,000	\$216,000
3	SET	NI	COP Planning and Public Works	Marginal Way/Bayside Roadway/Sidewalk Improv. & Related Work	\$742,300	29.25	26.00	21.25	7.75	84.25	\$408,861	\$408,861
10	CON	EO	Learning Works	Renovation of Historic 181 Bracket Phase 2	\$70,250	24.25	25.00	22.25	9.50	81.00		
7	CON	NI	COP Public Works	Libbytown Community Garden	\$13,500	24.75	25.25	20.25	8.25	78.50		\$13,500
14	CON	ANGHP	Preble Street	Rehab-Homeless Health Partners Clinic	\$154,643	25.50	25.25	17.75	9.75	78.25		
9	CON	NI	COP Recreation & Facilities	East Bayside Soccer Field Fencing and Futsal Court	\$194,000	26.00	26.75	20.50	4.75	78.00		
15	CON	NI	The Iris Network	Dormitory Accessibility for the Blind	\$171,325	23.00	19.75	22.75	10.00	75.50		
4	CON	EO	Catherine Morrill Day Nursery	Toddler Classroom Expansion Project	\$234,281	22.50	21.25	19.50	7.25	70.50		
8	CON	NI	COP Recreation & Facilities	Cliff Island School Playground	\$52,700	22.00	18.00	19.25	7.00	66.25		
				<i>Total Development, Econ Dev. & Construction Requests</i>	\$1,984,999							
				<i>Total Development, Econ Dev.& Construction Available</i>	\$760,861				Subtotal:	\$760,861	\$875,361	\$0

Social Service

Social Service					Priority Impact/ Goal	Guiding Principles	Capacity to Deliver	Partner/ Collaborat ion	Total	Committee Recomm	City Manager Recomm	Council Allocation
Type	Priority	Organization	Program/ Project	Request	33pts	30 pts	25 pts	12pts				
16	SET	NI	Police Department	Community Policing	\$150,000					\$150,000	\$150,000	
17	SET	EO	Catherine Morrill Day Nursery	Portland CDBG Child Care Voucher Program	\$89,994	29.50	26.50	22.25	11.00	89.25	\$90,000	\$50,000
32	SS	SN	Wayside Food Programs	Direct Service Programs	\$29,000	32.00	28.75	23.75	10.25	94.75	\$29,000	\$26,100
21	SS	NI	COP- Social Services Dept.	Family Shelter- After Hours Program	\$46,850	32.00	28.00	22.75	10.75	93.50	\$46,850	\$46,850
18	SS	ANGHP	Amistad Inc.	Amistad Peer Support and Recovery Center	\$39,000	31.25	28.00	23.25	10.50	93.00	\$39,000	\$35,100
28	SS	ANGHP	Preble Street	Food Programs	\$50,000	32.00	28.50	22.00	10.50	93.00	\$50,000	\$45,000
29	SS	ANGHP	Preble Street	Resource Center	\$45,000	31.25	28.25	23.00	10.25	92.75	\$45,000	\$40,500
19	SS	ANGHP	Amistad Inc.	Amistad Peer Coaching Initiative	\$50,000	31.00	27.75	22.75	10.75	92.25	\$50,000	\$45,000
30	SS	ANGHP	Preble Street	Florence House Women's Shelter	\$30,000	30.75	27.75	22.75	10.75	92.00	\$30,000	\$27,000
22	SS	ANGHP	COP- Social Services Dept.	Oxford Shelter- Housing Assistance- Long Term Stayers	\$47,702	28.13	28.75	23.00	11.25	91.13	\$47,702	\$47,702
23	SS	EO	Learning Works	English Language Program	\$55,000	30.75	26.88	22.50	9.75	89.88	\$47,845	\$43,061
25	SS	ANGHP	Milestone	Homeless Outreach & Mobile Engagement HOME Team	\$94,000	30.00	26.75	22.50	10.50	89.75		\$54,084
31	SS	ANGHP	Preble Street	Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter	\$30,000	30.00	27.25	22.00	10.50	89.75		\$15,000
20	SS	EO	Catholic Charities	Portland Jobs Alliance- Social Services	\$142,991	28.50	26.75	22.00	9.50	86.75		
27	SS	ANGHP	Port. Community Health Center	Survivors of War Trauma and Displacement	\$91,918	29.50	25.25	20.50	10.75	86.00		
26	SS	EO	The Opportunity Alliance	Work/Life Advisor Program (WLAP)	\$70,000	29.75	26.25	19.75	9.75	85.50		
24	SS	NI	Memory Works	Model Memory Cafes for Portland Seniors	\$21,253	26.25	26.25	22.25	10.00	84.75		
Total Social Services				\$1,082,708					Subtotal:	\$625,397	\$625,397	\$0
Total Social Services Available				\$625,397								
ALL CDBG REQUESTS TOTAL				\$3,524,286					Allocation Total:	\$1,791,448	\$1,905,948	

Portland, Maine



Yes. Life's good here.

Mary Davis

Division Director, Housing & Community Development Division

TO: City Council

FROM: Planning and Urban Development Department/HCD Division

DATE: March 4, 2016

SUBJECT: 2016-2017 Housing Program Budget

SUMMARY OF ISSUE - Council approval of the FY16/17 Housing Program Budget is required. The Housing Committee voted 5-0 to forward this item to the City Council for passage.

INTENDED RESULT

HOME Program: The Home Investments Partnerships Program (HOME) was established by Congress in 1992. Since 1992, the City of Portland and the Cumberland County HOME Consortium have received almost \$18.1 million dollars in HOME funding. In 2009 the City became the lead entity in the Cumberland County HOME Consortium (CCHC). The Consortium is a partnership of the communities in Cumberland County that administers HOME Program funds in Cumberland County. The creation of the consortium expanded the financial resources for affordable housing activities in the region. The City retains independent operation of its HOME program. Because the City serves as the "Lead Entity" and City staff administers the County portion of the funding, all administrative funds are retained by the City. The County's Municipal Oversight Committee controls the allocation of County's portion of the HOME funds.

When the Consortium was formed in 2009, it included a "hold harmless" clause to ensure that the City, as an existing HOME grantee, would continue to receive funding equal to its allocation prior to the formation of the consortium. The "hold harmless" formula was based on a comparison ratio to the HOME funding for the Lewiston/Auburn (L/A) Consortium. The formula identified Portland's "hold harmless" amount at 118% of the HOME allocation for the L/A Consortium. The Cumberland County HOME Agreement did allow for adjustments to be made if the current level of funding to the L/A HOME Consortium varied from historic levels. Over the years the L/A allocation has decreased which has resulted in the Portland "hold harmless" amount to decrease. Even though the CCHC HOME allocation went up this year, the City portion of the funding actually went down because of a decrease in the L/A allocation. Staff raised this issue with the other members of the CCHC which resulted in an agreement to divide the funding with 57% of allocation, after the administrative set-aside, to the City and 43% of the funding to the County.



Mary Davis

Division Director, Housing & Community Development Division

The 2016-2017 HUD HOME allocation is \$828,140, of which \$320,490 is reserved for County projects. The budget proposal was developed after a historical review of HOME funding allocations, previous year's budget allocations, program expenditures and program income (loan repayments) received. Currently, the City's HOME Program is divided into four funding categories: Administration, Housing Rehabilitation, Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) and Affordable Housing Development [including the required Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) set-aside mandated by HUD].

CDBG/Housing Development Fund: Housing and Community Development Division did not request funding in the FY 16/17 CDBG process. Staff and housing program costs normally funded through CDBG, are being funded through the Housing Development Fund (HDF). HDF is the program income account funded by CDBG housing loan repayments. Currently, the HDF fund is divided into two funding categories, administration and housing rehabilitation.

Lead Safe Housing Program Income: These funds result from repayment of loans given through prior Lead Hazard Control Grants from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and must be used to create additional lead-safe units.

Housing Trust Fund: The current balance in the Housing Trust Fund is primarily a result of fees generated by the Housing Replacement Ordinance. As of February 16, 2016, the balance of the Housing Trust Fund is \$468,551. While staff anticipates increases in revenue in the Housing Trust Fund as a result of the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance and other sources being considered by the City Council, those anticipated resources are not included in this budget.

FINANCIAL IMPACT - This budget is based on CDBG and HOME allocations from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development along with program income from CDBG, HOME and Lead Safe Housing. Local funds from the Housing Trust Fund are also included.

STAFF ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATION – The proposed Housing Program Budget can be adjusted as necessary throughout the year with appropriate analysis and public notice as required by our HUD Consolidated Plan. This budget, as may be amended by the Housing Committee, will be forwarded to the full City Council for two Public Hearings, as part of the overall HCD budget. The final budget allocations and Annual Action Plan are submitted to HUD on May 15 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2016.

At this time staff is requesting Committee approval and recommendation to the City Council of the FY 16/17 Housing Program Budget as outlined in the attachment.

FY 16/17 Housing Program Budget – Attached

Prepared by: Mary P. Davis, HCD Division Director March 4, 2016

2016-2017 HOUSING PROGRAM BUDGET HUD Final Allocation February 16, 2016		
		Recommended by HC 02/24/16
Total HUD HOME Entitlement Allocation	828,140	Approved by Council (add date)
Portland Portion	507,650	
County Portion	320,490	

Approved by Council (add date)

REVENUES- Housing Programs

HOME	CDBG	HDF**	LEAD Safe Housing**	Housing Trust Fund***	TOTAL BUDGET
82,814					82,814
424,836					424,836
200,000					200,000
					0
					0
				468,551	468,551
		353,458			353,458
			269,774		269,774
707,650	0	353,458	269,774	468,551	1,799,433

HOME	CDBG	HDF**	LEAD Safe Housing**	Housing Trust Fund***	TOTAL BUDGET
102,814		49,280			152,094
150,000		304,178			454,178
0					0
130,000					130,000
254,030				468,551	722,581
70,806					70,806
0			269,774		269,774
707,650	0	353,458	269,774	468,551	1,799,433

*** Balance of Previously Budgeted Amount

325,490

Emergency Solutions Grant 2012-2016

Program	ESG Budgeted Funding Amount by Fiscal Year				
	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17
Operations: Homeless Health	\$37,582	\$28,993	\$35,391	\$0	\$0
Essential Services: Family Shelter	\$28,327	\$21,853	\$26,675	\$28,327	\$28,327
Homeless Prevention: Family Shelter	\$28,326	\$21,853	\$26,675	\$52,369	\$52,369
Homeless Prevention: Oxford Street	\$12,242	\$8,972	\$10,952	\$13,800	\$13,244
Rapid Rehousing: Oxford Street	\$48,966	\$35,888	\$43,807	\$55,200	\$55,200
Administration and HMIS	\$12,603	\$5,600	\$6,838	\$12,138	\$12,092
<i>Total (Actual)</i>	<i>\$168,046</i>	<i>\$123,159</i>	<i>\$150,338</i>	<i>\$161,834</i>	<i>\$161,232</i>
<i>Admin/HMIS cap</i>	<i>\$12,603</i>	<i>\$9,237</i>	<i>\$11,275</i>	<i>\$12,138</i>	<i>\$12,092</i>

Explanation

Operations: Homeless Health	This program is no longer administered by the City of Portland
Essential Services: Family Shelter	Funds pay for staff who provides housing assistance by seeking affordable units, applying for eligible subsidies and accessing transitional housing opportunities and follow-up case management services by assisting with budgets, tenant/ landlord negotiations, and connecting to area resources.
Homeless Prevention: Family Shelter	Funds pay for staff who assist in preventing family homelessness. Services include advocating with their town of residency, landlord/tenant negotiations and family reunifications.
Homeless Prevention: Oxford Street Shelter	Funds pay for staff who assist in preventing individuals from becoming homeless and providing necessary case management and referrals.
Rapid Rehousing: Oxford Street Shelter	Funds pay for staff who assist persons who have become homeless by quickly moving them into permanent housing and providing the necessary case management and referrals the individual needs.
Administration and HMIS	Funding goes to pay for licenses to use HUD's Homeless Management and Information System. Licenses are provided by Maine Housing.

NEED	GOAL	PRIORITY IMPACT LEVEL
Neighborhood Investment & Infrastructure: <i>Description:</i> Public safety and mobility are key components to improving the livelihood of Portland neighborhoods. There is a significant need throughout the targeted neighborhoods to build sidewalks where none exist, improve accessibility through ADA compliance, increase the use of bicycles as a mode of transportation, and redevelop streetscapes to create shared streets for cars, bikes, and pedestrians that integrates with the fabric of the neighborhood. <i>Basis for Relative priority:</i> In 2014 the Portland City Council identified two goals that identified this need: 1) Develop a transportation system that advances healthy living, minimizes environmental impacts, and promotes the local economy by advancing opportunities for mass transit, bicycle use and walking; and 2) Advance environmental programs that safeguard our natural resources, promote a healthy lifestyle and support a sustainable economy. Resource: City of Portland <i>Capital Improvement Plan Sustainable Portland Report</i>	Create strong, safe, accessible and vibrant neighborhoods: <i>Description:</i> Invest in infrastructure to improve neighborhood assets and build strong, safe, accessible and vibrant neighborhoods. Improve accessibility and livability through age-friendly designs and ADA compliance. Build sidewalks and trails to improve connectivity, increase the use of bicycles as a mode of transportation, and redevelop streetscapes to create shared streets for cars, bikes, and pedestrians that integrate with the fabric of the neighborhood. Support programs that increase safety in neighborhoods for residents and visitors.	Including but not limited to: HIGH PRIORITY • Community policing • Public infrastructure in targeted neighborhoods (CDBG targeted neighborhood beginning with the Bayside Neighborhood) • Accessibility/ADA compliance • Alternative modes of transportation PRIORITY • Park and recreation facilities • Tree planting • Non-profit rehab • Community centers • Historic preservation • Aging in place related services

2016-2020 HUD Five-Year Consolidate Plan Needs/Goals/Priorities Table

NEED	GOAL	PRIORITY IMPACT LEVEL
Housing Availability: <i>Description:</i> In 2014 Portland contracted with the Greater Portland Council of Governments to complete a study entitled <i>2030 Workforce Housing Demand Study</i>. The report, released in January 2015, found that current housing production is not meeting the housing needs of Portland. The City Council has made a goal to promote housing availability in all segments of the housing market while insuring a suitable balance of housing opportunities among those sectors. <i>Basis for Relative priority:</i> In 2014 the Portland City Council identified the following goal to address this need: provide increased availability in all segments of the housing market while insuring that there is suitable balance of housing opportunities among those sectors. Resources: <i>2030 Workforce Housing Demand Study</i> 2002 Housing Plan <i>Report of the Task Force to Develop a Strategic Plan to Prevent & End Homelessness in Portland, Nov. 2012</i>	Increase housing availability & affordability: <i>Description:</i> Increase housing availability and affordability to all Portland residents regardless of income, race, ethnicity, and family size. Encourage housing development by removing barriers to traditional urban housing types while ensuring the inclusion of workforce and age-friendly housing in significant development projects.	Including but not limited to: HIGH PRIORITY • Construction of new housing (HOME funds only) • Adaptive reuse for housing • Rehabilitation of existing housing • Housing Retention PRIORITY • Rental assistance • Environmental testing and remediation • Energy efficiency/weatherization • Fair housing activities • Heating and fuel assistance • Tenant landlord counseling services • Legal services

NEED	GOAL	PRIORITY IMPACT LEVEL
Economic Opportunity: <i>Description:</i> Portland has a well-developed employment support system with many established providers. However, the system is fragmented, providers work in silos, there is insufficient funding to cover needs of potential workers, and career planning and financial stability are often prioritized less than job placement. Employment retention support is scarce and turnover results in economic uncertainty for employees and higher costs for employers. <i>Basis for Relative priority:</i> In 2014, the Portland City Council identified the following goal: Promote Economic Development in the City in a manner that provides for increased property values, diversification across industry sectors and high paying jobs. Specifically, as it relates to HUD programming and objectives, the Council further identified the need to advance work on the “Minority and Women-owned Business Development Initiative” and secure City Council approval to invest CDBG funds in workforce development. Resources: <i>Portland Economic Development Vision and Plan</i> Portland Community Chamber of Commerce: <i>Portland’s Economic Scorecard 2014-2015</i> Muskie School of Public Service: <i>The State of Infant Pre-K Childcare in Portland, Maine 2015</i> GPCOG 2014-2018 <i>Economic Development Action Plan</i>	Create economic opportunities to transition people out of poverty: <i>Description:</i> Invest in Portland businesses to enable them to expand to create jobs. Invest in persons wanting to create microenterprises. Engage job seekers in a continuum of services to increase their professional capacity, financial stability, and ability to maintain employment. Focus on difficult to employ populations including homeless, new Americans and single parent head of households. Combine resources and build partnerships between public and private entities to provide opportunities to transition Portland residents out of poverty to sustainable employment and financial stability.	Including but not limited to: HIGH PRIORITY • Job creation • Microenterprise assistance • Career advancement services • Education • Job training • GED attainment • ESL • Job retention support services • Childcare vouchers • Housing counseling • Transportation assistance PRIORITY • Façade improvements • Financial stability services • Budgeting • Financial planning • Tax preparation

NEED	GOAL	PRIORITY IMPACT LEVEL
Address the Needs for Growing Homeless Population: <i>Description:</i> The shelter system in Portland is beyond capacity. Staff and local organizations struggle to deal with overflow strategies to meet increasing need. Data suggests most persons who are homeless stay at the shelter less than three weeks. Homeless Prevention and Rapid Rehousing are key components to help reduce shelter usage and homelessness. Additionally increased case management is needed for those who have mental illness and substance abuse issues to help them navigate the service delivery system. Additionally, the State of Maine will be reducing funding support and increase documentation requirements for those staying at the shelter, making it more difficult to serve those most in need. <i>Basis for Relative priority:</i> In 2014 the Portland City Council identified the goal: Prevent and end homelessness in the city of Portland by continuing to implement the recommendations of the Homelessness Task Force, including retooling the emergency shelter system to create centralized intake process and evaluate steps to improve efficiency, prevent homelessness and rapidly rehouse those who become homeless to avoid long term stays in the shelters, and increase case management for persons with mental illness and substance abuse to help navigate the service delivery system. <i>Resource:</i> Report of the Task Force to Develop a Strategic Plan to Prevent & End Homelessness in Portland, Nov. 2012.	Prevent and Reduce Homelessness: <i>Description:</i> Prevent individuals and families from becoming homeless and entering into the shelter system. Rapidly rehouse those who enter the shelter system. Provide necessary resources to assist vulnerable population's transition out of homelessness, including housing opportunities for chronically homeless or long-term stayers at homeless shelters.	Including but not limited to: HIGH PRIORITY • Food assistance • Shelter services • Child care vouchers • Mental health services • Substance abuse services • Housing for long-term shelter consumers • Rental Assistance • At risk youth services



Memorandum

Planning and Urban Development Department
Housing and Community Development Program

To: City Council

Cc: Jeff Levine, Planning and Urban Development Director
Mary Davis, Housing and Community Development Director

From: Kristin Styles, HCD Program Manager

Date: March 23, 2016

Re: CDBG Follow Up Questions

At the March 14 Council Meeting, Councilors reviewed the HUD 5 Year Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan; including the FY17 CDBG funding recommendations by the CDBG Allocation Committee and the City Manager. Based on the presentations and public comment, Councilors had follow up question on the following applications.

CEI- Portland Jobs Alliance – Employment Development Initiative

The past two years the Portland Jobs Alliance received funding that they are not getting this year, what is not being funded?

The past two years, the CEI applied for and received a CDBG economic development set-aside which included funding from both the 'Development Activities' and 'Social Service Activities' funding pools. This year, CEI-Portland Jobs Alliance is projected to only receive funds from the 'Development Activities' CDBG funding pool. The social service activities *not* funded through CEI's FY16 application include: Job Readiness Classes, Financial Literacy, ESOL Assessment, job Retention Support, internships, development of employment plans, transportation support, childcare support, and contextualized English classes (*See attachment 1a- CEI- PJA*)

*Note: Many of PJA social service activities listed above applied for CDBG social services funds through Catholic Charities, this application did not score high enough to be recommended for funding.

Milestone – Homeless Outreach & Mobile Engagement HOME Team

What is minimum amount needed to run the HOME team?

Currently, the HOME Team operates 6-days a week from 9am-8pm. The program budget provided with the FY17 CDBG application estimated the cost per unit of service at \$21.65 with 8,500 units of service provided annually; a total of \$184,025. In response to Council Suslovic's question, Milestone has provided an updated program budget with a minimum of \$171,307.96 needed to run the program 6 days a week. Milestone has secured \$81,624.59 in funding from other sources, leaving a gap of \$89,683.37 (*See attachment 2a-Milestone*)

What would be to cost of running the HOME Team program 7 days a week?

The additional cost to operate the HOME team 7 days a week is estimated to be \$11,246 (See attachment 2b-Milestone).

What is the cost of an additional HOME team?

The projected cost of a second HOME team is \$66,000 per year. This second team would be a walking team (ie, no vehicle needed), which would walk the waterfront, Congress St, and do regular check-ins with merchants in the downtown area.

CDBG Program

Do the CDBG goals and priorities align with the City's goals? If not- where to they differ?

The goals and priorities created for the 5 Year Consolidated Plan, which include CDBG, HOME and ESG, are based on a HUD mandated community needs assessment and formatted to align with the City Council's 2014 Goals and Objectives.

The 2016 'Portland City Council Committee Work and Goals for the Next 1-5 Years' also align with the 5 Year Consolidated Plan. The areas which differ are due to the limitations of how CDBG, HOME and ESG funds may be used. A full description of the HUD 5 Year Consolidate Plan Needs Goals and Priorities table is attached (See attachment 3A- Needs Goals and Priorities)

City Goal 2014	HUD 5 Year Consolidated Plan Goals	2016 City Council Committee Goal
Implement TIF Program	N/A	
Promote Housing Availability	Increase housing availability & affordability	Housing Committee
Transportation Initiatives	Neighborhood Investment & Infrastructure	
Economic Development	Economic Opportunity	Economic Development Committee
Advance Environmental Program	Neighborhood Investment & Infrastructure	Energy and Sustainability Committee
Improve City Services	N/A	
Prevent and End Homelessness	Address the Needs for Growing Homeless Population	Health and Human Services Committee
Intergovernmental Collaboration	N/A	



Portland Jobs Alliance Social Service/Job Readiness and Support

	2015-2016 CDBG	2015-2016 Other PJA Grant Support	2016-2017 CDBG	2016-2017 Other PJA Grant Support
Job Readiness Classes	\$19,750	\$25,341	0	\$25,341
Financial Literacy Classes; 1-1 Counseling	\$8,600	\$1,525	0	\$1,525
Intake and Initial Job Readiness Assessment	\$10,500	0	0	0
English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Assessment	\$5,000	0	0	0
Development of Employment Plans	\$5,000	\$ 2,500	0	\$ 2,500
Job Retention Support	\$12,250	\$30,171 \$17,634	0	\$17,634
SS Internships	\$26,880		0	0
Transportation (bus passes)	\$1,260		0	0*
Childcare	\$9,040		0	0*
Other Job Retention Support	\$1,720	\$1,800	0	0
Career Ladders/Contextualized English classes		\$27,000	0	0
TOTALS	\$100,000	\$105,971	0	\$47,000

Funds highlighted in blue represent grant funding awarded directly to Portland Adult Ed to support Portland Jobs Alliance activities.

** PJA will leverage wherever possible Department of Labor Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act (WIOA) funds for childcare and transportation support.*

Milestone Foundation, Inc.
Profit Loss-HOME TEAM
YTD Actual and Fiscal 2016 Projected

Attachment 2a- Milestone

	Actual YTD Jul '15 - Feb 16	Projected Jul'15 - June 16
Ordinary Income/Expense		
Income		
City of Portland:		
CDBG	50,000.00	75,000.00
City's Health & Human Services budget	16,666.72	25,000.00
Unrestricted Donations/Grants:		
Mercy Hospital	5,000.00	5,000.00
Portland Downtown District	5,000.00	5,000.00
Kirby Foundation	5,000.00	5,000.00
Fund Raising Concert	1,905.00	1,905.00
John T. Gorman	15,000.00	15,000.00
Doree Taylor-Operating Grant 15	30,000.00	30,000.00
Cohen Foundation	0.00	6,000.00
Miscellaneous Income	994.62	994.62
Allocation of Unrestricted Donations-		
Unspecified	2,058.25	2,058.25
Total Income	<u>131,624.59</u>	<u>170,957.87</u>
Gross Profit	131,624.59	170,957.87
Expense		
Small Tool Purchases	350.00	
Salaries & Wages	69,780.66	104,670.99
Taxes	5,749.07	8,623.61
Fringe Benefits	5,450.24	9,266.12
Consultants	8,060.23	8,060.23
Occupancy	1,077.76	1,616.64
Utilities	1,959.39	2,939.09
Depreciation	3,177.36	4,766.04
Building Expenses	92.48	92.48
Recruitment	93.00	93.00
Supplies Expense	1,310.81	1,966.22
Travel Expense	3,209.43	4,814.15
Insurance	2,779.22	4,168.83
Miscellaneous Expense	1,509.73	1,509.73
Other Types of Expenses	552.00	552.00
Travel and Meetings	23.16	23.16
Agency Allocation of G&A	12,097.11	18,145.67
Total Expense	<u>117,271.65</u>	<u>171,307.96</u>
Net Ordinary Income	<u>14,352.94</u>	<u>-350.09</u>
Net Income	<u>14,352.94</u>	<u>-350.09</u>
2016 Funding Secured		
2016 Funding Requested not secured		

Milestone Foundation, Inc.**HOME-Team-Projected Cost for increase in Services****Additional Yearly Cost Increase to add an additional shift:**

Salaries	\$ 54,080.00
Taxes	\$ 4,122.00
Fringe	\$ 4,759.00
Fuel	\$ 2,500.00
Misc Supplies	\$ 500.00

Total yearly cost to add additional shift \$ 65,961.00

**Additional Yearly Cost Increase to add a day (ie, run program
7days/wk):**

Salaries	\$ 9,984.00
Taxes	\$ 761.00
Fuel	\$ 426.00
Misc Supplies	\$ 75.00

Total yearly cost to add an additional day \$ 11,246.00

NEED	GOAL	PRIORITY IMPACT LEVEL
Neighborhood Investment & Infrastructure: <u>Description:</u> Public safety and mobility are key components to improving the livelihood of Portland neighborhoods. There is a significant need throughout the targeted neighborhoods to build sidewalks where none exist, improve accessibility through ADA compliance, increase the use of bicycles as a mode of transportation, and redevelop streetscapes to create shared streets for cars, bikes, and pedestrians that integrates with the fabric of the neighborhood. <u>Basis for Relative priority:</u> In 2014 the Portland City Council identified two goals that identified this need: 1) Develop a transportation system that advances healthy living, minimizes environmental impacts, and promotes the local economy by advancing opportunities for mass transit, bicycle use and walking; and 2) Advance environmental programs that safeguard our natural resources, promote a healthy lifestyle and support a sustainable economy. Resource: City of Portland <i>Capital Improvement Plan Sustainable Portland Report</i>	Create strong, safe, accessible and vibrant neighborhoods: <u>Description:</u> Invest in infrastructure to improve neighborhood assets and build strong, safe, accessible and vibrant neighborhoods. Improve accessibility and livability through age-friendly designs and ADA compliance. Build sidewalks and trails to improve connectivity, increase the use of bicycles as a mode of transportation, and redevelop streetscapes to create shared streets for cars, bikes, and pedestrians that integrate with the fabric of the neighborhood. Support programs that increase safety in neighborhoods for residents and visitors.	Including but not limited to: HIGH PRIORITY • Community policing • Public infrastructure in targeted neighborhoods (CDBG targeted neighborhood beginning with the Bayside Neighborhood) • Accessibility/ADA compliance • Alternative modes of transportation PRIORITY • Park and recreation facilities • Tree planting • Non-profit rehab • Community centers • Historic preservation

NEED	GOAL	PRIORITY IMPACT LEVEL
Housing Availability: <i>Description:</i> In 2014 Portland contracted with the Greater Portland Council of Governments to complete a study entitled <i>2030 Workforce Housing Demand Study</i>. The report, released in January 2015, found that current housing production is not meeting the housing needs of Portland. The City Council has made a goal to promote housing availability in all segments of the housing market while insuring a suitable balance of housing opportunities among those sectors. <i>Basis for Relative priority:</i> In 2014 the Portland City Council identified the following goal to address this need: provide increased availability in all segments of the housing market while insuring that there is suitable balance of housing opportunities among those sectors. Resources: <i>2030 Workforce Housing Demand Study</i> 2002 Housing Plan <i>Report of the Task Force to Develop a Strategic Plan to Prevent & End Homelessness in Portland, Nov. 2012</i>	Increase housing availability & affordability: <i>Description:</i> Increase housing availability and affordability to all Portland residents regardless of income, race, ethnicity, and family size. Encourage housing development by removing barriers to traditional urban housing types while ensuring the inclusion of workforce and age-friendly housing in significant development projects.	Including but not limited to: HIGH PRIORITY • Construction of new housing (HOME funds only) • Adaptive reuse for housing • Rehabilitation of existing housing • Housing Retention PRIORITY • Rental assistance • Environmental testing and remediation • Energy efficiency/weatherization • Fair housing activities • Heating and fuel assistance • Tenant landlord counseling services • Legal services

NEED	GOAL	PRIORITY IMPACT LEVEL
Economic Opportunity: <i>Description:</i> Portland has a well-developed employment support system with many established providers. However, the system is fragmented, providers work in silos, there is insufficient funding to cover needs of potential workers, and career planning and financial stability are often prioritized less than job placement. Employment retention support is scarce and turnover results in economic uncertainty for employees and higher costs for employers. <i>Basis for Relative priority:</i> In 2014, the Portland City Council identified the following goal: Promote Economic Development in the City in a manner that provides for increased property values, diversification across industry sectors and high paying jobs. Specifically, as it relates to HUD programming and objectives, the Council further identified the need to advance work on the “Minority and Women-owned Business Development Initiative” and secure City Council approval to invest CDBG funds in workforce development. Resources: <i>Portland Economic Development Vision and Plan</i> Portland Community Chamber of Commerce: <i>Portland’s Economic Scorecard 2014-2015</i> Muskie School of Public Service: <i>The State of Infant Pre-K Childcare in Portland, Maine 2015</i> GPCOG 2014-2018 Economic Development Action Plan	Create economic opportunities to transition people out of poverty: <i>Description:</i> Invest in Portland businesses to enable them to expand to create jobs. Invest in persons wanting to create microenterprises. Engage job seekers in a continuum of services to increase their professional capacity, financial stability, and ability to maintain employment. Focus on difficult to employ populations including homeless, new Americans and single parent head of households. Combine resources and build partnerships between public and private entities to provide opportunities to transition Portland residents out of poverty to sustainable employment and financial stability.	Including but not limited to: HIGH PRIORITY • Job creation • Microenterprise assistance • Career advancement services • Education • Job training • GED attainment • ESL • Job retention support services • Childcare vouchers • Housing counseling • Transportation assistance PRIORITY • Façade improvements • Financial stability services • Budgeting • Financial planning • Tax preparation

NEED	GOAL	PRIORITY IMPACT LEVEL
Address the Needs for Growing Homeless Population: <u>Description:</u> The shelter system in Portland is beyond capacity. Staff and local organizations struggle to deal with overflow strategies to meet increasing need. Data suggests most persons who are homeless stay at the shelter less than three weeks. Homeless Prevention and Rapid Rehousing are key components to help reduce shelter usage and homelessness. Additionally increased case management is needed for those who have mental illness and substance abuse issues to help them navigate the service delivery system. Additionally, the State of Maine will be reducing funding support and increase documentation requirements for those staying at the shelter, making it more difficult to serve those most in need. <u>Basis for Relative priority:</u> In 2014 the Portland City Council identified the goal: Prevent and end homelessness in the city of Portland by continuing to implement the recommendations of the Homelessness Task Force, including retooling the emergency shelter system to create centralized intake process and evaluate steps to improve efficiency, prevent homelessness and rapidly rehouse those who become homeless to avoid long term stays in the shelters, and increase case management for persons with mental illness and substance abuse to help navigate the service delivery system. Resource: <i>Report of the Task Force to Develop a Strategic Plan to Prevent & End Homelessness in Portland, Nov. 2012.</i>	Prevent and Reduce Homelessness: <u>Description:</u> Prevent individuals and families from becoming homeless and entering into the shelter system. Rapidly rehouse those who enter the shelter system. Provide necessary resources to assist vulnerable population's transition out of homelessness, including housing opportunities for chronically homeless or long-term stayers at homeless shelters.	Including but not limited to: HIGH PRIORITY • Food assistance • Shelter services • Child care vouchers • Mental health services • Substance abuse services PRIORITY • Housing for long-term shelter consumers • Rental assistance • At risk youth services

CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE
2016 – 2020
HOUSING AND COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DRAFT
FIVE YEAR CONDOLIDATED PLAN



City of Portland, Maine

Planning and Urban Development Department

Housing and Community Development Division

Community Development Program

389 Congress Street, Room 312

Portland, ME 04101

www.portlandmaine.gov

CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE
2016 – 2020
HOUSING AND COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
DRAFT
FIVE YEAR CONDOLIDATED PLAN



City of Portland, Maine

Planning and Urban Development Department

Housing and Community Development Division

Community Development Program

389 Congress Street, Room 312

Portland, ME 04101

www.portlandmaine.gov

Executive Summary

ES-05 Executive Summary - 91.200(c), 91.220(b)

1. Introduction

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires jurisdictions to combine the planning and applications for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), the HOME Investment Partnership Program and the Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) into a single submission known as the Consolidated Plan. This Consolidated Plan provides a basis and strategy for the use of federal funds granted to the City of Portland's CDBG and ESG programs as well as the City of Portland and Cumberland County's HOME consortium. The City of Portland's Department of Planning and Urban Development, Housing and Community Development Division, is the lead entity for managing and distributing the HOME Consortium funding. This Consolidated Plan covers the period beginning July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2021, including five program years.

In addition to the Consolidated Plan, HUD requires jurisdictions to submit an Annual Action Plan which will describe how the funds for a program year will be distributed to address the needs, goals, and priorities identified in the Consolidated Plan. The programs and activities described in the Annual Action Plans are primarily intended to benefit low and moderate income residents of the City of Portland and Cumberland County through the HOME Consortium.

The Consolidated Plan is based on a combination of community outreach, public hearings, consultation with various agencies, and collaboration with non-profit organizations, neighborhood groups, and community stakeholders. Before submittal to HUD, the Consolidated Plan was made available to the public through a 30-day comment period as well as two public hearings.

Definitions used in this Consolidated Plan correspond to the HUD definitions of low income, extremely low income, and moderate income. Additionally, the CDBG program refers to 'eligible areas' as census block groups in which at least 51% of the households have an income less than 80% of the AMI; whereas 'target areas' refer to neighborhoods and census block groups which have the highest concentration (80-95%) of households with an income less than the 80% of the AMI. The boundaries of the 'target areas' will be defined in each Annual Action Plan.

2. Summary of the objectives and outcomes identified in the Plan

The objectives and outcomes identified in this Consolidated Plan are based on a combination of HUD-provided data, independent research, community outreach, consultation with various agencies and service providers, and the established goals and priorities of the City of Portland. Based on the information collected, the following goals will be used to allocate funding for the next five years. All programs and activities funded through the CDBG, HOME and ESG programs will help to fulfill one of these four goals:

1. Neighborhood Investment & Infrastructure- Create strong, safe accessible and vibrant neighborhoods
2. Housing Availability- Increase housing availability and affordability
3. Economic Opportunity – Create Economic opportunities to transition people out of poverty
4. Address the Needs of the Growing Homeless Population- Prevent and Reduce Homelessness

3. Evaluation of past performance

Limited financial resources are the City's biggest constraint to meeting the needs and goals of our community. Year after year the request of funding far exceeds the amount of funds available through the City's CDBG, HOME, and ESG programs. That being said, the use of the HUD funds allows for an increase in leveraged funds through many of the program's sub-grantees. In order to maximize the effectiveness of the HUD funds distributed within our Community, each sub-grantee's application goes through an extensive evaluation process.

The needs, goals, and priorities identified in this Consolidated Plan represent a continuing evaluation and evolution the City's CDBG, HOME and ESG programs. As new information becomes available about the needs of our community, the HCD staff work with City officials to make sure that the goals of the HUDS programs are aligning with the direction and goals of the City. Through the continued evaluation process, the HCD staff is able to make sure that the needs of the City are being address in every funding cycle. The four needs, goals, and priorities categories addressed in this Consolidated Plan encumber the two previous goals used by the City's HUD programs. The new categorization of these goals allow for a more streamline reporting and evaluation system.

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

In 2013 the City conducted an evaluation of the HUD required citizen participation plan. Through this process the HCD staff made several improvements to the citizen participation plan. The City holds multiple public meetings each year, including a 'service providers' meeting, to make sure the needs of the community heard. Per HUD requirement, two public hearings are held each year to allow the public to give input directly to the City Council on how HUD-program funding should be allocated. In addition to the public hearings and meetings, HCD staff welcome meetings with concerned citizens, neighborhood organizations and other community groups. The HCD staff also serve on serval committees and are active members of organizations related to improving the quality for life for low and moderate income Portland residents.

5. Summary of public comments

The Consolidate Plan public comment period was held from April 1 to April 31, 2016. **No public comment was given.** During the public hearings, many members of the community as well as organization representatives spoke about the need for continued CDBG support to the following

programs; CEI Microenterprise Assistant, Portland Jobs Alliance, Preble Street shelter and food programs, Childcare Voucher Program, Milestone HOME team.

6. Summary of comments or views not accepted and the reasons for not accepting them

All comments and views were accepted.

7. Summary

This 5 year Consolidated Plan identifies housing and community development needs in both the City of Portland and Cumberland County through the CDBG, ESG and HOME Consortia. The needs assessment and market analysis done in this Consolidated Plan were used to form the City's Housing and Community Development strategic plan for the next five years. The details of these needs, market analysis, and strategic plan are described in the following document.

The Process

PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies - 91.200(b)

1. Describe agency/entity responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source

The following are the agencies/entities responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source.

Agency Role	Name	Department/Agency
Lead Agency	PORTLAND	
CDBG Administrator	PORTLAND	Planning and Urban Development Dept, HCD Division
HOPWA Administrator	PORTLAND	Frannie Peabody Center, ME
HOME Administrator	PORTLAND	Planning and Urban Development Dept, HCD Division
ESG Administrator	PORTLAND	Health and Human Services Department, SS Division
HOPWA-C Administrator		

Table 1 – Responsible Agencies

Narrative

The City of Portland's Department of Planning and Urban Development, Housing and Community Development Division, is the lead entity for managing and distributing the CDBG and HOME funding. The ESG Grant is distributed through the Health and Human Services Department. HOPWA is managed and administered by the Frannie Peabody Center.

The 2016-2017 Action Plan was written by staff in the Department Housing and Community Development. However, numerous individuals and entities were involved in the process, recommendations, and decision making that defined the details of this Plan.

All CDBG applications for 2016-2017 funding were submitted to the Housing and Community Development Division. There were seventeen (17) requests for social service funding from twelve (12) different entities, and fourteen (14) requests for development activity funding from nine (9) different entities. Staff reviewed each application for threshold eligibility, and prepared and presented the information to the CDBG Allocation Committee. This year the Allocation Committee was comprised of four (4) community members who were vetted through an application process and appointed by the Portland City Council. The CDBG Allocation Committee read, reviewed, and scored all applications. The Committee recommended funding allocations to the City Manager based on priorities, provided

information, performance, and capacities of the applicants. Allocation Committee meetings were open to the public, the dates and times of which were posted on the City's website in the online calendar.

The City Manager reviewed the applications and recommendations from the Allocation Committee. Based on this information, the City Manager made his own recommendations. Both the Committee's and the City Manager's recommendations were presented to the City Council.

The HOME Budget is developed by HCD staff and presented to the Housing Committee. The Housing Committee consists of five of the nine City Councilors. This is a public meeting which is advertised on the City website with notices sent to housing partners, neighborhood organizations and other interested parties who have registered to receive notice of these meetings. Public Comment is taken.

The Emergency Solutions Grant was presented to the Continuum of Care and the Emergency Shelter Assessment Committee. Both groups discussed the allocations and voted unanimously to approve the budget and activities that are included in this Consolidated Plan.

The entire Consolidated Plan and Action Plan, including the budgets for CDBG, HOME and ESG, were presented and discussed at two public hearings on March 14 and March 28 consistent with the Citizen Participation Plan. Public comment was taken at both Council meetings. **Council voted to approve the final allocations supporting the City Manager's recommendations.**

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

Mary Davis

Housing and Community Development Division

389 Congress Street, Room 312, Portland, Maine 04101

(207) 874-8711

PR-10 Consultation - 91.100, 91.200(b), 91.215(l)

1. Introduction

The City of Portland Housing & Community Development Division works with other City departments, regional coalitions, state programs, and county partners to achieve its goals. Also, the City's Citizen Participation Plan ensures that the City undertakes an effective public process that encourages input and participation from all citizens, non-profit organizations and other interested parties. The plan also guarantees access to meetings, information and public hearings on the Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan. Technical assistance must also be provided, upon request, to organizations that would like to develop proposals for funding under the City's Housing and Community Development Program.

Provide a concise summary of the jurisdiction's activities to enhance coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies (91.215(l)).

In the City of Portland, 33% of CDBG funds support social service agency programs. The funds support housing programs, homeless services, crisis management services, childcare, family support services, substance abuse services, youth and adolescent support services, senior services, neighborhood based programs and projects, and health care for the homeless. City staff meets with the agencies throughout the year to provide technical assistance and ensure they are meeting HUD guidelines and regulations. Staff also assists in monitoring their progress and makes recommendations for more efficient services.

The City & the Portland Housing Authority (PHA) have a history of cooperation in several areas including community policing, development of affordable housing, recreational activities for at-risk youth, the Family Self-Sufficiency Program, Family Investment Center and applications to HUD for Section 8 certificates and vouchers for families, homeless, and disabled persons. City of Portland and PHA staff communicate regularly and provide each other with data for plans and reports. The City of Portland and Cumberland County also collaborate with the other Public Housing Authorities in Cumberland County.

Housing and Community Development staff also participate in the Maine Affordable Housing Coalition which is a coalition of developers, Community Action agencies, public housing authorities, investors, housing and service providers, advocates and others working to increase the supply of quality, affordable housing throughout Maine.

Describe coordination with the Continuum of Care and efforts to address the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans, and unaccompanied youth) and persons at risk of homelessness

City staff from the Health and Human Services Department and Housing & Community Development Division coordinate with other members of the Emergency Shelter Assessment Committee (ESAC) and

the United Way of Greater Portland to support the Homeless Continuum of Care, respond to the McKinney Vento NOFA and monitor shelter bed usage for single adults, adolescents, and families. ESAC members include shelter providers for singles, adolescents, mentally ill, women, families with children, and victims of domestic violence, supported housing providers, mental health service providers, substance abuse service providers, and health service providers and general services, including day shelter providers for the homeless population. ESAC also produces monthly and quarterly statistics on shelter usage and provides a forum to discuss new programs, resource availability, emerging trends and to resolve problems within the continuum that may arise from time to time. City staff also coordinate the Point in Time Survey each year.

The City of Portland has allocated \$130,000 in HOME Program Funds to continue a Tenant Based Rental Assistance Program. Staff modeled the program on the *Maine Housing Stability through Engagement Program*. The short term rental assistance program will provide security deposits and/or first month's rent and will be available to currently homeless or those in danger of becoming homeless.

Describe consultation with the Continuum(s) of Care that serves the jurisdiction's area in determining how to allocate ESG funds, develop performance standards and evaluate outcomes, and develop funding, policies and procedures for the administration of HMIS

HCD staff are in contact with the Continuum of Care Committee and the Emergency Shelter Assessment Committee (ESAC). Funding increases for homeless programs, in addition to changes in existing programs, have led staff to propose funding amounts that differed from in the past. Past years have funded Operations for Homeless Healthcare, Essential Services at the Family Shelter, Homeless Prevention at the Family Shelter and Oxford Street Shelter and also Rapid Rehousing at Oxford Street Shelter. Some funds were also allocated to HMIS and Administration. The Homeless Healthcare program no longer is operated by the City. At the same time the Continuum of Care lost their HMIS funds, the Family Shelter lost funding while the need has increased, and HUD prioritized Rapid Rehousing. For these reasons, the proposal is to increase funding for Homeless Prevention at the Family Shelter and increase it slightly at Oxford Street Shelter. Increase Rapid Rehousing at Oxford Street Shelter and maximize the HMIS/ Administration funding to help pay for HMIS data entry that is conducted by Maine Housing. ESAC monitors shelter bed usage and is working to improve their coordinated assessment process. The Portland CoC is also currently developing written policies and procedures. As recommended by HUD, Portland CoC is currently working to collaborate with the Balance of State to create a coordinated system. A new set of policies and procedures will be developed to apply to the entire State and the Portland policies and procedures will serve as a framework, taking into consideration various needs throughout the State. Currently HMIS is administered by the Maine State Housing Authority, who manages licenses throughout the state and is responsible for the majority of data entry.

2. Describe Agencies, groups, organizations and others who participated in the process and describe the jurisdictions consultations with housing, social service agencies and other entities

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

1	Agency/Group/Organization	CUMBERLAND COUNTY
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Other government - County
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The City of Portland and Cumberland County are partners in the HOME Consortium. The two entities work collaboratively to distribute resources and address affordable housing needs, residential rehabilitation needs for residents of Portland and Cumberland County.
2	Agency/Group/Organization	Portland Housing Authority
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	PHA
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Public Housing Needs
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The Portland Housing Authority was consulted to provide information regarding housing and public housing needs.
3	Agency/Group/Organization	City of Portland
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-homeless Services-Health Service-Fair Housing Other government - Local Planning organization Grantee Department

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Lead-based Paint Strategy Homelessness Strategy Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth Non-Homeless Special Needs Economic Development Market Analysis Anti-poverty Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The City of Portland includes the Planning and Urban Development Department, which is responsible for housing and community development needs and strategy in addition to anti-poverty barriers to affordable housing, and lead based paint remediation. The Economic Development Department is responsible for the Economic strategies for the City. The Health and Human Services Department is responsible for homeless needs, specifically families with children, single adults, and chronically homeless individuals. The Public Works Department is responsible for infrastructure needs and projects. The Recreation and Facilities Department is responsible for building maintenance and renovations.
4	Agency/Group/Organization	FRANNIE PEABODY CENTER
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	HOPWA Strategy
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Frannie Peabody is the direct recipient for all HOPWA funding that comes to the State of Maine. They are responsible for the HOPWA strategy.
5	Agency/Group/Organization	Community Housing of Maine
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services-Persons with Disabilities Regional organization

	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Community Housing of Maine provides housing to vulnerable populations including the elderly, disabled, people experiencing mental illness, people with developmental and intellectual disabilities, people recovering from addiction, veterans, victims of domestic violence and persons living with HIV/Aids.
6	Agency/Group/Organization	Family Crisis Services
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Services-Victims of Domestic Violence
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Homeless Needs - Families with children
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	Family Crisis Services serves women and their families who are experiencing domestic violence.

Identify any Agency Types not consulted and provide rationale for not consulting

All agencies pertaining public services available in the City Portland and housing services available in Cumberland County and the City of Portland were consulted.

Other local/regional/state/federal planning efforts considered when preparing the Plan

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Continuum of Care	City of Portland Health and Human Services Department	The City of Portland and the Continuum of Care's goal is to end homelessness

Table 3 – Other local / regional / federal planning efforts

Describe cooperation and coordination with other public entities, including the State and any adjacent units of general local government, in the implementation of the Consolidated Plan (91.215(l))

Narrative

Portland Housing Authority (PHA) was consulted to provide information regarding affordable housing demand and public housing needs. PHA was simultaneously developing their five year plan, annual agency plan and capital fund plan at the same time the City of Portland was update its consolidated five year plan and annual action plan, and the City was able to work closely with the Authority to collaboratively develop housing goals for the annual and strategic plans.

Social Service and homeless shelter staff were consulted to include input on housing the city's most vulnerable populations. Housing and Community Development staff attended Emergency Shelter Assessment Committee meetings to stay updated on shelter bed usage, housing successes and needs for this population, and to receive input from Homeless Voices for Justice, a local grassroots effort involved in affecting change for Portland's homeless populations.

Frannie Peabody Center, the administrator of HOPWA funds and provider of support for individuals and their families living with AIDS/HIV, was consulted for housing and community needs evident among this population.

Community Housing of Maine (CHOM), a non-profit developer of affordable and supportive housing will be the recipient of CDBG funds for 2015-2016 to acquire and rehabilitate properties in Portland, specifically to serve long-term stayers at the city's homeless shelters.

City of Portland Public Services Department was consulted on the need for public services in the city, specifically within CDBG eligible neighborhoods. Additionally, Preble Street, a non-profit social service and basis needs provider was consulted because of their expertise in assisting the city's most vulnerable populations.

PR-15 Citizen Participation - 91.401, 91.105, 91.200(c)

1. Summary of citizen participation process/Efforts made to broaden citizen participation Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting

A variety of exemplary sources were consulted in the drafting of the consolidated plan, including documents produced by intergovernmental organizations, non-profit and for-profit economic development and community development organizations, non-profit social service providers, and private planning and research firms. These sources relied on public data from the U.S. Census, year and month end reports and, more importantly, public input through survey instruments, stakeholder meetings and interviews, public board and council meetings.

A study performed by the Greater Portland Council of Governments (GPCOG) compared approaches to assessing housing development progress and extrapolated findings for Portland based on Maine Department of Labor and American Community Survey statistics. The Portland Housing Authority (PHA) consulted several local housing studies completed in the last three years to determine and anticipate affordable housing need for their annual plan: Population and Housing Market Analysis of Sustain Southern Maine and Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing, both by GPCOG in 2013; Analysis of Poverty in Peninsula Census Tracts by Planning Decisions for PHA in 2013; Out of Reach prepared by the National Low Income Housing Coalition in 2014; and Portland 2030 Workforce Housing Demand prepared by GPCOG in 2015. These reports accessed data from the U.S. Census and the ACS, Maine Human Rights Commission, Pine Tree Legal Assistance, Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, Portland Zoning and Land Use Policies, as well as through interviews with local service providers. A senior housing study by an independent researcher assessed Maine's demographics and determined the state is the oldest state in the nation, with 32.3% of its population age 55 and older, and found that a considerable share of Maine's older population was living in unaffordable housing situations in 2012. A Portland-based real estate group multi-family forecast was consulted to determine changes in the housing market's affordability. Month and year end reports from the city's homeless shelters and social service providers supply continual assessments on the city's neediest residents.

In response reports on a shortage of affordable housing in the city, the Planning and Urban Development Division with the Housing and Community Development Department held a public housing forum to assess current demand for affordable housing and to gain the opportunity to address the affordable housing needs of the city's residents. Surveys included homeless vulnerability surveys as part of the 100,000 Homes Campaign, a minority health assessment conducted by the City of Portland Minority Health Program in 2014, an asset and needs study for a Portland-based non-profit social service provider in 2014 that involved community meetings and a survey of residents and stakeholders within one of Portland's CDBG eligible neighborhoods.

Citizen Participation Outreach

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
1	CDBG Allocation Committee Meetings and Website	Minorities Persons with disabilities Non-targeted/broad community	All CDBG Allocation Committee meetings are public, posted on the City website and City calendar. All four committee members attend the majority of meetings. One member of the public attended.	The Committee discussed each application, along with their funding recommendations. This is documented as committee meeting summaries on the City website.	All comments were accepted	
2	CDBG Allocation Committee Meetings and Website	Minorities Persons with disabilities Non-targeted/broad community Residents of Public and Assisted Housing	Response was the attendance at the CDBG Eligible Neighborhood Meeting held on September 17th, 2015 at 6:00 PM at the City Hall.		All comments were accepted	

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
3	Public Meeting	Minorities Persons with disabilities Non-targeted/broad community Residents of Public and Assisted Housing	16 people attended the Neighborhood Meeting.	Concerns about accessibility to bus stop shelters, snow removal at bus stops, Request for paving and sidewalk repairs; Concern about a the homeless population; Concern about needs at social service facilities; Request for more legal services for low income individuals; Concerns about the need for more affordable childcare; Concern about programs for new American and persons coming out of incarceration	All comments were accepted	

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
4	Newspaper Ad	Minorities Persons with disabilities Non-targeted/broad community Residents of Public and Assisted Housing	Response was attendance at one of the two public hearings		N/A	
5	Internet Outreach	Minorities Persons with disabilities Non-targeted/broad community Residents of Public and Assisted Housing	181 members of the community have given their email address to HCD staff with the purpose of receiving information about public meetings, hearings, CDBG Allocations, and other events related to housing and community development in the City of Portland	Comments are received via email, voicemail messages, and attendance at public meetings.	All comments are accepted.	

Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

Needs Assessment Overview

NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment - 24 CFR 91.405, 24 CFR 91.205 (a,b,c)

Summary of Housing Needs

Demographics	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2012	% Change
Population	0	280,955	
Households	0	117,092	
Median Income	\$0.00	\$0.00	

Table 4 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2008-2012 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Number of Households Table

	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	>80-100% HAMFI	>100% HAMFI
Total Households *	15,795	14,765	24,200	15,185	77,260
Small Family Households *	3,747	4,299	8,733	6,895	43,875
Large Family Households *	489	715	1,110	642	5,064
Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age	2,442	2,773	4,798	2,977	14,428
Household contains at least one person age 75 or older	3,074	3,167	3,453	1,600	4,397
Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger *	1,825	2,059	2,524	1,848	8,240

* the highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI

Table 5 - Total Households Table

Data Source: 2008-2012 CHAS

Housing Needs Summary Tables

1. Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed needs)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	302	250	484	105	1,141	224	73	226	4	527
Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	70	105	60	60	295	20	0	70	20	110
Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	225	139	64	35	463	0	257	130	10	397
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	5,605	2,214	415	28	8,262	3,453	2,563	2,517	1,229	9,762
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	903	2,743	4,164	650	8,460	802	2,216	4,883	3,833	11,734

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total
Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)	708	0	0	0	708	528	0	0	0	528

Table 6 – Housing Problems Table

Data 2008-2012 CHAS
Source:

2. Housing Problems 2 (Households with one or more Severe Housing Problems: Lacks kitchen or complete plumbing, severe overcrowding, severe cost burden)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Having 1 or more of four housing problems	6,218	2,703	1,018	228	10,167	3,703	2,903	2,931	1,263	10,800
Having none of four housing problems	3,203	4,420	7,618	3,228	18,469	1,421	4,729	12,629	10,454	29,233
Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems	708	0	0	0	708	528	0	0	0	528

Table 7 – Housing Problems 2

Data 2008-2012 CHAS
Source:

3. Cost Burden > 30%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	2,149	1,882	1,548	5,579	852	1,671	3,472	5,995

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
Large Related	270	174	163	607	114	386	321	821
Elderly	1,332	1,135	653	3,120	2,023	2,179	2,177	6,379
Other	3,204	2,145	2,471	7,820	1,368	784	1,622	3,774
Total need by income	6,955	5,336	4,835	17,126	4,357	5,020	7,592	16,969

Table 8 – Cost Burden > 30%

Data 2008-2012 CHAS
Source:

4. Cost Burden > 50%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	1,819	954	185	2,958	690	1,026	1,055	2,771
Large Related	225	89	4	318	104	254	47	405
Elderly	1,033	455	285	1,773	1,522	1,024	741	3,287
Other	2,920	949	155	4,024	1,220	427	658	2,305
Total need by income	5,997	2,447	629	9,073	3,536	2,731	2,501	8,768

Table 9 – Cost Burden > 50%

Data 2008-2012 CHAS
Source:

5. Crowding (More than one person per room)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Single family households	244	224	219	60	747	24	297	90	30	441
Multiple, unrelated family households	40	20	0	0	60	0	0	70	0	70
Other, non-family households	10	0	40	35	85	0	0	60	0	60
Total need by income	294	244	259	95	892	24	297	220	30	571

Table 10 – Crowding Information - 1/2

Data Source: 2008-2012 CHAS

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
Households with Children Present	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 11 – Crowding Information – 2/2

Data Source
Comments:

Describe the number and type of single person households in need of housing assistance.

According to the 2010-2014 ACS 5 year data there are approximately 34,823 single person households earning a median income of \$27,847. In the 2015 HUD Income Limits this falls between very low (50% AMI earning \$27,000) and low income (80% AMI earning \$43,200). The Fair Market rents for the Portland Metro Area for efficiencies in 2016 is \$762 and one bedroom is \$886. A single person household would need to spend 33% of their income to be able to afford an efficiency or 38% of their income to afford a one bedroom apartment.

Looking at single person occupied housing units, 49% are owner occupied while the remaining 51% are renter occupied. When you consider the population at large approximately 67% of the occupied housing units are by owner while 33% are by renters. Therefore single person households are more likely than the overall population to rent than own.

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance who are disabled or victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.

Family Crisis Services serves women with children suffering from domestic violence. In 2015 99 families and 33 children stayed in the domestic violence shelter, staying an average of 42 days totaling 5,563 bed nights. In addition, Family Crisis Services provided individual advocacy to 2,558 different people and court advocacy to 570 individuals. There were 6,356 hotline or service calls, 10,360 face to face contacts, 1,824 support group contacts and 461 shelter requests.

What are the most common housing problems?

The two most common housing problems are 1) housing cost burden and the 2) availability of affordable housing. Housing cost burden is the greatest housing problem facing County residents with 64% of County households are paying more than 30% of their income on housing. 51% of renter households pay more than 30% of their income on housing, and 24% are paying more than 50% of their income on housing. Those earning 80% of the area median income or below are most affected. In Portland 57% of

households pay more than 30% of their income on housing, 49% of which are renter households. 25% of renter households in Portland pay more than 50% of their income on housing. Rental rates have increased an estimated 8-9% in the last year. Subsidized tenants struggle to find affordable units. Rents are expected to continue to increase, thus making it more difficult. The City of Portland Public Health Division conducted two surveys one for Cumberland County and one for Parkside Neighborhood (CT-10). In the study of Cumberland County affordable housing was the most important factor for a healthy community by 36% of the respondents. Likewise respondents to the Parkside survey indicated that many experience housing-related difficulties - 40% did not have enough money to pay utility bills, 39% did not have money for rent or mortgage and 37% could not find affordable housing. Additionally, Maine has the eighth oldest housing stock in the country with 31.3% built before 1950. Without proper upkeep, older units can be drafty, uninsulated, and contain lead based paint.

Are any populations/household types more affected than others by these problems?

All populations are affected by the housing cost burden. 64% of County households and 57% of Portland households pay more than 30% of their income toward housing costs. Renters comprise 51% of County households and 49% of Portland households. This burden falls most heavily on households earning 0-30% of AMI.

Describe the characteristics and needs of Low-income individuals and families with children (especially extremely low-income) who are currently housed but are at imminent risk of either residing in shelters or becoming unsheltered 91.205(c)/91.305(c)). Also discuss the needs of formerly homeless families and individuals who are receiving rapid re-housing assistance and are nearing the termination of that assistance

In FY 15, the City of Portland granted \$10.1 million through their General Assistance to 4,363 qualifying individuals and families. 52% of those who qualified and received assistance accessed the program for six months or less. Of the total cost of the program, \$2.0 million was paid for by Portland property tax payers and \$8.1 million was paid by the state. As of 2015, the State of Maine will no longer reimburse for benefits provided to unlawful immigrants, including people who have expired visas and do not have required paperwork. This change at the State level has had a tremendous impact on the City's ability to serve the populations coming to Portland, designated as a refugee resettlement city for over 35 years.

If a jurisdiction provides estimates of the at-risk population(s), it should also include a description of the operational definition of the at-risk group and the methodology used to generate the estimates:

The persons affected by the change in State policy noted above, those who will no longer be eligible for general assistance benefits are primarily refugees, asylees and persons with mental illness.

Specify particular housing characteristics that have been linked with instability and an increased risk of homelessness

The housing characteristic linked most closely with instability and increased risk of homelessness is cost burden or loss of subsidy. Families who must choose whether to pay for utilities, food, rent or other necessities, will eventually not be able to make rent or utilities which will eventually lead to eviction. Loss of subsidy will also lead to eviction as the person or family will be unable to pay.

Discussion

Almost 36% of all County households have at least one type of housing problem, as noted in the charts above. Of these households with housing problems, housing cost burden is the greatest need with 43% having a housing cost burden greater than 50%, 45% of which are renters and 54% are owners. Including households facing a housing cost burden of over 30% of household income, the percentage of households increases to almost 92%, 43% of which are renters and 56% are owners. Throughout Cumberland County owner households carry a higher cost burden.

Nearly 40% (39.3%) of all Portland households have at least one type of housing problem. Of these households with housing problems, housing cost burden is the greatest need with 49% having a housing cost burden greater than 50%, 36% of those households being renters. Including households facing a housing cost burden of over 30% of household income, the percentage of households facing a housing problem increases to 87.2%, with 64.9% of those households being renters. Predictably, the lowest-income group most predominantly faces a housing cost burden, with 66.0% of all households facing a housing burden of greater than 50% of household income falling in the 0-30% of average median income, with the majority of those households (56.5%) being renters. Affordable housing for low-income residents throughout Cumberland County is extremely limited.

NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems - 91.405, 91.205

(b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

Racial and ethnic groups categorized here represent very small populations and it can be difficult to statistically determine disproportionately greater need among minorities based on American Community Survey results. 7% of the County population and 14% of Portland's population are identified as Black African American, Asian and American Indian, Alaska Native.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	10,974	3,200	1,016
White	9,524	2,811	796
Black / African American	550	170	65
Asian	280	55	110
American Indian, Alaska Native	69	35	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	260	30	25

Table 12 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2008-2012 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

30%-50% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	9,332	3,651	0
White	8,657	3,436	0
Black / African American	275	105	0

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Asian	75	55	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	180	44	0

Table 13 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2008-2012 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	10,784	9,384	0
White	9,984	8,794	0
Black / African American	189	235	0
Asian	224	125	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	50	20	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	255	105	0

Table 14 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2008-2012 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	4,375	7,876	0

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
White	4,116	7,611	0
Black / African American	15	29	0
Asian	85	109	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	10	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	99	30	0

Table 15 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2008-2012 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

Discussion

The Black/African American population makes up 3% of the County's population and 3% of this population at 50%-80% of the area median income households with one or more housing problems. The American Indian and Alaska Native populations make up 0.21% of the total population in the County and 9 of this population are likely to show one or more housing problems among other 50%-80% area median households. 53% of County households at the 50-80% AMI level has at least one housing problem.

The Black/African American population makes up 7% of the total population in Portland and 73.2% of this population is likely to have one or more housing problems among other 50%-80% area median income households with housing problems, when only 53.5% of the jurisdiction as a whole shows housing problems in this group. Likewise, 43.5% of the Black/African American population is likely to have one or more housing problems among other 80-100% area median income households with housing problems when only 24.7% of the jurisdiction as a whole shows housing problems where housing cost is 30% of their household income.

NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems - 91.405, 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

Racial and ethnic minorities represent very small populations as compared to the population as a whole and it can be difficult to statistically determine disproportionately greater need among minorities based on American Community Survey results. Black/African American populations in Portland make up 4,305 of 66,235 residents; American Indian and Alaska Native populations make up less than 100 residents; Asian populations make up 2,724 residents. In Cumberland County there are 7,397 Black African American residents; 580 American Indian and Alaskan residents; 5,931 Asian residents.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	9,371	4,811	1,016
White	8,151	4,187	796
Black / African American	415	305	65
Asian	260	74	110
American Indian, Alaska Native	69	35	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	225	70	25

Table 16 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2008-2012 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

30%-50% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	4,981	8,000	0

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
White	4,586	7,504	0
Black / African American	175	205	0
Asian	35	95	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	105	119	0

Table 17 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2008-2012 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	3,038	17,126	0
White	2,758	16,021	0
Black / African American	85	334	0
Asian	45	304	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	50	20	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	110	245	0

Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2008-2012 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	1,040	11,222	0
White	970	10,797	0
Black / African American	15	29	0
Asian	0	195	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	10	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	50	78	0

Table 19 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2008-2012 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

Discussion

In Cumberland County 9,371 households at 0-30% of the area median income have one or more of four housing problems categorized as severe. 86% of those households are White, 5% are Black/African American, 3% are Asian, less than 1% are American Indian, Alaskan Native and 3% are Hispanic. 4981 households at 30-50% of the area median income have one or more of four housing problems categorized as severe. 92% of those households are White, 4% are Black/African American, less than 1% are Asian and 2% are Hispanic. 3,038 households at 50-80% of the area median income have one or more of four housing problems categorized as severe. 91% of those households are White, 3% are Black/African American, 1.5% are Asian, almost 2% are American Indian, Alaskan Native and 4% are Hispanic.

NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens - 91.405, 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

Minority racial and ethnic populations for housing cost burden are very small numbers and do not show disproportionately greater need in very many income categories due to these small representations. For example, in Portland, there were only 440 households sampled from the Black/African American racial group and only 395 sampled from the Hispanic ethnic group, of over 16,850 total, that indicated their housing cost burden was less than or equal to 30% of their income. Another caution is that the data is not necessarily indicative of cost burden for long time homeowners. For example, in 2011, there were 555 homes with a value affordable to households earning over 100% of median income that were occupied by households earning 50% or less of median income. This does not mean that the home is unaffordable to them. Certainly a large percentage of homeowners have owned their homes for a very long time: while initially the mortgage payment may have been more than 30% of their income, as wages rise, mortgage payments gradually decline as a percentage of household income. Some low income owners, such as senior citizens, have paid off their mortgage completely, leaving them "house-rich" but "cash-poor."

Housing Cost Burden

Housing Cost Burden	<=30%	30-50%	>50%	No / negative income (not computed)
Jurisdiction as a whole	75,414	23,543	17,640	1,022
White	72,110	21,983	16,003	796
Black / African American	910	419	505	65
Asian	958	409	310	110
American Indian, Alaska Native	183	0	69	0
Pacific Islander	25	20	0	0
Hispanic	665	374	415	25

Table 20 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Data Source: 2008-2012 CHAS

Discussion

The greatest disproportionality among households in Cumberland County is with households with a housing cost burden greater than 30%. Among this group 96% are White, 1.2% are Black/African

American, 1.3% are Asian, and American Indian, Alaskan Native, Pacific Islander and Hispanic represent less than 1% each.

NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion - 91.205 (b)(2)

Are there any income categories in which a racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need than the needs of that income category as a whole?

As previously discussed, racial and ethnic minorities represent very small populations and it can be difficult to statistically determine disproportionately greater need among minorities based on American Community Survey results. Housing cost burden is the greatest need throughout the jurisdiction as a whole.

If they have needs not identified above, what are those needs?

The increase in immigrants from Sub-Saharan Africa has shifted local demographics of country of origin and household size. Many landlords and local service providers are not familiar with the cultures and customs that accompany these new immigrants, and may inadvertently create new barriers to maintaining housing. For example, many Muslims consider dogs to be unclean, and do not allow them in the home. This belief becomes an issue when landlords use dogs for apartment bedbug inspections. There are also potential conflicts between immigrant and non-immigrant tenants over child supervision and overcrowding. (Portland's *Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing*.)

Are any of those racial or ethnic groups located in specific areas or neighborhoods in your community?

There are overlapping concentrations of poverty, black populations, foreign born residents, and single-parent families within Portland's subsidized housing. Many of these tracts are in the HCD areas, but there are several along the I-95 corridor, again likely due to PHA properties, and in the I-295 corridor north of Back Cove. Although mobile Section 8 vouchers were created with the intention of distributing low-income populations across a broader region, access to transit, services, cultural support systems and the location of affordable housing in the city are creating geographic concentrations of poverty and minorities within certain areas of Portland. (Portland's *Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing*.)

NA-35 Public Housing - 91.405, 91.205 (b)

Introduction

Totals in Use

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers in use	0	102	1,579	3,331	334	2,878	28	0	33

Table 21 - Public Housing by Program Type

*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Characteristics of Residents

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	
# Homeless at admission	0	0	1	6	0	6	0		0
# of Elderly Program Participants (>62)	0	37	655	724	183	528	2		0
# of Disabled Families	0	60	417	1,430	125	1,244	14		0

	Program Type							
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher	
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program
# of Families requesting accessibility features	0	102	1,579	3,331	334	2,878	28	0
# of HIV/AIDS program participants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
# of DV victims	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 22 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Race of Residents

Program Type									
Race	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
White	0	95	1,090	2,837	310	2,428	24	0	30
Black/African American	0	4	298	397	13	368	3	0	3
Asian	0	3	158	62	6	53	0	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	23	26	4	21	1	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	10	9	1	8	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

***includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition**

Table 23 – Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Ethnicity of Residents

Ethnicity	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Hispanic	0	4	36	65	6	58	0	0	0
Not Hispanic	0	98	1,543	3,266	328	2,820	28	0	33

***includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition**

Table 24 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Section 504 Needs Assessment: Describe the needs of public housing tenants and applicants on the waiting list for accessible units:

Limited mobility is a very common problem for many tenants and applicants, there's a need for more apartments without interior stairs (flats), and ground floor apartments with less exterior stairs. There's the need for more completely accessible units for the disabled tenants and applicants. PHA installs many modified bath room fixture, showers, grab bars, toilets. Special modifications for families with disabled children and the hearing and vision impaired include strobe light door bells and phones, special locks and window screens.

Housing Choice Voucher data represents a shared waiting list utilized by four local housing authorities established in 2013: Portland, South Portland, Westbrook, and Bath. More than 90% of applicants live in the Greater Portland area. As of February 2015, there are 5,266 applicants on the wait list for HCVs. The largest proportion of those on the wait list (40%) is disabled individuals, followed by non-disabled, non-elderly individuals at 36.5%. Elderly individuals make up 19.5% of those on the wait list, and 4% are families.

Each of the four communities utilizing the shared waiting list has different eligibility preferences for administering their HCV programs. Of the 5,266 applicants 3,351 or 64% have preference for Portland's HCV program. Of the 3,351 eligible for Portland's program 93.5% are elderly or disabled households. This indicates the large demand for 0/1BR units, with a likely need for accessible units. This conclusion is supported by the PHA voucher utilization data that 836 or 50% of vouchers used are for 0/1BR apartments.

What are the number and type of families on the waiting lists for public housing and section 8 tenant-based rental assistance? Based on the information above, and any other information available to the jurisdiction, what are the most immediate needs of residents of public housing and Housing Choice voucher holders?

Portland Housing Authority has a wait list of 1,464 applicants as of February 2015. The majority of those applicants (68.5%) are families. 17.3% of applicants are disabled and 5.2% are elderly, both possibly requiring accessible units. The remaining 9% of applicants are individuals. All applicants for public housing are either very low or extremely low income, based on self-reporting until applicants are selected from the wait list to be housed.

The largest demand (52.8%) is for studio and 1 bedroom units and comes from all household types, including disabled, elderly and small families. Demand for large units between 3 and 6 bedrooms is significant (22%) and generally reflects the number or low income refugee and immigrant populations with large families in need of affordable housing, as well as the lack of large apartments available in the private housing market.

Public Housing tenants and voucher holders tend to have higher percentages of people in poverty, with disabilities, and with physical and mental health problems than the general population. To be eligible for public housing rental assistance, an applicant must have an annual income at the time of admission that does not exceed the very low-income limits for occupancy established by HUD, which is an income that does not exceed 50 percent of the area median income. This eligibility requirement precludes a public housing tenant from any economic category other than living in poverty and should be expected of this population.

60% of PHA households are foreign born and English is not their first language. Lack of English is a major obstacle to employment and self-sufficiency for these residents. As well, a significant percentage of PHA

households suffer with mental illness and PTSD. Health care, psychiatric care and case management are needs for this population. PTSD is particularly a problem with the refugee communities who have relocated to Portland from worn torn countries and have witnessed horrible atrocities.

How do these needs compare to the housing needs of the population at large

Public Housing tenants and voucher holders tend to have higher percentages of people in poverty, with disabilities, and with physical and mental health problems than the general population. To be eligible for public housing rental assistance, an applicant must have an annual income at the time of admission that does not exceed the very low-income limits for occupancy established by HUD, which is an income that does not exceed 50 percent of the area median income. This eligibility requirement precludes a public housing tenant from any economic category other than living in poverty and should be expected of this population.

Housing affordability is a high need in the jurisdiction for the general population and is excessively high among the public housing resident population.

Discussion

Both the wait list for the Portland Housing Authority and the wait list shared by four local housing authorities are lengthy. The desire for subsidized housing in Portland is particularly high, with the majority of those on the shared wait list preferring housing in Portland. With housing units that become available for applicants on one of the wait lists, accessibility can be an issue for many applicants requiring assistance with mobility in and around their housing. Of those not disabled on the waitlist, nearly 20% are elderly and aging, which is representative of population trends in Maine, and they will likely require accessible housing units in the foreseeable future.

NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment - 91.405, 91.205 (c)

Introduction:

Portland homeless shelters (Family Shelter, Oxford Street Men's and Women's Shelters, Family Crisis Shelter, Stepping Stones, Milestone Foundation, Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter, and Florence House Women's Shelter) sheltered an average of 481 individuals per night last year. This number exceeds bed capacity among all shelters by over 100 individuals and includes providing hotels for overflow and accommodating overflow in chairs at the adult Oxford Street Men's and Women's Shelters. The City of Portland's Social Services Division operates the Family Shelter and Oxford Street Shelter, both the largest shelters serving their respective populations throughout the State of Maine. The Family Shelter offers preventative services for families at risk of experiencing homelessness and support services to assist families who are homeless to locate housing and achieve stability. Support services on site include assistance with housing placement; training sessions on daily life skills; crisis intervention and management, including follow-up services after housing is located; and assistance with public transportation for appointments and self-sufficiency. The major reasons for being homeless, as self-reported by families, were relocation (41%), domestic violence or family conflict (43%), lack of affordable housing (17%), and failure to pay rent resulting in eviction (16%). Other reasons for homelessness as self-reported by families include loss of job, substandard housing, loss of public assistance, and health and safety reasons. The aforementioned reasons combined accounted for 11% of all families in FY 14. The Oxford Street Shelter is a low-barrier shelter which provides safe, temporary housing for homeless adults, both men and women and offers a variety of support services to assist homeless individuals enhance their self-esteem, secure housing, and work towards a self-sufficiency plan. Support services at the Oxford Street Shelter include shower facilities and training on hygiene skills; housing placement assistance; health and housing assistance to veterans; clinical and outreach services for individuals with mental health concerns; and interpreting services. The Oxford Street Shelter served 1,715 men and 506 women in FY 14. This represents an increase of 6.6% compared to last year. The shelter provided 82,754 bed nights in FY 14, a decrease of 3.2% compared to FY 13. 36.3% of the individuals that stayed at the Oxford Street Shelter were identified as chronically homeless. Based on self-reporting, 45% of shelter clients experience mental illness, 75% struggle with substance abuse issues, and 31% experience a physical disability or illness. Unfortunately, many clients with significant mental health issues deny having any problems and refuse any form of medication or support. The Maine State Housing Authority coordinates the efforts of homeless shelters, outreach groups and volunteers who participate in an annual Point in Time Survey of State of Maine and City of Portland homeless populations. The annual census is required of all states at this time of year by U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the count provides a snapshot of the number of individuals and families in shelters and on the streets on a given night. For Maine, a count performed in January will represent chronic and truly desperate homelessness because of extreme weather conditions including temperatures well below freezing, regular snow accumulation, and minimal daylight hours.

If data is not available for the categories "number of persons becoming and exiting homelessness each year," and "number of days that persons experience homelessness," describe these categories for each homeless population type (including chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth):

In 2014, based on data provided by the City's run Oxford Street and the Family Shelter, there were 3,011 intakes. This included 951 individuals and 284 families at the Family Shelter and 2060 individuals at Oxford Street Shelter. On average this included 292 individuals, 51 families (152 individuals) and 20 adolescents totaling 464 individuals each night. Overall there were 146,464 bed nights in the City of Portland, averaging 464 individuals a night. There were 3,560 new intakes and 1,066 housing placement. 1,262 persons were experiencing homelessness for the first time.

In addition Preble Street manages the Joe Kresler Teen Shelter and Florence House, a women's shelter. In 2014 there were 183 individuals entering homelessness at the Teen Shelter, which would be unaccompanied youth, and 194 at the Women's Shelter.

Chronic homelessness as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD) and the McKinney-Vento Act: "an individual or family who has been homeless and living or residing in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter continuously for at least 1 year or on at least 4 separate occasions in the last 3 years. 36% of the persons staying at the Oxford Street Shelter are Chronically Homeless.

At the Oxford Street Shelter, 154 are veterans, comprising of 6.9% of the total individuals served, and totaling 5,164 bed nights. The age of those who stayed are as follows 16% aged 18-3, 16% aged 25-30, 28% aged 31-40, 28% aged 41-55 and 12% aged 61 or older. Based on self-reporting, 45% of shelter clients experience mental illness, 75% struggle with substance abuse and 31% experience a physical disability or illness. In 2014, 54% of the individuals staying at Oxford Street Shelter stayed two weeks or less, 26% stayed between two weeks and two months, and 20% stayed longer than two months.

At the Family Shelter, 6 individuals or 1.5% of the adults are veterans. 387 or 42% were adults and 529 were children. 56% of the families are female single parent families, 7% are single male parent families and 37% are two parent families. In 2014 of the families staying at the Family Shelter 52% stayed at the shelter for a month or less, 32% stayed between one and two months, and 16% stayed more than two months.

Nature and Extent of Homelessness: (Optional)

Race:	Sheltered:	Unsheltered (optional)
White	0	0
Black or African American	0	0
Asian	0	0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0
Ethnicity:	Sheltered:	Unsheltered (optional)
Hispanic	0	0
Not Hispanic	0	0

Data Source

Comments:

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance for families with children and the families of veterans.

In FY 2014, the Family Shelter provided shelter for 269 families consisting of 916 individuals for a total of 43,218 bed nights. Of the 269 families served, 24 families were homeless on two or more occasions during this fiscal year for a 9% homeless recidivism rate, compared to 9% in FY13. Of the 269 families sheltered, 151 were placed in permanent housing and 38 were placed in transitional housing. The Shelter experienced a decrease of 9% in the number of individuals served (heads of household and children) and an increase of 26% in the number of bed nights used. The average length of stay increased from 34 days to 47 days. The increase in the number of bed nights used and length of stay can be attributed to the tight rental market in Portland and the extreme difficulty in locating 3- to 4-bedroom units. Of the 269 families served, 58 families had relocated from other states, 63 families were from other countries, 69 families were residents from Maine but lived in towns outside of Portland, and 79 families were Portland residents. Of the 121 families coming from outside Maine, 54 families were secondary migrant refugee families or had visiting visas.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Homelessness by Racial and Ethnic Group.

Of the individuals the Family Shelter housed from April of 2013 through April of 2014, over five times, 31.6%, the proportion of the general population in Portland, 5.8%, was Black/African American. Other racial minorities housed were less than 1%. The White population in Portland makes up 84.2% of the total population, but was underrepresented at only 66.3% of the Family Shelter population last year. By ethnicity, the Family shelter housed 8.1% Hispanic individuals, nearly two and a half times the Portland Hispanic population of 3.4%.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.

Portland homeless shelters, including the Family Shelter, Family Crisis Shelter, Oxford Street Men's and Women's Shelters, Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter, Stepping Stones, Milestone Foundation and Florence House Women's Shelter sheltered an average of 481 individuals per night last year. This number exceeds bed capacity among all shelters by over 100 individuals and includes providing hotels from overflow at the Family Shelter and Family Crisis Shelter, and accommodating overflow in chairs at the adult Oxford Street Men's and Women's Shelters.

Discussion:

The annual Point in Time Survey of homeless individuals indicates there is still an increasing homeless population in Portland, including a representation of homeless individuals remaining unsheltered during the harshest time of year in Maine. CDBG funding to non-profit organizations reaching out to the city's most vulnerable populations, including the mentally ill and individuals with chronic substance abuse issues, will assist the city in providing programs and resources to serve the needs of the most vulnerable citizens in the community.

NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment - 91.405, 91.205 (b,d)

Introduction

Reviewing the non-homeless special needs populations in Portland, research focused on persons with disabilities both physical and cognitive, the elderly, persons suffering from addiction, victims of domestic violence, and persons with HIV/AIDS. Disabilities can limit the ability of an individual to earn income sufficient to compete in the housing market. Under the federal Fair Housing Act, a person with a disability is defined as any person or person associated with you who has a physical or mental disability that substantially limits one or more major life activities, has a record of such impairment, or is regarded as having such impairment. Disabilities include hearing, mobility and visual impairments, chronic alcoholism, chronic mental illness, AIDS and AIDS Related Complex, and mental retardation. The housing needs of victims of domestic violence are considered along with the special needs of the non-homeless. The housing needs of persons with disabilities are extremely difficult to determine and quantify. Meeting the housing needs for persons with mental developmental and physical disabilities will be a challenge for the extremely limited resources available to the City and the County through the HUD CDBG and HOME programs.

Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

Disabilities: According to the American Community Survey approximately 12.5% of the population in the City of Portland has a disability, over 8,000 individuals. There are various types of disabilities that are categorized by the ACS: hearing, vision, cognitive, ambulatory, self-care, and independent living. Several individuals have co-occurring disabilities. The highest disabilities are cognitive, comprising 6.2% of the total population, and ambulatory, comprising 5.9% of the total population. The highest age bracket suffering from cognitive disabilities is those aged 18-64. While those afflicted with ambulatory disabilities are equally likely to be aged 18-64 or 65+. The third highest disability is the ability to live independently, affecting 4.6% of the population, again equally affecting those aged 18-24 as 65+.

There are often co-occurring issues that accompany disabilities, for instance the national poverty rate for those with severe disabilities is 27% compared to 9% for those without a disability, and 28% of people over age of 25 with a disability have not completed high school. As well, up to 60% of substance abusers have a mental disorder in addition to addiction. The January 2012 homeless survey in Portland found that 23.4% had a severe and persistent mental illness, and that 39.6% had a chronic disability. In Portland Housing Authority properties, 54% of tenants are classified as disabled/handicapped. In addition, incidence of autism has grown from 1 in 10,000 in 1996, to 1 in 160 in 2006, to 1 in 88 at the present time. The need for housing and support services for this population will continue to be pressing in the Portland area.

Elderly: Portland's elderly population is projected to grow by 6,476 by 2030, to a total of 14,942. Of these, almost one out of five (19%) will be 85 or older. This will result primarily from aging in place, not from in-migration.

Drug Alcohol Addictions: Of the 12,413 incident reports in 2014 filed with the City of Portland Police Department, 2901 or 23% were alcohol related and 1297 or 10.5% were drug related. Additionally there were 643 drinking in public, 422 layouts, 334 drug overdoses, and 307 drug possession calls. There were also 87 motor vehicle accidents related to alcohol.

There is a strong correlation between homelessness and substance abuse. 58% of all families experiencing homelessness at the Family Shelter suffer from substance abuse/ mental illness. 75% of the shelter clients at Oxford Street Shelter struggle with substance abuse.

Victims of Domestic Violence: In 2014, there were 266 cases of reported domestic violence assaults in the City of Portland. The majority, 172, was male on female, 40 were female on male and the remainder involved some other domestic relationship (parent/child, male partner on male partner etc). The Family Shelter reported that 43% (115 or 269) of all families who became homeless experienced domestic violence and or family conflict and had to leave their current living situation.

What are the housing and supportive service needs of these populations and how are these needs determined?

Disabilities: Persons with disability, both physical and cognitive face a variety of challenges in Portland, including landlords and building codes for physical disabilities. For persons with cognitive disabilities case management and community integration seem to be successful models. Landlords do not always understand the needs of a physically or mentally disabled tenant, and make their own decisions about what is or is not medically necessary. Landlords see reasonable accommodations as a financial burden, and often do not understand, for example, that service animals can be used by people with non-vision related disabilities. A recent Pine Tree Legal investigation found "reasonable grounds for disability discrimination" when a Section 8 voucher for a two bedroom apartment was reduced to one bedroom when the tenant was told that her medically prescribed exercise equipment was not "medically necessary." For formerly homeless tenants with mental disabilities, case management makes a bigger difference than financial assistance in maintaining permanent housing, according to a local social service researcher. Portland's Homeless Prevention, Rapid Re-housing Program (HPRP) program saw a 2% recidivism rate for clients who received case management upon finding housing. The formerly homeless usually need at least nine months of case management support to make a successful transition from homeless to housed. With the exception of HPRP, the need for assistance to help people maintain independent housing has been identified as a service gap. Individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (including those on the Autism spectrum) as well as individuals with other disabilities (Cerebral Palsy, traumatic brain injuries, etc.) can successfully live in a community setting, granting them greater independence, while still receiving necessary support and services. The range and acuteness of service needs vary greatly. A one-sized fits all model does not work for these

populations; each person should be met where they're at. Housing options range from scattered-site housing with intermittent outside services, to dedicated supportive housing consisting of four to six individual units, possibly with an office on site for service providers. All housing options should allow individuals to be included and participate in the community in which they reside. Elderly: The growing number of elderly households will need more units that are smaller and more accessible; many will require units that are subsidized as well. Drug Alcohol Addictions: Almost all substance abusers have co-occurring mental health disorders. Formerly homeless people with both substance abuse and mental illnesses are the hardest to house because of poor rental histories and the need for lengthy cultural acclimation to non-shelter living. Over the past 12 years there have been statewide cuts to mental health services hampering efforts to help those with mental disabilities find and maintain housing. Persons living with HIV/AIDS: With high rental costs in Portland, many clients are simply unable to cover their living costs and also cover costs of transportation to medical appointments, nutritional care and medications. Access to HOPWA funding and supportive services helps to guide clients through the complex financial system of housing and medical care and to support them in accessing the appropriate resources and opportunities to achieve a decent standard of living.

Discuss the size and characteristics of the population with HIV/AIDS and their families within the Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area:

Cumberland County has the highest HIV case rate (148 cases per 100,000) and the most cumulative cases overall, with 35% of the state's total. Cases in Portland are growing: During the first three quarters of 2014, 73% of FPC's new case management intakes were residents of Cumberland Co. and of that, 88% of intakes are Portland residents. Over 76% of Cumberland County intakes were foreign-born. Many of these clients arrived in the U.S. with significant unmet medical, insurance, nutritional, employment and dental needs, at intake. Nearly all FPC clients are low-income, with the majority (65%) falling at or below the Federal Poverty Level.

With high rental costs in Portland, many AIDs/HIV clients are simply unable to cover their living costs and also cover costs of transportation to medical appointments, nutritional care and medications. Access to HOPWA funding and supportive services helps to guide clients through the complex financial system of housing and medical care and to support them in accessing the appropriate resources and opportunities to achieve a decent standard of living.

Discussion:

The City of Portland is the largest and most diverse community in the State of Maine, and as such, is committed to providing fair housing choice to all of its residents. Meeting supportive housing needs for Portland Residents and addressing impediments to fair housing choice and community accessibility in

Portland will mean focusing on reducing geographic concentrations of race and poverty in certain neighborhoods of the city, informing landlords of fair housing/accommodation regulations for person with disabilities, and addressing the city's high cost of both rental and home ownership housing. Portland recently re-established the Portland Disability Advisory Committee to enhance public education and awareness, advise the city on legal compliance, accommodations and accessibility and evaluate programs, opportunities and services for all ages in a manner which fosters dignity and self-determination.

NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs - 91.415, 91.215 (f)

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Facilities:

The City of Portland's non-housing public facilities and systems include fire buildings, parking garages, public safety data cable, signalized pedestrian intersections, streetlight poles, piers and irrigation systems; enterprise fund buildings and equipment including golf courses, an ice arena and libraries and corresponding irrigation systems (golf courses), skate sharpener, refrigeration system (ice arena), and network and storage devices (libraries). In addition, the City owns and maintains recreations facilities such as stadiums, playing fields, ball and tennis courts, swimming pools, skating ponds and play grounds, and open space and cemeteries. Due to harsh weather conditions and age, many of the City's non-housing public facilities require improvements and repairs.

How were these needs determined?

The Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) presents the City's capital needs in the current year and plans for capital needs in future years. It is also a financing plan for public facilities projects that require significant capital investment for the City. The purpose of developing and annually updating a five-year CIP is to inform policy makers and community of both the current and future capital needs of the community and balancing those needs with the City's debt position, public expectations, and the ability of the City's operating budget to fund capital projects. It is intended to be a living and flexible document that considers capital needs in the community and balances those needs with what the City can afford.

Recommended capital projects for 2017 include improvements to facilities, including vehicle replacement, in the amount of \$15,101,202, which includes public improvement amounts discussed in the next section.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Improvements:

This year's 5-year Capital Improvement Plan for the City of Portland presents a capital maintenance funding program that balances maintaining roads, sidewalks, facilities, parks and open space, as well as the City's vehicle fleet with minimizing the impact from capital expenditure on the operating budget and minimizing potential tax rate increases.

Keeping all of the City's capital assets in functional and working order requires regular reinvestment. Assuming that the City's entire General Fund asset portfolio required replacement tomorrow, the current replacement value (excluding land value) of those capital assets is estimated to be \$830 Million. Approximately 48% of that value is in infrastructure such as roads and sidewalks.

Some examples of public improvements scheduled for 2017 include sidewalk rehabilitation, accessibility for ADA compliance, and neighborhood safety upgrades, as well as continued construction the City's

sewer system network which needs to be upgraded to meet EPA standard and avoid backups or collapses.

It is understood that there are upcoming capital projects of great importance to the community that carry with them significant costs. It is recommended that the Capital Improvement Plan be used as the tool that it is will help the City plan for and analyze future capital expenditures.

Capital projects that will be considered by the community over the next five to ten year will have a significant impact upon the operating budget. There will be a need to balance funding the projects with impact to the operating budget, the tax rate and service impacts. The following is the known list of projects that are of importance to the community:

- Continuing to move Public Services from Bayside (estimated additional \$6 Million);
- Elementary School Renovations and Expansions (non-State funded \$51 Million);
- Capisic Pond Dredging and Park Improvements (additional \$1.125 Million);
- Congress Square Re-design (estimated \$3.4 Million);
- Franklin Street Re-design (estimated \$5 Million);
- Bayside Transportation Improvements (estimated \$1.5 Million);
- State and High Streets One-way/Two-way (estimated \$3 Million); and
- Forest Avenue Transportation Improvements (\$3.5 Million).

How were these needs determined?

The Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) presents the City's capital needs in the current year and plans for capital needs in future years. It is also a financing plan for public improvement projects that require significant capital investment for the City. The purpose of developing and annually updating a five-year CIP is to inform policy makers and community of both the current and future capital needs of the community and balancing those needs with the City's debt position, public expectations, and the ability of the City's operating budget to fund capital projects. It is intended to be a living and flexible document that considers capital needs in the community and balances those needs with what the City can afford. Needs for the capital improvement plan are prioritized annually according to budget availability.

The City of Portland has created a phone app called "FixIt Portland" which allows member of the community to take photos and comment on areas of the City in need of public improvement. This app is widely used among Portland residents and allows small repairs to be made right away and as well as keeps a record of larger repairs that need to be completed.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Services:

The City of Portland has the highest concentration of public services in the state. The City is home to the only teen Shelter in Maine and offers specific mental and substance abuse services that are not available in any other town or county in the state. Within Cumberland County, there is only one emergency shelter that does not fall in the borders of the City of Portland.

The City of Portland has been designated a refugee resettlement area for more than 35 years. The combination of New American's moving to Portland, people from other parts of Maine moving to Portland for the available services, and the decreasing general assistance funding from the state, creates a strain a financial stain on the City's public services.

The City's CDBG program is able to spend 33% of the annual allocation on Public Services. For FY16 the City received \$1,082,708 in public service application requests with only \$625,270 available. Year after year, the funds needed for public services programs far exceeds the available funds.

How were these needs determined?

The public service needs of Portland are determined through assessments and research conducted by the City of Portland's Health and Human Services Department, university studies, and non-profit public service providers in the City. Each month the Health and Human Services Department releases a report on the number of individuals residing in shelters per night, this report includes individuals residing in non-profit shelters as well as city run facilities.

The Opportunity Alliance (TOA) is the State of Maine's designated crisis services provider for Cumberland County, providing mental health services through its crisis response program, residential mental health treatment facilities, case management programs, and therapeutic foster care programs. In addition to the needs determined by The Opportunity Alliance, cities and towns within Cumberland County determine their needs based on reporting systems established within their governments.

Housing Market Analysis

MA-05 Overview

Housing Market Analysis Overview:

In 2002, the City of Portland adopted a Housing Plan with a policy goal to ensure an adequate supply of housing to meet the needs, preferences and financial capabilities of all Portland households. The Plan established a target of maintaining Portland's current proportion of subsidized units at 20% of the housing stock. In 2014 the Portland contracted with the Greater Portland Council of Governments to complete a study entitled *2030 Workforce Housing Demand Study*. The report, released in January 2015, found that current housing production is not meeting the housing needs of Portland. Affordability findings in the analysis show that sixty-two percent of Portland households earn less than the county's median income, including 38% of homeowners and 81% of renters. Over the last decade, the number of households earning less than median income has increased 10%. While rising incomes have narrowed the affordability of existing homes and apartments, new construction is well beyond the means of the middle class. From 2010 to 2014, 1,130 housing units were permitted and/or built in Portland, including apartments, condominiums and single-family homes. Just 29% were offered at a rent or sales price affordable to a household earning the median income. If robust growth continues, Portland will continue to lose the affordability of its housing stock. While the Portland housing market contains units in a variety of price ranges, the reality is that those with higher incomes, stable jobs, and good credit ratings are in a better position to compete for affordable units that are subsidized and unsubsidized. This creates a glut of affordable units at the low end of the range that may be in rough condition, with deferred maintenance issues. The rental market is extremely tight for 3-bedroom units that can accommodate working families. Based on the vacancy rate, the inventory of one-bedroom condos targeting households earning over the median income is reaching a point of saturation. In order to accommodate new residents, Portland would need to build between 4,188 and 13,084 housing units, or 210 and 654 units per year over a 20-year period. Modest housing growth prediction is in line with the development patterns of the 2000's, which resulted in the construction of approximately 1,974 units, or 198 units per year. Medium growth estimates are still robust, and would be double that witnessed in the 2000's and five times the growth of the 1990's. High growth estimates represent three times the growth of the 2000's and eight times the growth of the 1990's.

The Cumberland County Entitlement Jurisdiction (CCEJ) does not include the largest city and economic center of the region (and the state of Maine), the City of Portland. However, the communities that directly surround Portland are the location of several large employers for the region such as Texas Instruments, Wex, Inc., and IDEXX. They also serve as "bedroom communities" for residents that commute to Portland, which has many jobs in the sectors of 1) education & healthcare services, 2) finance, insurance, & real estate, and 3) professional, scientific & management. South Portland and Freeport are retail employment centers, while areas such as the Lakes Region, Harpswell, and the island

communities see seasonal employment from the tourism sector. Cumberland County also retains employment in legacy industries such as forestry, farming and fishing.

MA-10 Housing Market Analysis: Number of Housing Units - 91.410, 91.210(a)&(b)(2)

Introduction

From January 2003 through March 2016, 2388 net new housing units have been created in the City of Portland. Using CDBG, HOME and other local funds, the city has invested over \$13.5 million in the production of new rental housing and homeownership housing. This investment has helped to create 999 units of new housing of which 813 are affordable to households earning below 60% area median income (AMI).

All residential properties by number of units

Property Type	Number	%
1-unit detached structure	87,545	64%
1-unit, attached structure	6,823	5%
2-4 units	18,435	13%
5-19 units	10,457	8%
20 or more units	8,323	6%
Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc	5,847	4%
Total	137,430	100%

Table 25 – Residential Properties by Unit Number

Data Source: 2008-2012 ACS

Unit Size by Tenure

	Owners		Renters	
	Number	%	Number	%
No bedroom	107	0%	2,316	6%
1 bedroom	2,223	3%	12,144	32%
2 bedrooms	19,051	24%	14,685	39%
3 or more bedrooms	58,039	73%	8,527	23%
Total	79,420	100%	37,672	100%

Table 26 – Unit Size by Tenure

Data Source: 2008-2012 ACS

Describe the number and targeting (income level/type of family served) of units assisted with federal, state, and local programs.

There are 105 total housing developments in Cumberland County, the majority of which are located in Portland, currently accessing HUD funding, subsidies by HUD PBRA, insured by HUD,

accessing the LIHTC, and utilizing the HOME program, including public housing developments. These housing developments account for 6,742 individual housing units in Cumberland County. 2005 units are assisted with HUD Project Based Rental Assistance (PBRA), which are made affordable to low income households. Under Project-Based Section 8, tenants pay 30% of their monthly adjusted income for rent and utilities and HUD pays the owner the difference between the contract rent and the tenant's portion. New residents of Project-Based Section 8 units can have incomes of no more than 80% of area median income (AMI) and 40% must have incomes below 30% of AMI. Under the Rent Supplement Program, eligible tenants paid 30% of the rent or 30% of their income toward the rent, whichever was greater. Many Rent Supplement Program contracts were converted to Project-Based Section 8 when that program was created. Rental Assistance Payments (RAP) reduces the tenant payment for rent to 10% of gross income, 20% of adjusted income, or the designated portion of welfare assistance, whichever is greater. Most RAP contracts were converted to Section 8 Loan Management Set-Aside (LMSA) Section 8 contracts, but there are still some active RAP contracts today. Under Project Rental Assistance Contract residents pay 30% of their adjusted income towards rent and the PRAC makes up the difference between rental income and operating expenses.²

402 units are HUD Insured, which requires adherence to low-income use restriction.

2736 units make us of the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program, which requires that either at least 20% of the units are rent-restricted and occupied by households with incomes at or below 50% AMI, or that at least 40% of the units are rest-restricted and occupied by households with incomes at or below 60% of AMI.

87 units access HOME rental assistance, which, when used for rental activities, at least 90% of the units must be occupied by households with incomes at or below 60% of the area median income, and the remaining 10% can be occupied by households with incomes at or below 80% of the area median income. In rental properties with five or more HOME units, 20% of these units must be set aside for households with incomes at or below 50% of the area median income.

All public housing residents must have incomes at or below 80% of area median income and at least 40% of new admissions in any year must have incomes at or below 30% of area median income. Local public housing agencies can establish local preferences for certain populations, such as the elderly, persons with disabilities, veterans, full-time workers, domestic violence victims, or people who are homeless or at risk of being homeless. Rents for residents of public housing are restricted to the highest of 30% of their monthly adjusted income, 10% of their monthly gross income, their welfare shelter allowance, or a local public housing agency established minimum rent of up to \$50.

Provide an assessment of units expected to be lost from the affordable housing inventory for any reason, such as expiration of Section 8 contracts.

1347 units of the above subsidized housing units in Cumberland County have active HUD PBRA and LIHTC subsidies that expire between 2016 and December of 2020.

Does the availability of housing units meet the needs of the population?

While recent trends demonstrate that new construction is increasingly unaffordable, there are still thousands of existing housing units in Portland that are affordable due to condition, size, turnover and other factors. Of the 3,390 rental units offered at or below 30% the HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI) rent level, 92% are occupied by households earning up to 100% HAMFI. Based on the vacancy rate of 3.1%, competition appears to be stiffest for units with three or more bedrooms. Of the 2,490 rental units offered at 30%-50% HAMFI rent level, 86% are occupied by households earning up to 100% HAMFI. Judging by the vacancy rate of 0%, competition is again stiffest for units with three or more bedrooms, but extremely competitive for 2 bedroom units as well with a 2.3% vacancy rate. Of the 9,145 rental units offered at 50%-80% HAMFI price range, 74% are occupied by households earning up to 100% of HAMFI. Vacancy is tightest in this price range, at 3.8% among all sizes. Of the 1,790 units offered at more than 80% HAMFI rent level, 47% are occupied by households earning up to 100% of HAMFI. At 12.1%, the vacancy rate is highest amongst 3-bedroom units.

Describe the need for specific types of housing:

Overall the jurisdiction needs more housing that is rehabilitated, accessible, affordable, and can accommodate families. Jobs are moving out of Portland and into the suburbs, thus causing a need for increased transit as well. Much of the regions housing stock is old. According to recent ACS data 50% percent of Portland's housing stock was built before 1939 and 30% percent of the housing stock was built between 1940 and 1980. Overall, the county's housing stock is newer, when compared with Portland. Almost 39% of the county's housing stock was built after 1980. Twenty-seven percent of the housing stock was built prior to 1939. Single family homes, which include condominium units, account for almost half of the housing stock in Portland. Buildings with 20 or more units make-up approximately 22% of Portland's housing stock. Almost 72% of the county's housing stock is made up of single family homes, which include condominium units while only 6% is made up of buildings with 20 or more units. Estimates over the next ten years indicate that those in the 65-74 year old age bracket will be the fastest growing age population and will account for the 99% of the population growth in the State of Maine. With an aging population and an old housing stock, there will be a higher demand for rehabilitated, accessible housing in the very near future. Due to staffing issues, the City relies on state agencies to ensure that new construction meets accessibility standards, leading to an enforcement gap post construction. In 2014 the Portland contracted with the Greater Portland Council of Governments to complete a study entitled *2030 Workforce Housing Demand Study*. The report, released in January 2015, found that current housing production is not meeting the housing needs of Portland. If recent trends continue, there will be a gap between supply and demand of workforce housing units and 3-bedroom units that can accommodate working families. "Glut" of affordable units at the low end of the affordability range that are in rough condition due to deferred maintenance issues. Affordability and size are the two main issues with housing in Portland. Virtually half of the city's affordable rental units are studios, efficiencies, and one-bedroom apartments. Families are hard pressed to find large units at rents they can afford. With more jobs moving out to the suburbs, inadequate transit service to existing and

planned employment centers throughout the region disproportionately impacts the ability of minority households to obtain employment since one third do not have access to a vehicle. Transit accessed housing within the city and in the greater region is a regional issue involving transportation planning. Transportation improvements will create more housing options for citizens by enabling residents who rely on social service providers to reside anywhere in and around the city and still be able to access the services they rely on.

Discussion

New housing development has only recently begun to rebound from the economic collapse of the credit market beginning in 2008. The “Medium Growth” forecast is the average of the Low and High forecasts. Under this scenario, Cumberland County would grow by 44,176, people, an increase of 8% per decade. Over the last century, the county’s decennial growth rate has ranged from a high of 16% during the 1940’s to a low of 5% during the 1960’s. Therefore, the Low forecast, at 3% growth, represents a rate lower than in any decade of the last century, while the High forecast, at 14%, is only slightly higher than the pattern of the 1990’s. At 8%, the Medium forecast reflects the average growth rate per decade of the past century. Portland’s goal of maintaining a 25% share of the county’s population is paramount to its vitality and its influence over state and regional politics. As the largest city in one of the nation’s smallest states, Portland exerts an extraordinary influence over Maine’s economy out of proportion with its actual size. Indeed, the number of jobs in the city now outstrips population, making Portland the engine of the largest labor market in Northern New England. Over the last century, Portland’s share of the county’s population has declined from a peak of 56% in 1920 to 24% in 2010. While this share is on a definite downward trajectory, Portland did not yield any ground during the 2000’s. To claim a 25% share of the county’s population, Portland would need to grow by 15,268 people, or 764 people per year, a growth rate of 11.5% per decade. This would bring Portland’s population to 81,462 people, just past its 1950 peak. In order to reach this 25% share, Portland would need to claim 35% of the county’s future growth. In order to accommodate new residents, Portland would need to build 8,636 housing units, or 432 units per year over a 20-year period. This robust growth would be double that witnessed in the 2000’s and five times the growth of the 1990’s. Another method of calculating housing demand relies on the economic impact of job creation based on the demand from more families purchasing market-rate housing. The purchasing power of those families support more jobs and increase the need for workforce housing. The number of workforce households is multiplied by 62%, which is the percentage of Portland households earning less than the county’s median income. The result, 53%, is the percentage of workforce housing demand generated by these 100 market-rate units. If the market, in keeping with current production patterns, supplies 29 affordable units for every 100 built, there would still be an unmet gap for 24 affordable units.

MA-15 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing - 91.410, 91.210(a)

Introduction

Currently, the Greater Portland housing market is emerging from one of the worst economic downturns in recent memory. However, data from Wells Fargo Bank indicates that the proportion of homes sold that are affordable to the average person has more than doubled since 2007. Further, Wells Fargo estimates that the current median value of a home in the Portland metropolitan area is up from the first quarter of 2011, but down from the previous market high in the second quarter of 2007.

The Portland housing market is emerging from the recession and while owner housing is more affordable than it was five years ago, rental housing prices have been rising, and as the economy improves, can be expected to go even higher. While the area has not seen the devastation that foreclosure caused in many other areas throughout the country, Maine has seen some of the highest foreclosure rates in New England. Foreclosure counseling agencies indicate that filings appear to be leveling off.

Cost of Housing

	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2012	% Change
Median Home Value	0	0	0%
Median Contract Rent	0	0	0%

Table 27 – Cost of Housing

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2008-2012 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Rent Paid	Number	%
Less than \$500	9,025	24.0%
\$500-999	19,346	51.4%
\$1,000-1,499	7,869	20.9%
\$1,500-1,999	909	2.4%
\$2,000 or more	523	1.4%
Total	37,672	100.0%

Table 28 - Rent Paid

Data Source: 2008-2012 ACS

Housing Affordability

% Units affordable to Households earning	Renter	Owner
30% HAMFI	2,906	No Data

% Units affordable to Households earning	Renter	Owner
50% HAMFI	6,242	2,113
80% HAMFI	18,797	6,073
100% HAMFI	No Data	10,126
Total	27,945	18,312

Table 29 – Housing Affordability

Data Source: 2008-2012 CHAS

Monthly Rent

Monthly Rent (\$)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Fair Market Rent	730	869	1,074	1,421	0
High HOME Rent	730	869	1,074	1,350	1,486
Low HOME Rent	677	725	870	1,005	1,121

Table 30 – Monthly Rent

Data Source: HUD FMR and HOME Rents

Is there sufficient housing for households at all income levels?

Of the County's 38,794 occupied rental units, 72%, or 27,945, are affordable to households earning up to 80% of the region's median income. At first glance, these numbers seem to indicate that there is no affordable housing problem in the rental market. The reality, however, is that there is a mismatch between income and availability because renters do not seek to maximize their incomes on rent. While many households seek to buy "more house" than they need, renters tend to seek out the best bargain for their preferred location and/or the smallest unit that they can squeeze into. Some renters want to spend as little as possible so that they can save money for a home. Other renters may not compete well for housing in the private market against higher income renters with more stable jobs, incomes, and credit ratings.

In Portland, of the 3,390 rental units offered at rents affordable to very low income households (earning less than or equal to 30% of Median Income), 92% are occupied by households earning up to 100% HAMFI. Judging by the vacancy rate, competition is stiffest for units with three or more bedrooms. Of the 2,490 rental units offered at rents affordable to low income households (earning 30%-50% of Median Income), 86% are occupied by households earning up to 100% HAMFI. Judging by the vacancy rate of 0%, competition is stiffest for units with three or more bedrooms. Of the 9,145 rental units offered at rents affordable to moderate income households (50%-80% of Median Income), 74% are occupied by households earning up to 100% of HAMFI. Vacancy is tightest in this price range. Of the 1,790 units offered at rents affordable to households earning more than 80% of Median Income, 47% are occupied by households earning up to 100% of HAMFI. At 12.1%, the vacancy rate is highest amongst 3-bedroom units.

Rental growth in Portland does not reflect current need. Distribution of rents between 2010 and 2012 shows a decrease in units under \$500 and an increase in units over \$1,000 over a very short period of time. Rents under \$500 decreased by 821 units between 2010 and 2012, for a loss of 27% among these

low cost units. Rental units available between \$500 and \$1,000 remained relatively flat, with an increase of only 140 units during the same time period. Rents available between \$1,000 and \$1500 increased by 15% and rents over \$1,500 increased by 47%.

In 2011, 66% of existing home ownership units, or 6,895 units, were affordable to households earning 100% of the region's median household income. This data should be used with caution as owners lock in 30 year mortgages which stabilizes their payments for the life of the loan. Also these numbers do not reflect cost burden, for example seniors who are house rich but cash poor.

From: *2030 Workforce Housing Demand Study*

How is affordability of housing likely to change considering changes to home values and/or rents?

Rental rates in Portland have fluctuated during the recession, and are now closer to 2005 levels. Fifty-seven percent of Portland households and 45% of Cumberland County households are renters. Census data shows that over the last ten years rental rates in Portland have increased by 20% and by 16% in Cumberland County. The proportion of low-income people paying 30% or more for housing is higher on the peninsula than elsewhere in Portland or in Cumberland County. The peninsula is also relatively expensive for moderate income renters (income between \$20,000 and \$35,000) – 80% of whom pay over 30% for rent and utilities. This is an even higher percentage than low-income renters, due to the fact that moderate income renters do not get the rent subsidy help that some low income renters receive. Rents have continued to rise with an 8-9% increase in the last year.

Homeownership pricing also continues to increase. Affordability on the peninsula is particularly difficult as similar homes can cost more than if located elsewhere in the City. Even for existing homeowners, affordability in the peninsula is a particular issue for low income homeowners (incomes under \$20,000) – where 100% pay more than 30% for housing (includes mortgage, taxes, and utilities). Most such homeowners are over age 45 (25% owners over age 45 are paying over 30% of their income for mortgage costs). Homeownership prices are also expected to increase. Since 2011 the median sales price in Cumberland County, as well as throughout the State, has increased by 10%.

How do HOME rents / Fair Market Rent compare to Area Median Rent? How might this impact your strategy to produce or preserve affordable housing?

The rent to FMR ratio is calculated by dividing the total amount of gross rent being charged for subsidized units by the total amount of rent that would be charged if the rents were equal to the HUD-determined Fair Market Rent levels. Maine's overall rent to FMR ratio is fourth in the nation at 146% after New Jersey, Hawaii and West Virginia, and most of Portland subsidized and public housing units are above this ratio.

The rent to fair market rent (FMR) ratio for these properties ranges from 89.4% at Portland Volunteers of America's Bayview Heights with 60 units of elderly housing, to 187.3% at Goodwill Industries' Ingraham House with 12 units for disabled adults. The average rent to FMR ratio among subsidized and PHA units is 137.58%.

Discussion

The City of Portland contracted with the Greater Portland Council of Governments (GPCOG) to produce a 2030 Workforce Housing Demand Study to examine trends in the Portland housing market in order to help policy makers determine what gaps may exist between what is currently being provided in the market and the city's housing needs. The study utilizes two approaches to an analysis used in other states: the Massachusetts Approach and the California Approach. The Massachusetts Approach is based on the goals articulated in a municipality's comprehensive plan, including the housing plan and individual neighborhood plans. This approach assumes that Portland will capture a certain percentage of the region's population growth, and that the demand from those new households can be projected by the current distribution of housing units by tenure and affordability. The California Approach assumes that the construction of market-rate units attract high income households, which support lesser income households through their support of low-paid service jobs with their purchases of goods and services. The two approaches were deployed to help policymakers determine what percentage of new construction should be made affordable by policy to increase diversity in the city's housing stock.

Portland's Housing Plan establishes as a goal to maintain the city's 25% share of the county's population. In order to create enough affordable housing for the future, this share should be applied to the county's future growth projections. To address this housing plan goal, utilizing the Massachusetts Approach one calculates the gap between current production trends and future demand, which finds: Approximately 62% of Portland households earn less than the county's median income and if recent construction trends hold, the market, without compulsion, will build affordable units to meet 29% of demand. This leaves a gap between supply and demand of 33%. Utilizing the California Approach if the market, in keeping with current production patterns, supplies 29 affordable units for every 100 built, there would still be an unmet gap for 24 affordable units, or 24% gap.

MA-20 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing - 91.410, 91.210(a)

Introduction

Much of Portland's housing stock is old. According to recent ACS data 50% percent of Portland's housing stock was built before 1939 and 30% percent of the housing stock was built between 1940 and 1980. Overall, the county's housing stock is newer when compared with Portland. Almost 39% of the county's housing stock was built after 1980. Twenty-seven percent of the housing stock was built prior to 1939. Single family homes, which include condominium units, account for almost half of the housing stock in Portland. Buildings with 20 or more units make-up approximately 22% of Portland's housing stock. Almost 72% of the county's housing stock is made up of single family homes, which include condominium units, while only 6% is made up of buildings with 20 or more units.

Describe the jurisdiction's definition for "substandard condition" and "substandard condition but suitable for rehabilitation":

The City defines substandard condition as "properties unfit for human habitation." Property unfit for human habitation shall include but not be limited to: (a) Properties which are either damaged, decayed, dilapidated, unsanitary, unsafe, or vermin-infested in such a manner as to create a serious hazard to the health, safety, and general welfare of the occupants or the public; (b) Properties which lack plumbing, ventilating, lighting or heating facilities or equipment adequate to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the occupants or the public; (c) Properties which, because of their general condition, state of the premises, number of occupants, or location, are so unsanitary, unsafe, overcrowded or otherwise dangerous or detrimental that they create a serious menace to the occupants or the public; (d) Properties which contain lead-based paint substances, as defined by the City.

Condition of Units

Condition of Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
With one selected Condition	24,080	30%	17,000	45%
With two selected Conditions	301	0%	924	2%
With three selected Conditions	169	0%	275	0%
With four selected Conditions	0	0%	0	0%
No selected Conditions	54,870	69%	19,473	52%
Total	79,420	99%	37,672	99%

Table 31 - Condition of Units

Data Source: 2008-2012 ACS

Year Unit Built

Year Unit Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
2000 or later	10,634	0%	3,518	9%
1980-1999	24,514	31%	7,453	20%
1950-1979	22,789	29%	9,660	26%
Before 1950	21,483	27%	17,041	45%
Total	79,420	87%	37,672	100%

Table 32 – Year Unit Built

Data Source: 2008-2012 CHAS

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total Number of Units Built Before 1980	44,272	56%	26,701	71%
Housing Units build before 1980 with children present	8,604	11%	1,715	5%

Table 33 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint

Data Source: 2008-2012 ACS (Total Units) 2008-2012 CHAS (Units with Children present)

Vacant Units

	Suitable for Rehabilitation	Not Suitable for Rehabilitation	Total
Vacant Units	0	0	0
Abandoned Vacant Units	0	0	0
REO Properties	0	0	0
Abandoned REO Properties	0	0	0

Table 34 - Vacant Units

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Describe the need for owner and rental rehabilitation based on the condition of the jurisdiction's housing.

Only 5% of the housing units in the City of Portland have been built in the last 15 years. 77% were built before 1979, thereby being at risk for lead paint. While many units have been and continue to be rehabilitated and upgraded to compete in the market, many have not and are in poor condition thereby causing risk to those who live there. All homes need basic maintenance, repair and upgrades. The older the unit, the more likely it is to need some level of repair; the lower the income of the household who occupies the unit, the more likely it is that repairs will be deferred. There are many levels of repair that pose a threat to health, life, safety and comfort. Structural needs, system improvements, energy efficiency, handicap accessibility and some of the more frequent types of repairs need in older housing units.

Estimate the number of housing units within the jurisdiction that are occupied by low or moderate income families that contain lead-based paint hazards. 91.205(e), 91.405

Although the City of Portland has an aging housing stock, it is estimated that only 3% of owner-occupied and 2% of renter-occupied housing units build before 1980 have children present based on the ACS 2007-2011 data provided by HUD. Lead based paint causes the most harm to children under the age of six because lead poisons their ability to think, concentrate and learn, so the City will focus its strategic planning for dealing with LBP hazards on these units as a priority. There is, however, a very large percentage of housing units in the City with potential LBP hazards that could affect future populations if not considered early. 77% of owner-occupied housing units build before 1980 have a risk of LBP hazards and 82% of renter-occupied housing units built before 1980 have the risk of LBP hazards. Abatement of LBP hazards is expensive. Units occupied by low or moderate income households are less likely to have the means or command the rent necessary to abate the LBP hazards.

Discussion

In addition to catching up with the high demand for housing of all types, particularly workforce housing affordable to low and low to moderate income households, the housing market in Portland will be approaching the end of the useful life of a large percentage of its housing stock due to age. Based on ACS 2007-2011 data provided by HUD, 33% of owner-occupied units have one or two housing conditions, other than lead based paint hazard, and 49% of renter-occupied housing units have one or two housing conditions, also separate from lead based paint hazards. Vacant properties that are and become available to the city will likely have issues with the condition of the housing, requiring extensive rehabilitation to make them suitable for habitation, and will likely be aging. The current vacant housing stock in the city was built between 1800 and 1966, and many have permits and are under renovation already.

MA-25 Public And Assisted Housing - 91.410, 91.210(b)

Introduction

The Portland Housing Authority currently owns and manages 994 active public housing units within 12 developments and four Asset Management Projects, representing 420 elderly/disabled units and 574 family units. The occupancy rate is 97% in all developments. All PHA units are in good condition and continue to provide decent, safe affordable housing for extremely low, very low and low to moderate income families and individuals. PHA is rated as a "high performer" under HUD's Public Housing Assessment System.

The PHA administers 1809 Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers for very and extremely low income families and individuals in Greater Portland. Within the total number of vouchers administered, there are special programs for homeownership, chronically homeless individuals and homeless veterans. Utilization of vouchers and funding is always between 98% and 100%. PHA consistently scores 100% under HUD Section 8 Management Assessment Program.

From: 2000-2015 PHA Five Year Plan

Totals Number of Units

	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Total	Project -based	Tenant -based	Vouchers		
							Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers available	0	102	1,626	3,306	267	2,650	205	0	1,004
# of accessible units									

*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Table 35 – Total Number of Units by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Describe the supply of public housing developments:

Describe the number and physical condition of public housing units in the jurisdiction, including those that are participating in an approved Public Housing Agency Plan:

There are 12 active sites, including combined scattered sites on Anderson Street, Hammond Street and Salem Street, built between 1941 and 1994.

The Portland Housing Authority (PHA) maintains 14 housing development properties with a total of 994 individual units. The majority of the units are in large developments built in the late 1960s and early 1970s, with four developments built during this time containing 100-200 units each, and one built in 1942 containing 198 units. Four additional units built in the 1960s and early 1970s contain 24-98 units each, and one built in 1971 contains just 4 units. Four newer developments built in the late 1980s and early 1990s are of a much smaller scale and contain only 1-6 units each.

The following is a list of units and the year they were built: Sagamore Village (1941) 198 units; Kennedy Park (1965) 45 units; Bayside Terrace (1966) 24 units; Franklin Towers (1969) 200 units; ; Dermot Court (1971) 4 units; Front Street (1971) 50 units; Harbor Terrace (1971) 119 units; Bayside East (1972) 98 units; Riverton Park (1972) 142 units; Washington Gardens (1973) 100 units; and most recently various scattered sites on Anderson Street (1994) 6 units, Hammon Street (1994) 4 units, and Salem Street (1994) 3 units.

The 12 developments are combined into four AMPs (asset management projects). They use one development name to describe each AMP, but all 12 are included in the REAC score.

Development	Year	HUD	
			Dwelling Units
Franklin Towers	1969	ME003-004	200
Harbor Terrace	1971	ME003-006	119
Kennedy Park	1965	ME003-002	45
Bayside Terrace	1966	ME003-003	24
Bayside East	1972	ME003-005	98
Dermot Court	1971	ME003-011	4
Scattered Site - Anderson St.	1994	ME003-016	6
Scattered Site – Hammond	1994	ME003-016	4
Scattered Site – Salem St.	1994	ME003-016	3
Condo – Liberty Sq.	1988	ME003-017	1
Washington Gardens	1973	ME003-009	100
Front Street	1971	ME003-010	50
Sagamore Village	1941	ME003-001	198
Riverton Park	1972	ME003-008	142

Public Housing Condition

Public Housing Development	Average Inspection Score
AMP 1 Franklin Towers	89
AMP 2 Bayside East	95
AMP 3 Washington Gardens	90
AMP 4 Sagamore Village	74

Table 36 - Public Housing Condition

Describe the restoration and revitalization needs of public housing units in the jurisdiction:

In 2011, the Portland Housing Authority (PHA) completed a physical needs assessment and asset positioning report for all of its public housing properties to determine priorities for capital investment and redevelopment. 98% of apartments are over 40 years old and 20% are closer to 70 years old. The majority have not had a major investment in renovations, only maintenance. They are safe and warm, but worn, inefficient, and closing in on the end of useful life. It is critical to plan for the long term viability of PHA inventory.

The report identifies \$25 million of renovation work needed in the properties in the next five years to extend the useful life for another 50 years. Findings from the assessment include:

Years 1-5: \$25 million needed to replace items that exceeded their useful life, for deferred maintenance, maintain HUD Quality Standards and reduce energy and water use.

Years 1-20: \$55.5 million needed for projected needs and to insure long term viability of the housing.

Describe the public housing agency's strategy for improving the living environment of low- and moderate-income families residing in public housing:

The Portland Housing Authority (PHA) includes the following resident services and security goals and objectives as part of its 2015 Five Year Agency Plan and Capital Fund Plan: Continue to provide and expand services and programming to youth and adult residents to help improve the quality of their lives and empower them to succeed; Implement a volunteer management plan to maximize volunteer effectiveness and recognize their efforts; Increase the number Family Self Sufficiency (FSS) participants 10% annually; Continue the close working relationship with the Portland Police Department to reduce and prevent criminal activities in public housing; and Update fire safety and emergency policies and procedures for all properties and programs.

Additionally, the PHA has the following operations and policy goals and objectives that contribute to the agency's long-term sustainability: Maintain the high level of excellence in the administration of its core programs and the overall financial stability of the agency; Seek opportunities to increase revenue, reduce operating costs and gain efficiencies without impacting program effectiveness; Work with Housing Authorities in neighboring communities to provide and expand common services; Increase communications with all stakeholders to improve access to programs, enhance the understanding of the PHA mission, and improve engagement and feedback on topics such as policy development and operations; Continue to implement Green Policy goals with the installation of energy conservation measures using the HUD Energy Performance Contract Program, and the completion recycling programs in all developments; and Implement a web based energy monitoring system to track consumption, rates and savings based on established benchmarks.

The PHA 2015 Five Year Agency Plan further identifies the following Public Housing Program, Housing Choice Voucher Program, and New Housing Development goals and objectives: Insure the long term viability of the Public Housing inventory; Develop a strategy and set priorities for future investment to finance, modernize and redevelop Public Housing, using HUD and non-HUD resources; Maximize utilization Housing Choice Voucher rates to insure program benefits and future funding opportunities; Increase the number of available Housing Choice Vouchers through programs such as VASH; Continue conversion to project-based vouchers to meet community needs and enhance development opportunities. Expand Portland's inventory of affordable housing by developing 100 new housing units in five years utilizing a variety of programs, partnerships and financing opportunities; and Develop a strategy to set priorities for new development concerning housing types, location, funding and timing. From: *Portland Housing Authority 2015 Five Year Agency Plan and Capital Fund Plan*

Discussion:

The Portland Housing Authority's (PHA) progress on its previous five year goals (2010 to 2014) demonstrates its ability to achieve sustainability goals.

The PHA achieved high performer status under PHAS three of the last five years and under SEMAP in each of the last five years to meet its goal of maintaining and enhancing a high level of excellence in the administration of its core programs.

To meet its goal of maintaining excellent financial stability, the PHA obtained additional revenue generation through increased rent collection, and new development; lowered operating expenses through operating efficiencies and energy conservation efforts; obtained unqualified annual audits with no findings in each of the last five years; created a non-profit corporation to work with South Portland and Westbrook Housing Authorities and implemented a shared waiting list program for Housing Choice Vouchers; and converted to a new internal integrated software programs with expanded capabilities. The PHA invested in its buildings, apartments and grounds to insure the safety of its residents, visitors and employees, as well as the efficient management of all facilities by Investing over \$7 million in HUD CFP grant funding in the renovation and upgrading for public housing apartments, common areas and sites; adopting a Green Policy to guide to guide energy and resource conservation efforts and investments; and investing \$4.3 million of bond funds in energy and water conservation measures under HUD's Energy Performance Contract Program.

Improving the safety and security of its residents was achieved as a goal by improving community policing efforts with the Portland Police Department in the family developments in Riverton Park and Kennedy Park/Bayside and by Continuing aggressive tenant screening and lease enforcement.

The PHA housed additional low income families and individuals by obtaining 50 additional HUD VASH vouchers for homeless veterans and creating a set aside of 40 Housing Choice Vouchers for chronically homeless disabled individuals living in emergency shelters in partnership with Preble Street Resource Center and the City of Portland. In addition, the PHA planned and obtained financing for the Bayside Anchor project, 45 new units of affordable and market rate housing in East Bayside, which provided an additional 45 housing choice vouchers at three properties in Portland to serve homeless and disabled tenants.

The PHA continued to provide services and programming to youth and adult residents to help improve the quality of their lives and empower them to achieve self-sufficiency through expanded youth services through the PHA Study Centers to include the CHEETA Program and other special programming administered by Americorp members. In addition, it created an additional Study Centers in the Front Street family development and expanded Boys and Girls Club facilities and programming in Riverton

Park and Sagamore Village. The PHA also developed a new partnership with Portland Community Health Center, and opened two new health clinics in our Riverton Park and Franklin Towers developments.

From: *Portland Housing Authority 2015 Five Year Agency Plan and Capital Fund Plan*

MA-30 Homeless Facilities and Services - 91.410, 91.210(c)

Introduction

The Preble Street Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter provides 24 beds to adolescents or unaccompanied youth. There are three shelters serving families the City of Portland Family Shelter, with 104 beds, Family Crisis Shelter with 16 beds and Stepping Stones with 12 beds, totaling 132 shelter beds. Hotels are used as needed for overflow for families. There are three adult shelters Milestone Foundation has 41 beds and serves adults suffering from substance abuse. The City of Portland Oxford Street Shelter provides 141 beds to men and women and Florence House provides 25 shelter beds, thus totaling 207 shelter beds. Florence House also provides 13 transitional safe haven beds. The development at Danforth on High has approximately 10 units, services are provided by outside agencies. These are not dedicated permanent supportive housing beds, but are generally used for this purpose. There are 75 overflow beds at Preble Street Resource Center and an additional 17 overflow beds at the General Assistance. There are also 15 units of permanent supportive housing at McAuley Residence for women and their children. The services are temporary but the housing is permanent.

Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons

	Emergency Shelter Beds		Transitional Housing Beds	Permanent Supportive Housing Beds	
	Year Round Beds (Current & New)	Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds	Current & New	Current & New	Under Development
Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	0	0	0	0	0
Households with Only Adults	0	0	0	0	0
Chronically Homeless Households	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans	0	0	0	0	0
Unaccompanied Youth	0	0	0	0	0

Table 37 - Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons

Data Source Comments:

Describe mainstream services, such as health, mental health, and employment services to the extent those services are used to complement services targeted to homeless persons

The Portland Community Health Center offers an Integrated behavioral Health program that is designed to bring adults into treatment who are experiencing homelessness, and are suffering from co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders. The goal of the program is to help stabilize individuals in need of health and mental health services and provide housing stabilization, housing placements, residential treatment use, and detox and follow-up treatment.

Milestone operates a program called the Homeless Outreach & Mobile Engagement (HOME) Team who provides outreach and community supports to homeless individuals experiencing chronic health and substance abuse issues in Portland. The HOME Team provides daily street outreach, intervention, referrals and transportation of homeless individuals, highly intoxicated individuals, individuals with mental illness and individuals engaging in disruptive behavior. Staff works to engage these individuals in a compassionate manner, encouraging them to access appropriate treatment services.

Another crisis intervention resource is offered by the Opportunity Alliance provides Crisis by calling 774-HELP.

The City of Portland Homeless Employment Program assists consumers in strengthening their employment skills by working toward independence from public assistance programs. The employment assessment includes identifying transferable skills, job matching and searching, and gaining and retaining temporary, permanent, and part-time employment. Services are designed specifically for Portland's homeless population. The staff conducts outreach at homeless shelters and linkage to the Career Center in Portland.

List and describe services and facilities that meet the needs of homeless persons, particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth. If the services and facilities are listed on screen SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure or screen MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services, describe how these facilities and services specifically address the needs of these populations.

Families with Children- There are three shelters that serve families with children. The City of Portland Family Shelter provides temporary housing to families with children. There are 114 beds available. Families staying at the shelter learn important life skills, have access to various household items, participate in house meetings to discuss issues and assistance, laundry and transportation services to appointments. Staff assists with housing placement and case management. Family Crisis Services operates an Emergency Shelter for women and children who are experiencing domestic violence. They provide 16 beds. Families can access basic necessities like food, clothing and personal care items and are offered in house education programs, individual advocacy, case management and safety planning. Stepping Stones Family Shelter provides 12 beds in a safe environment for homeless, pregnant and or parenting women and their children. They provide trainings and connections to resources that assist clients attain life skills that will lead to healthy independent living free from government assistance.

Unaccompanied Youth- The Preble Street Joe Kreisler Teen Shelter provides 16-24 beds unaccompanied youth ages 12-20. The shelter provides safe, clean overnight accommodations in a secure building, showers, bathrooms, laundry facilities, towels, and personal hygiene products, community living areas, light breakfast and snacks. Staff responds to the crisis that led to homelessness, provides referrals, link youth to necessary services including substance abuse, counseling and medical facilities.

Chronically homeless- Chronically homeless men and women stay at the Oxford Street Shelter which has the capacity of 154 beds with overflow services at Preble Street (an additional 75 beds) and General Assistance Lobby (15 beds). While at Oxford Street consumers have access to showers; housing placement, referrals and counseling; mental health services; access to interpreting services; rapid rehousing and Veterans services including an interdisciplinary health clinic and Veteran housing services.

Oxford Street and Family Shelter housing staff have focused resources and efforts to house the most chronic and vulnerable clients residing at the shelter. The Long Term Stayer Initiative is based on the theory that if we are successful in securing housing for folks who are with us night after night after night, it will create capacity in the shelters and free up resources that can be made available for others. As the 100,000 Homes Campaign has taught us, this population are the most vulnerable. It is estimated that this group represents approximately 5% of the individuals served at the OSS. There are variations of the Initiative at the Family Shelter and Oxford Street, particularly in defining long term stayers, but the premise remains the same; prioritize resources for those who have been in the shelter the longest.

The Home to Stay (HTS) Program is modeled after a rapid re-housing approach that provides housing stability services to persons who are experiencing homelessness. The program provides assessments for individuals residing at the Oxford Street Shelter. Participants are offered and receive case management services while enrolled in Home To Stay.

MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services - 91.410, 91.210(d)

Introduction

Portland's population has a higher incidence of disability than people in Cumberland County as a whole. There is a much higher incidence of people with "cognitive difficulties" in Portland among adults, and a much higher incidence of disability in the population 65 years or over. 40% of the non-institutional population 65 years and over has a disability, including hearing difficulty, vision difficulty, cognitive difficulty, ambulatory difficulty, self-care difficulty, and independent living difficulty.

Including the elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities (mental, physical, developmental), persons with alcohol or other drug addictions, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, public housing residents and any other categories the jurisdiction may specify, and describe their supportive housing needs

Riverview & Dorothea Dix are Maine's two publicly-funded mental health hospitals that have adopted a discharge plan process that begins at admission, to connect clients back to community supports & housing. Several agencies and organizations, including Amistad, Opportunity Alliance, Spring Harbor, collaborate to address "difficult to discharge" patients. Various funding resources are utilized to help in this effort including: BRAP, HOPWA, VASH and other resources

Describe programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing

Riverview & Dorothea Dix are Maine's two publicly-funded mental health hospitals that have adopted a discharge plan process that begins at admission, to connect clients back to community supports & housing. Maine DHHS' top priority is to use BRAP to house those being discharged from psychiatric hospitals. The Opportunity Alliance works with Spring Harbor (private psychiatric hospital) to prevent patients from being discharged to homelessness. Portland homeless providers have regular discharge meetings with hospitals for "difficult to discharge" patients. Placements are in residential treatment facilities, market rate apartments, boarding homes & other federal, state, or locally-funded housing options, HOPWA, & VASH. Another resource is the Amistad Peer Center, which invites membership from adults in Portland who live with the symptoms of severe & persistent mental illness, addiction, homelessness, etc.

VA Maine Healthcare partners with Portland Housing Authority to administer VASH vouchers, & participates in ESAC. In 2013, the City of Portland Oxford Street Adult Shelter appointed a Veteran Liaison to conduct outreach to Vets, including those ineligible for VA assistance due to less than honorable discharge. Preble Street is a SSVF grantee, providing outreach, case management, housing

search assistance, budget counseling & financial assistance to eligible homeless & at risk Vets & their families. In addition, there are two per-diem projects in York County to which Vets are referred. All referred Veterans are helped to access entitlements, community resources, & VA benefits. Portland CoC will continue to use these strategies to reduce bed nights by another 25% in the first 6 months of 2014 to continue making progress toward the goal of ending all Vet homelessness in 2015.

Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. 91.315(e)

Riverview & Dorothea Dix are Maine's two publicly-funded mental health hospitals that have adopted a discharge plan process that begins at admission, to connect clients back to community supports & housing. Several agencies and organizations, including Amistad, Opportunity Alliance, Spring Harbor, collaborate to address "difficult to discharge" patients. Various funding resources are utilized to help in this effort including: BRAP, HOPWA, VASH and other resources.

For entitlement/consortia grantees: Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. (91.220(2))

MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing - 91.410, 91.210(e)

Describe any negative effects of public policies on affordable housing and residential investment

The City of Portland recognizes there are certain public policies, particularly zoning and land use regulations that pose challenges in increasing affordable housing opportunities and residential investment. This is revealed in higher housing costs, a shortage of affordable housing in relation to demand and higher land costs. Inflexible or outdated regulations contribute to this problem. Portland acknowledges present ordinances (particularly in older neighborhoods) do not reflect the traditional urban character of these neighborhoods, resulting in a scenario where many neighborhoods built in the 1800s and early 1900s could not be duplicated under present ordinances. The net effect is that fewer dwelling units could be built today than in the past and even modest additions to existing buildings for affordable housing are impeded. Present ordinance language such as residential density, yard dimensions, lot coverage and lot size hinders affordable workforce housing and housing investment. Parking provisions require an inordinate number of spaces for neighborhoods within walking distance of the downtown and served by public transportation. Excessive parking occupies valuable buildable land on residential lots and is costly to provide. Resources given to parking would be better served by enhancing housing investment.

MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets - 91.410, 91.210(f)

Introduction

This section provides a concise summary of the non-housing community development assets of the City of Portland. The Portland Community Chamber of Commerce (PCCC) works with public, private and nonprofit partners to identify obstacles to growth in key economic sectors, and has proposed a strategy, based on an economic development market analysis, that will expand prosperity in the City of Portland and within the Greater Portland Region. PCCC aligned economic development indicators with the City of Portland's Economic Vision and Plan, a collaboration of City officials, the Portland Development Corporation, Creative Portland, the Greater Portland Convention and Visitors Bureau, the Portland Downtown District, and the Growing Portland Collaborative.

Economic Development Market Analysis

Business Activity

Business by Sector	Number of Workers	Number of Jobs	Share of Workers %	Share of Jobs %	Jobs less workers %
Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction	69	67	0	0	0
Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations	3,677	5,953	14	11	-3
Construction	755	1,984	3	4	1
Education and Health Care Services	6,775	16,276	26	29	3
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	2,713	7,784	10	14	4
Information	713	2,181	3	4	1
Manufacturing	1,800	3,249	7	6	-1
Other Services	1,042	2,162	4	4	0
Professional, Scientific, Management Services	2,833	6,557	11	12	1
Public Administration	0	0	0	0	0
Retail Trade	3,587	5,176	14	9	-5
Transportation and Warehousing	753	1,386	3	3	0
Wholesale Trade	1,134	2,597	4	5	1
Total	25,851	55,372	--	--	--

Table 38 - Business Activity

Data Source: 2008-2012 ACS (Workers), 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (Jobs)

Labor Force

Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force	39,410
Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over	36,994
Unemployment Rate	6.13
Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24	23.19
Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65	4.42

Table 39 - Labor Force

Data Source: 2008-2012 ACS

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Management, business and financial	10,278
Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations	1,548
Service	4,308
Sales and office	8,281
Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair	2,051
Production, transportation and material moving	1,393

Table 40 – Occupations by Sector

Data Source: 2008-2012 ACS

Travel Time

Travel Time	Number	Percentage
< 30 Minutes	29,680	86%
30-59 Minutes	3,813	11%
60 or More Minutes	991	3%
Total	34,484	100%

Table 41 - Travel Time

Data Source: 2008-2012 ACS

Education:

Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	1,299	307	1,201
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	4,636	544	2,215
Some college or Associate's degree	8,156	347	1,702
Bachelor's degree or higher	15,955	519	1,871

Table 42 - Educational Attainment by Employment Status

Data Source: 2008-2012 ACS

Educational Attainment by Age

	Age				
	18–24 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–44 yrs	45–65 yrs	65+ yrs
Less than 9th grade	25	171	279	581	759
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	834	508	522	746	607
High school graduate, GED, or alternative	1,650	1,673	1,952	3,781	2,674
Some college, no degree	3,584	2,204	1,749	3,013	1,296
Associate's degree	199	942	755	1,596	473
Bachelor's degree	1,452	4,590	2,851	4,154	1,342
Graduate or professional degree	14	1,665	1,540	3,590	1,114

Table 43 - Educational Attainment by Age

Data Source: 2008-2012 ACS

Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months
Less than high school graduate	18,370
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	24,100
Some college or Associate's degree	28,776
Bachelor's degree	38,585
Graduate or professional degree	51,587

Table 44 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Data Source: 2008-2012 ACS

Based on the Business Activity table above, what are the major employment sectors within your jurisdiction?

Major employment sectors in Portland making up 70% of the share of jobs include Education and Health Care Services; Arts, Entertainment, and Accommodations; Retail Trade; Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate; and Professional, Scientific, and Management Services. The employment sector with the largest share of jobs is Education and Health Care Services, with 29% of jobs and 26% of the share of workers, followed by Arts, Entertainment, and Accommodations and Retail trade, each with 11% of the job share. Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate with 14% of the job share and Professional, Scientific, and Management Service sectors with 12% of the job share. Arts, Entertainment, and Accommodations show 3% more works than there are jobs available and as well as Retail trade show 5% more workers than jobs available. This may be a reflection of seasonal demand with peak seasonal employment

reflecting a shortage of workers, and perhaps balancing out during the off season. Although not a major employment sector in Portland, Manufacturing also shows 1% more workers than jobs. It should be noted that Greater Portland losing over 4,000 manufacturing jobs from 2000 - 2010.[1] Education and Health Care Services and Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate show worker shortages of 3 and 4% respectively.

Data collected by the ACS 2008-2012 shows 27,859 occupations by sector. Management, Business and Financial occupations employ the most people in Portland, 10,278 (26.1%) of total civilians in the labor force. Sales and Office occupations employ 8,281(21.0%) of the population, followed by 4,308 (10.9%) in Service occupations. Interestingly, farming, fisheries and forestry occupations comprises only 5.5% of the occupations by sector or 1,548 jobs.

The unemployment rate among Portland residents 25-65 was 4.42% as of the 2007-2011 ACS, slightly skewed by the high proportion of young adults ages 16-24 showing an unemployment rate of 23.19, presumably because many of these young people are in high school, college or graduate school.

Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of the business community:

Business plays a significant role in the Portland region. Business Infrastructure supports communities, families, and workers, and includes water, sewer, gas, electric, broadband, roads, airports, interstates, ports and rail lines. Much of the infrastructure in Maine is old and expensive to maintain. The Greater Portland Council of Governments (GPCOG) has identified transportation infrastructure needs of \$1.484 billion over the next 20 years. Within the region, Portland specifically faces the following infrastructure challenges:

- Aging water, gas and sewer lines
- Lack of safe, decent and affordable multi-family workforce housing
- High homeowner costs
- Vacant, abandoned or idle Brownfield sites
- High costs to preserve, renovate and reuse historic buildings
- Limited public transportation with little or no linkages to the rest of the region
- Maintaining bridges and collector road systems
- Heavy dependence on foreign oil as a home heating fuel

The majority of workers (86%) travel less than 30 minutes to their job, while 11% travel between 30 and 59 minutes. Improvements to the current public transportation system alone would put the majority of current commuters' needs within reach. (*GPCOG 2014-2018 Economic Development Action Plan*)

Describe any major changes that may have an economic impact, such as planned local or regional public or private sector investments or initiatives that have affected or may affect job and business growth opportunities during the planning period. Describe any needs for workforce development, business support or infrastructure these changes may create.

In 2007 the City of Portland applied for 108/BEDI funds in an amount of \$1.2 million in Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) and \$10.8 million in Section 108 loan. The funds were awarded in February 2008. The combined \$12 million will revitalize the distressed area of Bayside by stimulating residential and commercial economic development activities and creating jobs.

In 2012 the City underwent negotiations with Federated Companies for the purchase and sale of seven parcels of land in the Bayside neighborhood. The project is slated to build four buildings consisting of approximately 715,000 square feet, including 90,000 square feet of direct street access retail space at the ground level, 445 new apartments (from 400 sq. ft studios to 1050 sq. ft. two-bedroom units) and structured off street parking for approximately 800 vehicles.

The specific community development objectives flow from activities required to relieve the blighted conditions and introduce economic activity: Remove blighted land uses; upgrade infrastructure; facilitate re-use by firms that compliment downtown Portland and the city overall; create a vital area of mixed business, residential and recreational uses by building a parking garage to spur growth; and private sector job creation.

The project received Portland Planning Board approval in January 2014. A legal appeal filed by opponents of the project has been settled. In March 2015, the Portland Planning Board approved revisions to the original plan. The City anticipates the project to be under construction by the summer of 2016 with an anticipated two to three year build-out period.

How do the skills and education of the current workforce correspond to employment opportunities in the jurisdiction?

According to the 2007-2011 ACS data provided, 53% of the population in the civilian labor force in Portland has a Bachelor's degree, and 27% of that population has some college or an Associate's degree. 15.4% of the civilian labor force has only a high school education and only 4.3% has not graduated from high school. The labor force unemployment rate among 16-24 year-olds is 23.19, however, this age group includes high school, college and graduate students who will not identify as full-time employed.

Considering the Occupations by Sector, Management, business and Financial comprise 36.8% of the jobs while Sales and office provide 29.72% of the jobs. If you assume that both of these sectors require college degrees, this comprises of 66.2% of the market. If only 53% of the population has a Bachelor's degree or higher than this is 13% gap in education to employment opportunities.

Median earnings are directly correlated by educational attainment. Individuals who do not graduate from high school earn a median income of \$18,370. High school graduates earn 1.3 times as much as those who do not graduate from high school. Those with some college or an Associate's degree earn 1.6 times more than those without a high school diploma, and those who graduate with a Bachelor's degree

earn 2.1 times as much. Those with graduate or professional degrees earn 2.8 times as much as those who do not finish high school. (*GPCOG 2014-2018 Economic Development Action Plan*)

Describe any current workforce training initiatives, including those supported by Workforce Investment Boards, community colleges and other organizations. Describe how these efforts will support the jurisdiction's Consolidated Plan.

The City of Portland has created an Employment Development Program funded by CDBG. As a result the Portland Jobs Alliance was created, a collaborative and coordinated approach to providing employment services that promote access and success for low/moderate income job seekers. The initiative is a collaboration of Coastal Enterprises Inc, Catholic Charities Maine, City of Portland Refugee Services, Portland Adult Education, Preble Street, Community Financial Literacy, Southern Maine Community College, and other organizations partnering to improve coordination and employment outcomes for homeless individuals, new Mainers and single parents by addressing some of the employment challenges they experience. The initiative focuses on business engagement, job readiness and sector specific training, linking learning to work through internships work experiences, job retention support and helping to initiate conversations of workforce diversity. The project takes a collaborative approach to job referral and placement utilizing a web-based interagency database to communicate information about job seekers and job opportunities and track participant activity. This initiative has piqued the interest of the Gorman Foundation which seeks to bring this initiative community wide. This will be directly funded by CDBG funds in the future and therefore tied to the Consolidated Plan.

Another initiative in Portland is ConnectED, a partnership between the following organizations in the municipality: the City of Portland, Creative Portland, the Sam L. Cohen Foundation, the John T. Gorman Foundation, the Opportunity Alliance, the Portland Public Schools, Portland Regional Chamber, Southern Maine Community College, United Way of Greater Portland, and the University of Southern Maine. The partnership aims to build and sustain a citywide culture dedicated to supporting highly effective education for Portland's youth, for Portland Families, and for the Portland community at large.

There are also a variety of targeted incentive programs are offered by the State of Maine including workforce training and education. Tax reimbursements are available at the local level for Workforce Development, the Governors Training Initiative (training cost reimbursement for new hires and incumbent workers), and Maine Quality Centers, which provide custom workforce education.

Does your jurisdiction participate in a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDs)?

Yes

If so, what economic development initiatives are you undertaking that may be coordinated with the Consolidated Plan? If not, describe other local/regional plans or initiatives that impact economic growth.

In 2011, the Greater Portland Council of Governments (GPCOG) was designated by the Economic Development Administration, a division of the United States Department of Commerce, as an Economic Development District serving 26 communities in Cumberland County. The region's 256,656 people represent 19% of Maine's population, its 155,431 jobs represent 27% of its employment, and accounts for 33% of the state's gross domestic product. As an Economic Development District, one of GPCOG's core responsibilities is the creation of a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy for the region. To fulfill that mission, GPCOG, along with each of the state's seven economic development districts, is implementing Mobilize Maine, a grassroots economic strategy that focuses on leveraging unique assets within each region for economic growth and quality of place.

Through Mobilize Maine, GPCOG has identified the six drivers of economic development that will be implemented across time in each of the state's seven economic development districts: Asset-based cluster development, Entrepreneurship and innovation, Education and workforce development, Access to capital, Infrastructure and environment, and Leadership. The areas most in line to the Consolidated Plan include Entrepreneurship and Innovation, Education and Workforce Development, Access to Capital, and Infrastructure and Environment. (*GPCOG 2014-2018 Economic Development Action Plan and City of Portland 2011 Economic Development Vision and Plan*)

Discussion

A unified Portland Economic Development Plan was created in collaboration with the Portland Community Chamber of Commerce, the Creative Portland Corporation, the Portland Development Corporation, Convention and Visitors Bureau, Portland's Downtown District, and the City of Portland. These groups formed a task force to steer the direction of the plan from its infancy to completion. Former Mayor Brennan then formed the Portland Economic Development Plan Implementation Stakeholder Group to oversee the work plan activities and annually measure progress.

The Plan has three main sections: Grow the Economy; Enrich the Creative Economy; and Support Business. All three plan sections set forth a development direction for Portland, including specific work plan activities to support "creating economic prosperity through growth of the city's employment and tax base," while paying respect to Portland's quality of life. The 2011-2012 Work Plan was recently updated to a 2014/2015 Work Plan:

<http://www.portlandmaine.gov/DocumentCenter/Home/View/4202>

Economic Development Vision & Plan Portland Maine August 2011:

<http://www.portlandmaine.gov/documentcenter/view/1648>

MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

Are there areas where households with multiple housing problems are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")

The City of Portland Inspections Division was consulted to determine areas with the most housing problems within the city. Complaints reported for housing problems, junk or trash accumulation, infestations, bed bugs, fire complaints and utility shut-offs were sorted by Census Tract and analyzed for the 2014 year. The neighborhoods with the most cumulative reports for all housing problems (reports in excess of 100) were Parkside, Bayside, St. John Valley, East Bayside, the West End and the East End, all HCD eligible areas in Census Tracts 1, 5, 6, 10, 11 and 13. Parkside, Bayside and St. John Valley in Census Tracts 10, 6 and 13, respectively, exceeded 150 complaints each for housing problems.

The majority of the actions by inspections involved performing a drive by inspection in response to a complaint about junk or trash accumulation on the sidewalk. Again, Census Tracts 6, 10 and 13 saw the most complaints of this type, over 150 in Parkside and nearly 150 each in Bayside and St. John Valley. There were at least twice as many reports for junk and trash accumulation in yards in East Bayside and Parkside than in most other neighborhoods and slightly more reports of bed bug infestations in the East End, East Bayside and Bayside.

Are there any areas in the jurisdiction where racial or ethnic minorities or low-income families are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")

The two areas in the CCEJ where there are notable concentrations of poverty and minorities are the Redbank neighborhood of South Portland and the Brown Street neighborhood of Westbrook. Redbank, located between the Maine Mall and the Portland International Jetport, has been the site of affordable housing since World War II, when units were built for returning veterans. Today, those units as well as affordable developments at Brickhill are the home to many of the immigrant and refugee families that have come to the region in recent years. Brown Street is located in the downtown of Westbrook, which has struggled in recent years due to the decline of manufacturing in the city.

According to the 2010 Census, 95.3% of the Maine's population is white. Cumberland County has slightly more minorities than the state as a whole (6.2%), and the HCD neighborhoods in Portland have a nearly 10% black population and 3% Asian population. The Asian population declined on the Portland peninsula in the 2000s, even as it increased in the county. The Black/African American population has more than doubled. These numbers largely reflect an increase in the number of refugees and immigrants in Portland. For the past 35 years Portland has been an official refugee resettlement city, originally drawing many refugees from Southeast Asia, while more recent refugees have come from sub-Saharan Africa.

Population estimates of these communities are imprecise, but the City of Portland Refugee Services estimates that there are 5,000 refugees in Portland (and 3,000 in Lewiston). At a count of 5,000, recent immigrants would make up 7.5% of Portland's population – and the Portland Refugee Services program

has seen an average of 650 new clients (refugees and asylees) each year for the past five years. The most common countries of origin in 2011 were Somalia, Burundi, Iraq, Sudan, Rwanda, and Congo/Zaire.

Due to the high percentage of rental and public housing, certain neighborhoods exhibit high concentrations of racial or ethnic minorities and low-income families, particularly Parkside and Bayside. St John Valley neighborhood is also showing a higher concentration of Hispanic population. This has not occurred because of a deliberate effort to segregate these populations. Areas of higher concentrations of race and poverty occur in the sections of the city where many social service agencies are located as well as affordable housing, including public housing, and public transportation. Many in the refugee and immigrant community choose to live in proximity to their social and cultural network and in areas with better access to schools, public transportation, employment within the city, health care, and affordable housing.

A major challenge in the area is poverty. The HCD area on the Portland peninsula has a concentration of families below the poverty level that is three times that of the rest of the county. The proportion of families with children below poverty is four times the county rate. Within Portland, 90% of the families under poverty are renting. In the rest of the county, only 62% are renters, and 38% are owners. Portland has the highest concentration of poverty not only with the county but also within the state. However, as noted previously, Portland also offers greater access to affordable housing, social services, public transportation and jobs. Most Black/African American families living below the poverty level in Cumberland County live in Portland. On the other hand, most white families under poverty live in the rest of the county.

What are the characteristics of the market in these areas/neighborhoods?

The Portland market is within a healthy vacancy rate, however the owner housing vacancy rate in the HCD areas of Portland is more than twice the rate of the owner housing outside of HCD areas. Also, the actual number of vacant units available for rent has declined. Subsidized housing is concentrated on the peninsula, where there is also higher concentrations of populations living below poverty and racial minorities. The peninsula also has more accessible resources than other areas of the Cumberland County Entitlement Jurisdiction (CCEJ) does not include the largest city and economic center of the region (and the state of Maine), the City of Portland. However, the communities that directly surround Portland are the location of several large employers for the region such as Texas Instruments, Wex, Inc., and IDEXX. They also serve as "bedroom communities" for residents that commute to Portland, which has many jobs in the sectors of 1) education & healthcare services, 2) finance, insurance, & real estate, and 3) professional, scientific & management. South Portland and Freeport are retail employment centers, while areas such as the Lakes Region, Harpswell, and the island communities see seasonal employment from the tourism sector. Cumberland County also retains employment in legacy industries such as forestry, farming and fishing. The City.

Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?

Nearly all of the neighborhoods on the peninsula have active neighborhood associations: Parkside, Bayside, East Bayside, West End, Munjoy Hill, and St. John Valley. Each of the neighborhood associations work to foster a sense of community and neighborhood among its members and fellow citizens, to work for the safety, cleanliness, and livability of its streets and homes, and to work for the preservation, restoration, promotion and appreciation of their neighborhoods and parks. They hold neighborhood meetings, clean ups, and work to inform their neighborhoods about projects at the City that will impact them.

Neighborhoods on the peninsula have a higher concentration of parks, playgrounds, churches, stores, restaurants, shelters, schools, and community resources than other areas of the City. Plus because neighborhoods are dense, amenities are more accessible because residents can access them by walking, biking or taking the bus.

Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?

The areas of with higher concentration of poverty and racial diversity are also the target areas for CDBG funding. Neighborhood improvements and area wide benefit projects are then focused on these areas of the City. As a result more neighborhood scale infrastructure projects, playgrounds, parks, trees, handicap ramps, and other amenities will be constructed in these neighborhoods.

A HUD BEDI/108 project is slated to be built in the Bayside neighborhood. This will bring over 235 market rate housing units, a 700 parking space garage plus 43,000 square feet of retail/ commercial space. This will transform the Bayside neighborhood.

Additionally the City of Portland is considering creating a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area for certain areas of the peninsula, Bayside, East Bayside and possibly Parkside. This will bring additional resources and focused development in these neighborhoods.

Strategic Plan

SP-05 Overview

Strategic Plan Overview

The priorities and goals addressed in the strategic plan are based off of the needs assessment and market analysis from the previous sections. Additionally, the priorities and goals in the strategic plan align with the City Council's 2014 Goals and Priorities. These goals will be used to guide the City's investment of resources and allocation of funding for the next five years. The needs, goals and priorities of the City were placed into four categories:

1. Neighborhood Investment & Infrastructure
2. Housing Availability
3. Economic Development
4. Addressing the Needs of the Growing Homeless Population

SP-10 Geographic Priorities - 91.415, 91.215(a)(1)

Geographic Area

Table 45 - Geographic Priority Areas

1	Area Name:	Bayside Neighborhoods
	Area Type:	Local Target area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	
	% of Low/ Mod:	88.95%
	Revital Type:	Comprehensive
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	The Bayside Neighborhoods consist of the Bayside and East Bayside neighborhoods. It is bound by I-295, Washington Ave, Congress Street, and Forest Ave.
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	The Bayside neighborhoods have highest concentration of homeless shelters and LMI housing in the City. There is a diverse mix of commercial properties within the neighborhood boundaries; including grocery stores and food services, industrial buildings, health care centers.
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	In 2015 the City decide to create a 'targeted neighborhood investment' strategy; starting with the Bayside Neighborhoods and moving to a different neighborhood every 2-7 years, depending on community and public infrastructure needs. The Bayside Neighborhoods were chosen at the first targeted neighborhood investment area due to a combination of this area having the highest percentage of LMI residents, a lack of adequate housing and public infrastructure, as well as a high potential for private investments.
	Identify the needs in this target area.	The Bayside neighborhoods have the highest percentage of LMI residents in the City. Many of the roads and sidewalks with this neighborhood are in great need of repair and redesign in order to make the neighborhood a safe and sustainable.

	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Housing, public infrastructure, neighborhood development, public services.
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	Limited funding resources
2	Area Name:	CDBG Target Neighborhoods
	Area Type:	Local Target area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	
	% of Low/ Mod:	72.3%
	Revital Type:	Comprehensive
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	Districts 1 and 2 of the Portland Peninsula. This consists of eligible census tracts, 1, 2.1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13.2, 13.3, 15.1, 15.3, and 20.2.1
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	The CDBG target neighborhoods include the oldest housing stock in the City, the downtown district, and the highest concentration of public services.
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	Members of neighborhood organizations, residents, service providers, and business owners all participated in the creation of this target area.
	Identify the needs in this target area.	Housing, public infrastructure, safety, and public services.
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Housing, public infrastructure, neighborhood development, public services.
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	Limited funding resources
3	Area Name:	Eligible Census Tracts
	Area Type:	Local Target area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	
	% of Low/ Mod:	71.8%
	Revital Type:	Comprehensive

	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	Any census tract with more than 51% of the residents are below 80% of the AMI This includes: census tracts 1, 2.1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13.2, 13.3, 15.1, 15.3, and 20.2.1, 21.1.3, 21.2.2, and 22.2
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	This area consist of census tracts in the highest and lowest density neighborhoods of the city. The housing type is very diverse, including single family and multi-unit buildings as well as a wide array of businesses and services.
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	Members of neighborhood organizations, residents, service providers, and business owners all participated
	Identify the needs in this target area.	Housing, public infrastructure, safety, and public services.
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Housing, public infrastructure, neighborhood development, public services.
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	Lack of funding resources
4	Area Name:	PORTLAND, MAINE
	Area Type:	Local Target area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	Housing
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	The boundaries of the City of Portland
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	Portland consist of highest and lowest density neighborhoods. The housing type is very diverse, including single family and multi-unit buildings as well as a wide array of businesses and services.

	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	Members of neighborhood organizations, residents, service providers, and business owners all participated.
	Identify the needs in this target area.	Housing, public infrastructure, safety, and public services.
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Housing, public infrastructure, neighborhood development, public services.
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	Limited funding resources
5	Area Name:	Cumberland County
	Area Type:	Local Target area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	Housing
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	All of Cumberland County
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	The housing type is very diverse, including single family and multi-unit buildings as well as a wide array of businesses and services.
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	
	Identify the needs in this target area.	With a very old housing stock, many LMI residents are in need of home repairs.
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	Opportunity to improve individual LMI eligible homes
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	Limited funding resources

General Allocation Priorities

The City of Portland's priority to allocating resources is to focus them on the areas of the jurisdiction that is in the most need. To determine this the City considered which areas of the City have the highest combination of poverty, minorities, single parents, oldest housing stock, and housing problems. These are located in Census Tracts 5, 6 and 10, which represents East Bayside, Bayside and Parkside neighborhoods respectively. Over the next five years the City of Portland will consider creating a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area to help increase investment in these neighborhoods

In 2015 the City decide to create a 'targeted neighborhood investment' strategy; starting with the Bayside Neighborhoods and moving to a different neighborhood every 2-7 years, depending on community and public infrastructure needs. The Bayside Neighborhoods were chosen as the first targeted neighborhood investment area due to a combination of this area having the highest percentage of LMI residents, a lack of adequate housing and public infrastructure, as well as a high potential for private investments.

On a larger scale, the city will focus federal resources into areas of the City with the highest percentage of LMI residents, which are located primarily on the peninsula in districts 1 & 2. Street, sidewalk, infrastructure, parks, playgrounds, and other area benefit projects will be located in the target neighborhoods to benefit the low and moderate income individuals and families that live there. Due to the amenities and proximity to services, many HOME funded affordable housing projects are also located in the target neighborhoods.

Housing rehabilitation and new construction benefit individual persons or households who are low to moderate income, and therefore HOME funds can be spent throughout the City and County, which are the next geographic area priorities.

SP-25 Priority Needs - 91.415, 91.215(a)(2)

Priority Needs

Table 46 – Priority Needs Summary

1	Priority Need Name	Neighborhood Investment & Infrastructure
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families Victims of Domestic Violence Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	PORTLAND, MAINE Eligible Census Tracts CDBG Target Neighborhoods Bayside Neighborhoods
	Associated Goals	Neighborhood Investment & Infrastructure
	Description	Public safety and mobility are key components to improving the livelihood of Portland neighborhoods. There is a significant need throughout the targeted neighborhoods to build sidewalks where none exist, improve accessibility through ADA compliance, increase the use of bicycles as a mode of transportation, and redevelop streetscapes to create shared streets for cars, bikes, and pedestrians that integrates with the fabric of the neighborhood.

	Basis for Relative Priority	In 2014 the Portland City Council identified two goals that identified this need: 1) Develop a transportation system that advances healthy living, minimizes environmental impacts, and promotes the local economy by advancing opportunities for mass transit, bicycle use and walking; and 2) Advance environmental programs that safeguard our natural resources, promote a healthy lifestyle and support a sustainable economy.
2	Priority Need Name	Housing Availability
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions
	Geographic Areas Affected	PORTLAND, MAINE Eligible Census Tracts Cumberland County CDBG Target Neighborhoods Bayside Neighborhoods

	Associated Goals	Housing Availability
	Description	In 2014 Portland contracted with the Greater Portland Council of Governments to complete a study entitled <i>2030 Workforce Housing Demand Study</i> . The report, released in January 2015, found that current housing production is not meeting the housing needs of Portland. The City Council has made a goal to promote housing availability in all segments of the housing market while insuring a suitable balance of housing opportunities among those sectors.
	Basis for Relative Priority	In 2014 the Portland City Council identified the following goal to address this need: provide increased availability in all segments of the housing market while insuring that there is suitable balance of housing opportunities among those sectors.
3	Priority Need Name	Economic Opportunity
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Victims of Domestic Violence

	Geographic Areas Affected	PORTLAND, MAINE Eligible Census Tracts CDBG Target Neighborhoods Bayside Neighborhoods
	Associated Goals	Economic Opportunity
	Description	Portland has a well-developed employment support system with many established providers. However, the system is fragmented, providers work in silos, there is insufficient funding to cover needs of potential workers, and career planning and financial stability are often prioritized less than job placement. Employment retention support is scarce and turnover results in economic uncertainty for employees and higher costs for employers.
	Basis for Relative Priority	In 2014, the Portland City Council identified the following goal: Promote Economic Development in the City in a manner that provides for increased property values, diversification across industry sectors and high paying jobs. Specifically, as it relates to HUD programming and objectives, the Council further identified the need to advance work on the "Minority and Women-owned Business Development Initiative" and secure City Council approval to invest CDBG funds in workforce development.
4	Priority Need Name	Address the Needs for Growing Homeless Population
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Non-housing Community Development

Geographic Areas Affected	PORTLAND, MAINE Eligible Census Tracts CDBG Target Neighborhoods Bayside Neighborhoods
Associated Goals	Address the Needs for Growing Homeless Population
Description	The shelter system in Portland is beyond capacity. Staff and local organizations struggle to deal with overflow strategies to meet increasing need. Data suggests most persons who are homeless stay at the shelter less than three weeks. Homeless Prevention and Rapid Rehousing are key components to help reduce shelter usage and homelessness. Additionally increased case management is needed for those who have mental illness and substance abuse issues to help them navigate the service delivery system. Additionally, the State of Maine will be reducing funding support and increase documentation requirements for those staying at the shelter, making it more difficult to serve those most in need.
Basis for Relative Priority	In 2014 the Portland City Council identified the goal: Prevent and end homelessness in the city of Portland by continuing to implement the recommendations of the Homelessness Task Force, including retooling the emergency shelter system to create centralized intake process and evaluate steps to improve efficiency, prevent homelessness and rapidly rehouse those who become homeless to avoid long term stays in the shelters, and increase case management for persons with mental illness and substance abuse to help navigate the service delivery system.

Narrative (Optional)

In 2014, the City Council established Common Goals and Objectives. These goals include:

Promote Housing Availability in all segments of the housing market while insuring a suitable balance of housing opportunities among those sectors. The City will accomplish these objectives by offering city owned property to construct affordable housing and by implementing Encourage and Ensure strategy mentioned previously.

Transportation initiatives to develop a transportation system that advances healthy living, minimizes environmental impacts and promotes the local economy by advancing opportunities for mass transit, bicycle use and walking.

Promote economic development in a manner that provides for increased property values, diversification across industry sectors, and high paying jobs. One objective will be to include work on the "Minority and Women-owned Business Development Initiative" and promote investment of CDBG funds for workforce development.

Advance an environmental program that safeguards natural resources, promotes a healthy lifestyle and supports a sustainable economy.

Prevent and end homelessness by continuing to implement the recommendations of the Homelessness Task Force which includes a comprehensive approach to work with the chronically homeless on housing stability plans, engaging surrounding communities in collaborative efforts to address homelessness on a regional basis, promote affordable housing development and access to additional housing subsidies, avoid duplication of services and maximize resources by clearly articulating roles and responsibilities of all homeless service providers.

These goals serve as the basis in which the priority needs outlined in this plan were established. Federal funding is an integral resource for accomplishing these goals and vital to making strategic decisions regarding the implementation of City priorities.

SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions - 91.415, 91.215(b)

Influence of Market Conditions

Affordable Housing Type	Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type
Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)	The number of people seeking housing in the city's shelters has decreased by 12% in the last year; over 36% of individuals staying at the shelter have been identified as chronically homeless.
TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs	Not applicable.
New Unit Production	There is a gap of 33% between the demand and supply of affordable housing. 62% of Portland households earn less than the county's median income.
Rehabilitation	50% of Portland's housing stock was built before 1939; 30% of the housing stock was built between 1940 and 1980. In Cumberland County, 26% of the housing stock was built before 1939; 31% of the housing stock was built between 1940 and 1980
Acquisition, including preservation	Preservation of building stock is a focus of the affordable housing development program. The creation of affordable housing that includes the conversion of non-residential property into affordable housing is encouraged as a means of meeting the supply/demand needs mentioned above.

Table 47 – Influence of Market Conditions

SP-35 Anticipated Resources - 91.420(b), 91.215(a)(4), 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

For the Five Year Consolidated Plan, the anticipated resources include federal CDBG, HOME, ESG, and Continuum of Care. The amount of each of these resources is dependent on federal allocation, which can be unpredictable. Estimates assume level funding for the next four years. Lead Safe Housing is program income from past grants. Payments are typically made when owners sell or refinance their homes and are therefore unpredictable. Estimates are based on past years income. The Local Housing Trust Fund is funded by the city's Housing Replacement Ordinance, which is only paid into when an owner decides to remove housing from the market. The Section 108 funding is to build a parking garage in the Bayside neighborhood through a project called Midtown. Once funds are expended no more are expected.

Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	1,791,448	234,500	0	2,025,948	0	

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
HOME	public - federal	Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA	828,140	205,000	0	1,033,140	0	
ESG	public - federal	Conversion and rehab for transitional housing Financial Assistance Overnight shelter Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Rental Assistance Services Transitional housing	161,232	0	0	161,232	0	

Table 48 - Anticipated Resources

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

CDBG funds are leveraged considerably for their investment. Year 1 of this Consolidate Plan is expecting to leverage \$22,469,344 from the CDBG investment of \$1,905,948. The CDBG Program Application process discourages applicants from using CDBG funds as the sole source of project funding. Applicants must include other resources as leveraged funding. The City will continue to make this a requirement of the program.

The HOME Program leverages considerable funds, primarily through the Affordable Housing Development Program. This program leverages funding from several sources including Low Income Housing Tax Credits, state and federal Historic Tax Credits, state funds from the Maine State Housing Authority and local Housing Trust Funds. The City of Portland meets its match requirement through the expenditure of local General Assistance funds providing tenant based rental assistance to low and very low income households. The City expends General Assistance funds for this purpose, well in excess of the required HOME program match and will continue this assistance.

The ESG Program is expected to provide match funds equal to the amount of ESG funds allocated through the following resources: City's General Assistance.

If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

In 2012, the City Council adopted a Housing Investment Policy that requires the Housing & Community Development Committee (HCDC) to complete an annual review of program priorities that includes the type and location of housing, and an analysis of tax acquired or City-owned property that may be included as a development resource. In its 2014 Common Goals and Objectives the City Council identified the promotion of housing availability as a goal with one objective being the assessment of city owned property to construct affordable housing. The HCDC has identified four parcels as potential development sites and will be working towards a development project for each parcel. The identified parcels are 98 High Street, 83 Middle Street, 65 Munjoy Street and 65 Hanover Street/52 Alder Street. The City is negotiating with developers who submitted proposals to create homeownership and rental units at 65 Munjoy Street and 65 Hanover Street/52 Alder Street. The City anticipates construction at both of these sites will begin in the next 12-18 months. Over the next few years, the HCD staff will continue to identify additional city-owned properties for affordable housing development.

Discussion

In 2007 the City of Portland applied for 108/BEDI funds in an amount of \$1.2 million in Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) and \$10.8 million in Section 108 loan. The funds were awarded in February 2008. The combined \$12 million will revitalize the distressed area of Bayside by stimulating residential and commercial economic development activities and creating jobs.

In 2012 the City underwent negotiations with Federated Companies for the purchase and sale of seven parcels of land in the Bayside neighborhood. The project is slated to build four buildings consisting of approximately 715,000 square feet, including 90,000 square feet of direct street access retail space at the ground level, 445 new apartments (from 400 sq. ft studios to 1050 sq. ft. two-bedroom units) and structured off street parking for approximately 800 vehicles.

The specific community development objectives flow from activities required to relieve the blighted conditions and introduce economic activity: Remove blighted land uses; upgrade infrastructure; facilitate re-use by firms that compliment downtown Portland and the city overall; create a vital area of mixed business, residential and recreational uses by building a parking garage to spur growth; and private sector job creation.

The project received Portland Planning Board approval in January 2014. A legal appeal filed by opponents of the project has been settled. In March 2015, the Portland Planning Board approved revisions to the original plan. The City anticipates the project to be under construction by the summer of 2016 with an anticipated two to three year build-out period.

SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure - 91.415, 91.215(k)

Explain the institutional structure through which the jurisdiction will carry out its consolidated plan including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions.

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
CITY OF PORTLAND	Government	Economic Development Homelessness Non-homeless special needs Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	Jurisdiction
Portland Housing Authority	PHA	Public Housing	Jurisdiction

Table 49 - Institutional Delivery Structure

Assess of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System

The City will continue to carry out its Housing and Community Development Plan in partnership with the other management and delivery entities for housing and community development activities. These organizations include the Housing and Community Development Division and the Planning Division; the City's Health and Human Services Department, the Economic Development Department, the Portland Housing Authority, and a network of individual non-profit housing and social service providers.

The City of Portland Housing and Community Development Division is responsible for overseeing the budget and distribution of the City's CDBG and HOME entitlement funds and development of the Five-Year Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan and Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report, as well as ensuring that all programs comply with HUD's federal regulations. The Health and Human Services Department oversees the budget and distribution of the ESG entitlement funds. Additionally the HCD Division administers the City's housing rehabilitation, new construction and homebuyer programs.

City of Portland Social Services Division administers the General Assistance Program, the City's emergency shelters (for single adults and families), transitional housing facilities, housing location services, Family Services Program, job readiness training and employment services and several other support activities in coordination with non-profit housing and social service agencies. Additionally, the Social Services Division administers the HOME funded Tenant Based Rental Assistance Program.

Portland Housing Authority owns and manages twelve public housing developments with 994 dwelling units and administers 1,809 HUD Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers. PHA is a partner in the Family Investment Center and funds other resident initiatives to improve residents' skills and education. PHA also oversees the modernization of its developments to improve their livability.

Non-Profit Housing and Social Service Agencies play a large role in directly providing housing and services to low income, homeless, and special needs populations throughout Portland.

Availability of services targeted to homeless persons and persons with HIV and mainstream services

Homelessness Prevention Services	Available in the Community	Targeted to Homeless	Targeted to People with HIV
Homelessness Prevention Services			
Counseling/Advocacy			
Legal Assistance			
Mortgage Assistance			
Rental Assistance	X	X	
Utilities Assistance	X		
Street Outreach Services			
Law Enforcement	X	X	
Mobile Clinics			
Other Street Outreach Services			
Supportive Services			
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	X	X	
Child Care	X		
Education	X		
Employment and Employment Training	X		
Healthcare	X	X	
HIV/AIDS			
Life Skills		X	
Mental Health Counseling	X		
Transportation	X		
Other			

Table 50 - Homeless Prevention Services Summary

Describe how the service delivery system including, but not limited to, the services listed above meet the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth)

There are several services available to the homeless and persons with HIV/AIDS in the Community.

The Portland Community Health Center offers an Integrated behavioral Health program that is designed to bring adults into treatment who are experiencing homelessness, and are suffering from co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders. The goal of the program is to help stabilize individuals in need of health and mental health services and provide housing stabilization, housing placements, residential treatment use, and detox and follow-up treatment.

Milestone operates a program called the Homeless Outreach & Mobile Engagement (HOME) Team who provides outreach and community supports to homeless individuals experiencing chronic health and substance abuse issues in Portland. The HOME Team provides daily street outreach, intervention, referrals and transportation of homeless individuals, highly intoxicated individuals, individuals with mental illness and individuals engaging in disruptive behavior. Staff works to engage these individuals in a compassionate manner, encouraging them to access appropriate treatment services.

Another crisis intervention resource is offered by the Opportunity Alliance provides Crisis by calling 774-HELP.

The City of Portland Homeless Employment Program assists consumers in strengthening their employment skills by working toward independence from public assistance programs. The employment assessment includes identifying transferable skills, job matching and searching, and gaining and retaining temporary, permanent, and part-time employment. Services are designed specifically for Portland's homeless population. The staff conducts outreach at homeless shelters and linkage to the Career Center in Portland.

Describe the strengths and gaps of the service delivery system for special needs population and persons experiencing homelessness, including, but not limited to, the services listed above

Working collaboratively, these entities implement the City's Housing and Community Development Plan. The system's strengths include the collaborative manner in which these diverse groups work together to maximize available resources. Portland is a large enough City to have many institutional resources, yet small enough to be able to effectively communicate and collaborate. Currently there are no gaps in types of housing and services, but there is a lack of funding resources. The City and its partners will continue to seek additional resources to improve the system's ability to meet community needs.

Provide a summary of the strategy for overcoming gaps in the institutional structure and service delivery system for carrying out a strategy to address priority needs

The City of Portland will continue to work in collaboration with partners organizations and governments to meet the goals and objectives of this 5 Year Consolidated Plan.

SP-45 Goals - 91.415, 91.215(a)(4)

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Neighborhood Investment & Infrastructure	2016	2020	Non-Housing Community Development		Neighborhood Investment & Infrastructure		Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 5 Persons Assisted Facade treatment/business building rehabilitation: 10 Business Rental units constructed: 15 Household Housing Unit
2	Housing Availability	2016	2020	Affordable Housing		Housing Availability		
3	Economic Opportunity	2016	2020	Economic Development		Economic Opportunity		
4	Address the Needs for Growing Homeless Population	2016	2020	Homeless		Address the Needs for Growing Homeless Population		

Table 51 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

1	Goal Name	Neighborhood Investment & Infrastructure
	Goal Description	Create strong, safe, accessible and vibrant neighborhoods- Invest in infrastructure to improve neighborhood assets and build strong, safe, accessible and vibrant neighborhoods. Improve accessibility and livability through age-friendly designs and ADA compliance. Build sidewalks and trails to improve connectivity, increase the use of bicycles as a mode of transportation, and redevelop streetscapes to create shared streets for cars, bikes, and pedestrians that integrate with the fabric of the neighborhood. Support programs that increase safety in neighborhoods for residents and visitors.
2	Goal Name	Housing Availability
	Goal Description	Increase housing availability & affordability. Increase housing availability and affordability to all Portland residents regardless of income, race, ethnicity, and family size. Encourage housing development by removing barriers to traditional urban housing types while ensuring the inclusion of workforce and age-friendly housing in significant development projects
3	Goal Name	Economic Opportunity
	Goal Description	Create economic opportunities to transition people out of poverty. Invest in Portland businesses to enable them to expand to create jobs. Invest in persons wanting to create microenterprises. Engage job seekers in a continuum of services to increase their professional capacity, financial stability, and ability to maintain employment. Focus on difficult to employ populations including homeless, new Americans and single parent head of households. Combine resources and build partnerships between public and private entities to provide opportunities to transition Portland residents out of poverty to sustainable employment and financial stability.
4	Goal Name	Address the Needs for Growing Homeless Population
	Goal Description	Prevent and Reduce Homelessness. Prevent individuals and families from becoming homeless and entering into the shelter system. Rapidly rehouse those who enter the shelter system. Provide necessary resources to assist vulnerable population's transition out of homelessness, including housing opportunities for chronically homeless or long-term stayers at homeless shelters.

Estimate the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families to whom the jurisdiction will provide affordable housing as defined by HOME 91.315(b)(2)

SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement - 91.415, 91.215(c)

Need to Increase the Number of Accessible Units (if Required by a Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement)

50 units, or 5% of total Portland Housing Authority Units, meet accessibility standards.

Activities to Increase Resident Involvements

- Periodic community meetings with residents
- Assist with the organization of resident councils where none exist
- A new website with inactive features for residents to engage staff
- Newsletters in certain developments

Is the public housing agency designated as troubled under 24 CFR part 902?

No

Plan to remove the 'troubled' designation

N/A

SP-55 Strategic Plan Barriers to Affordable Housing - 91.415, 91.215(h)

Barriers to Affordable Housing

The City of Portland recognizes there are certain public policies, particularly zoning and land use regulations that pose challenges in increasing affordable housing opportunities and residential investment. This is revealed in higher housing costs, a shortage of affordable housing in relation to demand and higher land costs. Inflexible or outdated regulations contribute to this problem.

Portland acknowledges present ordinances (particularly in older neighborhoods) do not reflect the traditional urban character of these neighborhoods, resulting in a scenario where many neighborhoods built in the 1800s and early 1900s could not be duplicated under present ordinances. The net effect is that fewer dwelling units could be built today than in the past and even modest additions to existing buildings for affordable housing are impeded. Present ordinance language such as residential density, yard dimensions, lot coverage and lot size hinders affordable workforce housing and housing investment. Parking provisions require an inordinate number of spaces for neighborhoods within walking distance of the downtown and served by public transportation. Excessive parking occupies valuable buildable land on residential lots and is costly to provide. Resources given to parking would be better served by enhancing housing investment

Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing

In the fall of 2015, the Planning Department presented the City with a two-pronged approach designed to encourage housing development by removing barriers to traditional urban housing types while ensuring the inclusion of workforce housing in significant development projects. The City adopted the recommended suite of ordinance changes designed to loosen restrictions on housing development while still preserving City residents' quality of life. Part of this approach includes changes to Division 30 of the City's ordinance which refers to affordable housing. These changes provide additional density through development incentives as well as adding a workforce housing inclusionary zoning requirement for all residential development projects of 10 or more units. These changes will help to address housing needs throughout the City through reforms to zoning and density requirements and neighborhood strategies. Other portions of the enacted reform package provides a regulatory framework for affordable housing production that utilizes a variety of methods including affordable accessory dwelling units, mixed use development, infill development, rehabilitation and new construction in supporting opportunities for affordable housing. These changes included revisions to the R-6, R-5, IR-1, IR-2, B-1, B-2, B-3, B-5, B-6, and B-7 zones to allow for greater housing density encouraging greater urbanity and uses that often were more reflective of the historical norm within the surrounding neighborhood context. These included changes to the B2 to increase allowed housing densities to 100 units/ acre and R6 zone that would increase density from 45 to 60 units an acre and reducing minimum lot size; eliminate parking requirements for residential uses in the B3, B5, B6 and B7 business zones; eliminate residential

density limits in B1 and B2 business zones; allow the use of fee-in-lieu of parking in off-peninsula business zones; amend the downtown height overlay map to increase it to 45 feet height limits; allow for the conditional use of affordable accessory dwelling units in island residential zones and R-5 zone within existing structures; amend Division 30 affordable housing, proposing to increase the affordability levels to allow for rental properties affordable at up to 100% AMI; and expanding the application of density bonus numbers to incentivize the creation of more housing. The conglomeration of these initiatives will help to reduce barriers to building affordable housing in the City of Portland.

The City recently formed a new Housing Committee to in part examine affordable housing issues in Portland. The Committee is currently in an information gathering stage as it prepares to take a holistic look at the housing challenges and opportunities within our local market. Staff will be assembling a list of potential reforms and new policies that will help mitigate housing pressures in the City. Information on best practices from around the country will be gathered and tailored to fit Portland's unique needs. At the present time there is significant momentum and support for housing policy reforms. The City hopes to build off its recent successes adapting its policies and ordinances to better reflect the housing needs of Portland.

SP-60 Homelessness Strategy - 91.415, 91.215(d)

Describe how the jurisdiction's strategic plan goals contribute to:

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

The Maine State Housing Authority coordinates the efforts of homeless shelters, outreach groups and volunteers who participate in an annual Point in Time Survey of State of Maine and City of Portland homeless populations. The annual census is required of all states at this time of year by U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the count provides a snapshot of the number of individuals and families in shelters and on the streets on a given night. For Maine, a count performed in January will represent chronic and truly desperate homelessness because of extreme weather conditions including typical temperatures well below freezing, regular snow accumulation, and minimal daylight hours.

The Emergency Shelter Client Support & Services Plan Policy guides needs assessments. The policy requires clients to work with their case manager on a plan to secure permanent housing and clients who chose not to participate are asked to leave the shelter. Also, the Oxford Street Shelter housing placement team now focuses on housing long-term stayers. The City has also added a full-time case manager to work with families experiencing homelessness, resulting in locating permanent housing placements with follow up case management and tenant education services. The City has also designated a full time housing counselor to work with the Preble Street Support Services for Veteran Families Program to prevent and end homelessness among veterans at the Oxford Street Shelter.

The Homeless Outreach and Mobile Engagement (HOME) Team is a collaboration between the City of Portland, the Portland Downtown District and Milestone to provide outreach and community supports to those with chronic health, mental health and substance abuse issues living on the streets of Portland. The HOME team has become part of the emergency service delivery system for businesses and community members.

A Portland-based non-profit organization that has been CDBG funded for its peer coaching initiative works with clients that live with mental illness, often times co-occurring substance abuse disorders, and often times experience homelessness. The initiation of the peer coaching initiative includes placing an ad on Craigslist for hiring peer coaches with mental illness and selecting coaches through an extensive interview process involving scoring the applicants. Hired coaches job-shadow a peer supporter working inside the emergency department at the local hospital, attend a 3-day motivational interviewing session, complete a peer-support class at Amistad, and participate in weekly staff meetings that provide on-going training. Clients are identified by Amistad peer coaches and confirmed by the hospital staff as someone who presents to the emergency department frequently and absent of medical need.

Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

Shelter Consolidation: Due to mounting financial pressures, the need for more efficient and effective emergency shelter service delivery is paramount. The City has created a task force to explore the idea of redesigning the shelter system in Portland. Staff has already started exploring the possibility of a consolidated shelter where all services would be located under one roof. A second option is to create multiple specialized shelters to serve the various needs. A Task Force has been created and will be examining the various options and collecting public input. The Task Force will be evaluating the different options and making recommendations in the fall to the Portland City Council.

Special Population Housing: The United Way of Greater Portland is taking the lead on convening a group of stakeholder to investigate the feasibility of a Homeless Medical Respite Program. The group will research models that have been effective in other communities, potential funding sources and evaluate the need for such a program. The pilot program at York County Shelter, Inc. (YCSI) which provides sober shelter for Oxford Street Shelter consumers was finalized in the fall of 2013 and a total of 9 individuals

Housing First: Last year the Planning and Urban Development department released a Pre-Development RFP for a new Housing First project. They decided to fund two proposals, one a traditional housing first project which proposed the development of 30-35 efficiency apartments in Portland. The second is a scattered site approach which proposes to blend “the population quickly and seamlessly into a combination of rehabilitated existing small multifamily apartment buildings and larger low income Housing Tax Credit and/or Historic Tax Credit funded properties aimed at serving the general public.”

Regional Approach: The Public Housing Authorities in Westbrook and South Portland have both made commitments to set aside Section 8 housing vouchers specifically for people experiencing long-term homelessness.

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

In 2011, the Portland City Council created the Task Force to Develop a Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness (TF). The TF submitted its final report which included an Implementation Plan comprised of four overarching Recommended Actions: 1) Retooling the Emergency

Shelter System, 2) Rapid Rehousing, 3) Increased Case Management and 4) Report Monitoring. The plan includes six general themes of focus: Case Management, Rapid Rehousing, Outreach, Zoning Constraints, Special Population Housing and the Housing First Model.

Significant gains have been made to address these complex issues since the plan was endorsed. The City, along with its many partners, has made great progress in addressing the recommended actions of the Plan. However several obstacles, including a major shift in funding allowances through the state mandated General Assistance Program, have surfaced and delayed progress on many of the recommended actions. These changes will require that the City re-evaluate its role as the social services center for Maine.

For the three federal grants utilized in this consolidated plan: one of the goals for the CDBG program will be for projects that help to reduce homelessness through rapid rehousing or other means and nearly 35% of the Emergency Solution Grant Funds is dedicated to rapid rehousing at the City's Oxford Street Shelter. The HOME funded Tenant Based Rental Assistance Program was designed to meet the recommendations from the homelessness task force report. The funds will be used to pay for security deposits and short term rental assistance for individuals and families currently homeless in the "mid-range" (clients who have 14-178 bed nights) for whom a potential living unit has been identified. In addition, the program will also provide assistance to those individuals who may be in danger of becoming homeless because their current housing situation is no longer affordable. These individuals will receive short term assistance to relocate to a more affordable unit.

Additionally the Home to Stay (HTS) Program is modeled after a rapid re-housing approach that provides housing stability services to persons who are experiencing homelessness. The Home to Stay Program assists homeless clients seeking permanent housing with education, services and support to meet their health, housing, and employment needs in order to overcome barriers to obtaining and maintaining housing. The goal is to help participants achieve permanent stable housing.

Help low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from a publicly funded institution or system of care, or who are receiving assistance from public and private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education or youth needs

One of this Consolidated Plans strategic goal is to Prevent and Reduce Homelessness. Through the Portland City Council effort to end homelessness, they are implementing the 2011 Task Force to Develop a Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness. This program had four overarching Recommended Actions: 1) Retooling the Emergency Shelter System, 2) Rapid Rehousing, 3) Increased Case Management and 4)

Report Monitoring; and six general themes of focus: Case Management, Rapid Rehousing, Outreach, Zoning Constraints, Special Population Housing and the Housing First Model.

For the three federal grants utilized in this consolidated plan: one of the goals for the CDBG program will be for projects that help to prevent homelessness; nearly 40% of the Emergency Solution Grant Funds is dedicated to homeless prevention at the City's Family and Oxford Street Shelters; and HOME TBRA will provide assistance to those individuals who may be in danger of becoming homeless because their current housing situation is no longer affordable. These individuals will receive short term assistance to relocate to a more affordable unit.

In addition there are policies and procedures in place that mitigate individuals and families who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from a publically funded institution or system of care or other service.

Mental Health: Riverview & Dorothea Dix are Maine's two publicly-funded mental health hospitals that have adopted a discharge plan process that begins at admission, to connect clients back to community supports & housing. Several agencies and organizations, including Amistad, Opportunity Alliance, Spring Harbor, collaborate to address "difficult to discharge" patients. Various funding resources are utilized to help in this effort including: BRAP, HOPWA, VASH and other resources.

Corrections: The Department of Corrections (DOC) & the Cumberland County jail include The Opportunity Alliance, Preble Street, and/or the City of Portland Oxford Street Shelter in pre-release planning for offenders & Maine DHHS funds Intensive Case Managers in corrections facilities to help with release planning and placements.

Youth: Preble Street provides 24-hour care to all unaccompanied youth through its Teen Center & night shelter, which provides support in transitioning back to their families or to other situations, health care, employment, education, mental health & substance abuse counseling, & legal assistance. Primary partners include Day One (substance abuse & mental health), City of Portland Public Health (health care), & Portland Adult Education Street Academy (education).

Veterans: VA Maine Healthcare partners with Portland Housing Authority to administer VASH vouchers, & participates in ESAC. In 2013, the City of Portland Oxford Street Adult Shelter appointed a Veteran Liaison to conduct outreach to Vets, including those ineligible for VA assistance due to less than honorable discharge. Preble Street is a SSVF grantee, providing outreach, case management, housing search assistance, budget counseling & financial assistance to eligible homeless & at risk Vets & their families.

SP-65 Lead-based Paint Hazards - 91.415, 91.215(i)

Actions to address LBP hazards and increase access to housing without LBP hazards

The City of Portland has been committed to eliminating lead poisoning in children since 1995 when it received its first HUD Lead Hazard Control Grant. The control and elimination of lead-based paint remains a critical focus of the City of Portland in the housing rehabilitation program and over the years, 405 units have been made lead-safe in Portland. In past years Portland received Lead Hazard Control funds and has effectively and successfully addressed the lead hazards prevalent in the City's older housing stock. Lead-safe efforts will continue through the housing rehabilitation program, first-time home buyer program and lead program income funded projects.

Portland also addresses lead-safe practices by leveraging funds as the lead entity for the Cumberland County HOME Consortium (CCHC). The Consortium allows both parties to reach a much wider audience with their lead outreach and education efforts, as well as produce a number of lead-safe units in other communities across Cumberland County. This joint effort results from a desire to provide cost-effective, efficient programs to benefit all communities of the region.

In addition, the City leads the County in its rehabilitation program. The program is geared to benefit low and moderate income families and households. An owner-occupied applicant in the City of Portland must prove that their income is less than 80% of the median area income with a child under six years of age. In order to remediate a rental unit the building must contain at least 50% of individuals who earn 50% of the area median income. Preference is given to rental units where children reside. Projects outside of the City of Portland will meet HUD income eligibility limits established for Cumberland County. Wherever possible, the City will utilize housing rehab program funds in combination with lead program income funds to complete additional units.

How are the actions listed above related to the extent of lead poisoning and hazards?

Portland has had a referral process for those children identified with elevated blood lead levels (EBLL) since 1990 when legislation was passed requiring all lead blood test to be reported to the State of Maine laboratory. The laboratory then reports all EBLL's to Maine Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (MCLPPP) and they do an environmental investigation and case management referral to the local public health nurse and community action agency, for lead hazard reduction funding. The City of Portland receives referrals for cases in Portland and a remediation plan is implemented for all income eligible property owners.

Primary prevention measures are a critical focus of Portland's hazard reduction efforts, through education and outreach we continue to eliminate the risk of childhood lead poisoning. Lead notification is given to all property owners, as well as referrals for blood lead testing for children at risk. All rehabilitation projects are assessed for risk and lead- safe practices are implemented on all projects.

How are the actions listed above integrated into housing policies and procedures?

Integration of lead hazard control policies and procedures are standard practice in all Portland's housing programs.

SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy - 91.415, 91.215(j)

Jurisdiction Goals, Programs and Policies for reducing the number of Poverty-Level Families

It is the policy of the City of Portland to consider all resources, regardless of their source, when making strategic decisions regarding the City's service priorities. For this reason, Portland has identified needs and goals that align with the 2014 City Council Common Goals and Objectives. These Common Goals were designed to guide the City Council in their policy decisions and City Departments in their goals and operations. Eight goals were identified including: Promote Housing Availability, Increase Transportation Initiatives, Economic Development, Prevent and End Homelessness, Advance an Environmental Program, Improve City Services, Implement TIF Program, and Intergovernmental Collaboration. In addition, Portland has incorporated the recommendations and findings from several plans and studies, such as the Report of the Task Force to Prevent and End Homelessness in Portland and the 2030 Workforce Housing Demand Study, into its strategic plan. Portland will continue to allocate federal resources towards activities designed to improve the lives of families and individuals and facilitate their transition out of poverty. Programs will be designed to help families move out of poverty as opposed to simply serving those in poverty.

How are the Jurisdiction poverty reducing goals, programs, and policies coordinated with this affordable housing plan

Portland has identified needs and goals that align with the 2014 City Council Common Goals and Objectives and respond to the recommendations and findings from the Report of the Task Force to Prevent and End Homelessness in Portland and the 2030 Workforce Housing Demand Study into its strategic plan.

1. NEED: Housing Availability GOAL: Increase housing availability & affordability Description: Increase housing availability and affordability to all Portland residents regardless of income, race, ethnicity, and family size. Encourage housing development by removing barriers to traditional urban housing types while ensuring the inclusion of workforce housing in significant development projects. Projects that will meet this goal: Community Housing of Maine, Housing Rehabilitation Program, TBRA Program, Affordable Housing Development Program,
2. NEED: Economic Opportunity GOAL: Create economic opportunities to transition out of poverty Description: Invest in Portland businesses to enable them to expand to create jobs. Invest in persons wanting to create microenterprises. Engage job seekers in a continuum of services to increase their professional capacity, financial stability, and ability to maintain employment. Focus on difficult to employ populations including homeless, new Americans and single parent head of households. Combine resources and build partnerships between public and private entities to provide opportunities to transition Portland residents out of poverty to sustainable

employment and financial stability. Projects that will meet this goal: Business Assistance Program, Catherine Morrill Child Care Assistance, Employment Development Program

3. NEED: Address the Needs for Growing Homeless Population GOAL: Prevent and Reduce Homelessness Description: Prevent individuals and families from becoming homeless and entering into the shelter system. Rapidly rehouse those who enter the shelter system. Provide necessary resources to assist vulnerable population's transition out of homelessness, including housing opportunities for chronically homeless or long-term stayers. Projects that will meet this goal: Community Housing of Maine, Preble Street Emergency Food, Preble Street Resource Center, Amistad Peer Support and Recovery Center, Preble Street Women's Shelter, Preble Street, Teen Center, Milestone HOME Team, Amistad Peer Coaching Initiative, ESG funded programs

NEED: Infrastructure Investment in Target Neighborhoods GOAL: Create strong, safe, accessible and vibrant neighborhoods Description: Invest in infrastructure to improve neighborhood assets and build strong, safe, accessible and vibrant neighborhoods. Improve accessibility through ADA compliance, build sidewalks and trails to improve connectivity, increase the use of bicycles as a mode of transportation, and redevelop streetscapes to create shared streets for cars, bikes, and pedestrians that integrate with the fabric of the neighborhood. Support programs that increase safety in neighborhoods for residents and visitors. Projects that will meet this goal: Greenleaf Street Reconstruction, Reiche School Brackett Street Pedestrian Safety Project, Community Policing, Bike Parking

SP-80 Monitoring - 91.230

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

The City of Portland is committed to monitoring the performance of grant recipients to ensure that Federal funds are used appropriately and in a manner to maximize low and moderate income public benefit. Grant recipients include City of Portland Departments and Divisions, outside social service agencies, and non-profit organizations. Monitoring each grant recipient ensures that the goals and objectives identified within the Action and Consolidated Plan are met. CDBG public service recipients submit performance reports quarterly. The reports are reviewed for accuracy, goals, performance measures, and compliance. If an agency is not meeting their target goals, or not reporting on time, this information is shared with the citizen review committee, who utilizes this information when allocating resources for the following year. On site monitoring of social service agencies is done on a rotating schedule. Public infrastructure projects are managed by staff in the Public Services Department and monitored by staff in the Housing and Community Development Office. Staff from both offices attend the engineering project coordination meetings monthly during the construction season. Staff monitors all construction, infrastructure and non-profit rehabilitation projects. Non-profit rehabilitation projects are monitored from beginning to end to ensure that they comply with federal procurement, Davis-Bacon and other federal requirements. The City's Housing Rehabilitation Specialist reviews project scope and pricing and assists in working with the subrecipient to ensure the project will be completed on time and on budget. Economic Development projects are monitored on a case by case basis with the staff from Economic Development Department for the Façade and Business Assistance Program. Additional monitoring for other economic development projects happens yearly as needed. HOME and CDBG funded housing projects are monitored regularly to ensure that rent level and income guidelines are being met. All housing projects are entered into the Housing Database. All contracts for CDBG and HOME funds include provisions that include outreach to women and minority business owners. Owner occupied rehab projects are monitored on an annual basis for occupancy. Owner Occupied 2-4 Units and Multi-Family Rehab Program are monitored on an annual basis for occupancy and rental affordability compliance. Occupancy monitoring notices and tenant income verification forms are sent out on a quarterly basis. (HOME funds have not been a successful financing mechanism for multi-family rehab and therefore we have very few of these types of projects that require monitoring). New Construction/CHDO Funded Rental Housing are monitored on an annual basis. Tenant affordability reports are obtained annually and staff works with the developer and/or property management company to coordinate the necessary housing inspections. Preferably, the inspections are scheduled to coincide with the inspections of other lending sources. To report timeliness the senior accountant reports expenditures at month end and compares totals to total allocated funds. The resulting percentage is utilized to track timeliness. Monthly draw-downs are completed through IDIS. Divisions in the Department funded under the 20% administrative cap submit plans identifying CDBG projects and the

percentage of their time spent working on such projects, as well as identifying specific areas in eligible census tracts where the projects are taking place. This information, plus quarterly reports, are reviewed to ensure compliance with comprehensive planning goals and requirements.