RESULTS OF NCDA'S HOME SURVEY

Do you favor increasing the administrative cap under the HOME program?

25 respondents (89%) favored an increase while 3 respondents (11%) did not.

If YES, at what level should the cap be set?

The average of all responses was 19%. The most common response was 20%.

If YES, why is the increase needed in your jurisdiction?

- Admin. costs have increased as a result of implementing Title X. More oversite is required to meet this regulation.
- Monitoring has increased. Salary and cost of living increases. Health care cost increases. Overall admin has increased, funding has not.
- Recertification/re-inspection of HOME-assisted unites are increasing with each program year. Increased monitoring responsibilities.
- Merging with county, expanding out, bringing more folks on board
- Would allow for expanding a program. Greater demand for SF rehab programs, but can't hire more people.
- Hard to get CHDOs to leverage funds. Have a lot of CHDOs. Good management determines success. Restrictive cap leads to struggling CHDOs. Need money to work the system.
- Each year we create new HOME-assisted units for the consortium's affordable housing stock. These HOME units have to be maintained for at least 20 years and some forever. This stock of housing units has expanded to around 100 units that require annual recertification of tenants along with inspections of units to insure housing quality standards are being met. The stock continues to grow and so does the monitoring.
- Increased payroll costs to retain staff. Increased reporting requirments. We use program income to offset the high development costs in our area.
- Staff costs, because the CDBG cap is 20%, we charge more to that grant, we could definitely use more money to make it a little less on CDBG. Same applies with expenditures. We can always use more money. It would be a great help.
- We receive our HOME funds through the state, which takes the entire 10% leaving none for us. Our admin charges go against the maximum allowable subsidy per project.
- Project monitoring, increased time for recertifications and re-inspection of past HOME projects--time needed to pay off and subordination requests associated with First Time Homebuyer Program. Extra time needed to work with nonprofit and for-profit housing developments to make their projects HOME-feasible and help them secure financing other than HOME. It takes time and staff to run a clean and positive HOME Program--and to address all issues.
- The cost of monitoring projects.
- Need to rely less on CDBG
- I have worked as an administrator for 8 years with responsibilities for HOME and other communtity development programs. Through collective bargaining agreements, my

salary/fringe far exceeded the HOME administrative cap. If other sources were not available to augment my salary, I would have been forced to leave my job.

- Lead-based paint is eating away at our Housing Program Policy. Stabilization of HOME grant yet contractually obligated salary increases for staff outpace awards. Ever-increasing federal regulations.
- The 10% cap was always below what the typical costs for operating the program are. With the new requirements for lead-based paint, those costs continue to increase.
- Reduction in funds has reduced percentage available to operate and manage HOME. CDBG has assisted in past but can't afford to continue. Management of HOME rental inspection requirements. Implementing affordable housing programs.
- Needs assessments, planning and citizen participation events can be very costly. Those activities generally exhaust admin funds leaving the jurisdiction without resources to staff the HOME program, continue community development efforts, or monitor projects.
- Ongoing monitoring of projects. Complexity of financing of projects. Number of CHDOs.

Do you use CDBG or other funding sources to supplement your HOME admin. needs?

18 respondents indicated they use CDBG or other funding sources to supplement their HOME admin. needs while 2 respondents indicated they do not. 8 respondents completed a version of the survey that did not include this question.

If YES, estimate how much in CDBG or other funding sources do you use each year to supplement y our HOME admin. costs?

Six respondents answered this question by providing a percentage. The average percentage was 48%.

8 respondents answered this question by providing a specific dollar figure or a range of dollar figures. The average figure was approximately $150,000.

What other specific changes would you suggest be made to the HOME program?

- More money. It's already easy to use.
- Program uses are pretty much ideal
- Simplify. Give us more flexibility.
- More federal funding. Streamline monitoring requirments to synchronize with other funding sources. Ability to invest additional HOME funds in projects before existing affordability period expires at the PJs' discretion in exchange for additional affordability.
- More money from HOME would most beneficial.
- Eliminate project/site-specific reporting within IDIS
- Get rid of CHDO/IDIS hitch. What a pain to designate money to a CHDO and then set up a project. Can't the IDIS gurus figure out how to let us set u p any project and then designate that the developer is a CHDO?
- More flexibility; shorter monitoring period.
- More consistent regs with CDBG.
- Allow 108 loans with HOME funds.

- Exceptions to investment caps, I.e. historic neighborhoods. Ability to charge staff costs for projects that fall through. Exemption from Davis-Bacon. Loan guarantee program like Section 108 from CDBG.