



# Second Program Year CAPER

The CPMP 2011 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report includes Narrative Responses to CAPER questions that CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, and ESG grantees must respond to each year in order to be compliant with the Consolidated Planning Regulations. The Executive Summary narratives are optional.

## GENERAL

**GRANTEE: City of Green Bay**  
**CON PLAN PERIOD: 2010 to 2014**

### Executive Summary (92.220(b))

**The Executive Summary is required. Provide a brief overview that includes major initiatives and highlights how activities undertaken during this program year addressed strategic plan objectives and areas of high priority identified in the consolidated plan.**

#### PY 2011 Action Plan Executive Summary:

In accordance with the Cities 5-year Consolidated Plan and Strategy, in 2011 the City of Green Bay used its CDBG and HOME entitlement funding to focus on accomplishing three main goals:

- **Increase quality, affordable housing**
- **Increase Economic Development Opportunities**
- **Crime Prevention**

To do this the City established a Neighborhood Division to focus on creating and sustaining healthy neighborhoods. The division created Impact Areas in its 2011 Annual Action Plan throughout the City. These areas were selected based on need, crime prevention, aging housing stock and deterioration and Economic Development opportunities. Most neighborhoods within these areas contain the oldest housing stock, highest concentrations of low-income households and above-average crime rates. To revitalize and create healthy neighborhoods in these areas, the City utilized its Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Program funds for the following types of programs:

#### **Providing decent and affordable housing for low-and-moderate income persons.**

Increasing homeownership in Green Bay's neighborhoods was a top priority in 2011. Research has proven that owner-occupied housing helps to create stable and healthy neighborhoods. The 2011 designated Impact Areas contain some of the most impoverished and blighted neighborhoods. Many of these neighborhoods also suffer from an unhealthy mix of owner to rental properties and crime. The City utilized both CDBG and HOME funding in 2011 for education and creating more options for affordable, single-family housing. A 2011 subrecipient, NeighborWorks® Green Bay,

was able to provide homebuyer counseling to approximately 63 low and moderate-income (LMI) potential homebuyers. Many participants of their homebuyer counseling program went on to utilize the HOME-funded NeighborWorks® Green Bay Downpayment/Closing Cost Program. In 2011, 23 loans were made to LMI households to purchase homes within the City's CDBG Eligible and Impact areas. All of these loans were made to first-time homebuyers.

A 2011 Single-Family Rehabilitation Loan Program assisted 13 LMI home-owners with maintaining their homes. This program provided deferred, no-interest loans to LMI owner-occupied households to repair their homes, often times bringing them up to code.

Using a combination of CDBG and local funds, the City of Green Bay was successful in eliminating 10 blighted properties.

The Greater Green Bay Habitat for Humanity has become an important not-for-profit partner with the City of Green Bay in working to further affordable housing and homeownership opportunities. In 2011, 3 homes were built in the Impact Neighborhoods and 1 citywide. Habitat for Humanity anticipates building another 6 single-family, owner-occupied homes in 2012. All homes will be occupied by LMI households upon completion.

### **Providing suitable living environments and crime prevention for low-and-moderate income persons.**

In 2011, many efforts were made to improve the physical appearance and infrastructure of Impact neighborhood as well as CDBG eligible neighborhoods citywide. CDBG funds were used to replace alleys and sidewalks due to tree root damage or to ensure ADA accessibility. Along with the improvement to the sidewalks & alleys, CDBG funds were used to improve parks in CDBG LMI neighborhoods.

Nonprofits providing direct services to LMI persons were funded and able to provide valuable services to area residents. As both a HUD mandate and an important component to affirmatively furthering fair housing choice, an allocation of \$10,000 was utilized by the Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council (MMFHC) to ensure fair housing practices. The Fair Housing Council was able to provide educational services through presentations and direct assistance, manage fair housing complaints, and distribute information on fair housing laws and illegal discrimination.

Minor inspection violations such as junk, trash, pet waste, grass and weed control, and vehicles in the front yards are becoming a major problem in the Impact Areas. In 2011, CDBG funds were allocated to fund a full-time inspection position that was responsible for performing inspections and conducting problem resolution in CDBG eligible areas.

A final component of the City's 2011 CDBG funding to provide suitable living environments for LMI income persons was to allocate funding to a Community Service Interns program. This program has been a very successful component in decreasing crime in the City's CDBG eligible neighborhoods. Interns assist the Police Department by attending neighborhood events, picking up found bicycles and logging them into police evidence, conducting vacation checks for residents gone for extended periods of

time, providing translation services, making referrals to the Inspection Department, and creating a police presence in neighborhoods.

### **Expanding economic opportunities in downtown Green Bay.**

The Economic Development Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) continued to serve as a catalyst for new business in Green Bay. In 2011 one (1) business received a loan to purchase equipment. The loan will create eighteen (18) job, Ten (10) of which will be available to LMI persons.

## **Summary of Resources and Distribution of Funds**

- 1) Provide a description of the geographic distribution and location of investment (including areas of low-income and minority concentration).

***You are encouraged to include maps in this description. Specifying census tracts where expenditures were concentrated and the percentage of funds expended in NRSAs or local target areas may satisfy this requirement***

### PY 2011 CAPER #1 response:

As previously mentioned, the City of Green Bay has concentrated funding into impact areas. Maps of these areas are attached. The local impact areas were chosen based on need. These neighborhoods contain the oldest housing stock, highest concentrations of low-income households and above-average crime rates.

However, many activities do take place city-wide in low-income Census tracts. According to Census data, low and moderate income Census tracts, (51% or more of the households at less than 80% of the County Median Income), are found in the following areas: CT1, CT2 BG1,3,7, CT3.02 BG1, CT3.03 BG2, CT4.01 BG2,3,4, CT5 BG1,2, CT7 BG1,3,6, CT8, CT9, CT10, CT11 BG2,3, CT12, CT13 BG1,2, CT14 BG2,4,5, CT15.02 BG2, CT16 BG2,3, CT17

Census data from 2000 shows that minorities constitute 16.9% of the total Green Bay population. Areas of concentration are defined as census tracts or block groups having a higher percent minority population than the City as a whole. Those Census tracts or block groups are as follows: CT1, CT2 BG1, CT5, CT7 BG1, CT8, CT9, CT10 BG2, CT11, CT12, CT13 BG1,2, CT14 BG 4,5, CT15.02 BG2, CT16 BG2, CT17, CT20.01 BG1.

## **General CAPER Narratives:**

### **2) Assessment of Three to Five Year Goals and Objectives**

- a) Describe the accomplishments in attaining the goals and objectives for the reporting period.

**Providing decent and affordable housing for low-and-moderate income persons.**

Increasing homeownership in Green Bay's neighborhoods was a top priority in 2011. Research has proven that owner-occupied housing helps to create stable and healthy neighborhoods. The 2011 designated Impact Areas contain some of the most impoverished and blighted neighborhoods. Many of these neighborhoods also suffer from an unhealthy mix of owner to rental properties and crime. The City utilized both CDBG and HOME funding in 2011 to education and creating more options for affordable, single-family housing. A 2011 Subrecipient, NeighborWorks® Green Bay, was able to provide homebuyer counseling to approximately 63 low and moderate-income (LMI) potential homebuyers. Many participants of their homebuyer counseling program went on to utilize the HOME-funded NeighborWorks® Green Bay Downpayment/Closing Cost Program. In 2011, 23 loans were made to LMI households to purchase homes within the City's Impact Areas. All of these loans were made to first-time homebuyers.

A 2011 Single-Family Rehabilitation Loan Program assisted 13 LMI home-owners with maintaining their homes. This program provided deferred, no-interest loans to LMI owner-occupied households to repair their homes, often times bringing them up to code.

Using a combination of CDBG and local funds, the City of Green Bay was successful in eliminating 8 blighted properties.

The Greater Green Bay Habitat for Humanity has become an important not-for-profit partner with the City of Green Bay in working to further affordable housing and homeownership opportunities. In 2011, 3 homes were built in the Impact Neighborhoods and 1 citywide. Habitat for Humanity anticipates building another 6 single-family, owner-occupied homes in 2012. All homes will be occupied by LMI households upon completion.

### **Providing suitable living environments and crime prevention for low-and-moderate income persons.**

In 2011, many efforts were made to improve the physical appearance and infrastructure of Impact neighborhood as well as CDBG eligible neighborhoods citywide. CDBG funds were used to replace alleys and sidewalks due to tree root damage or to ensure ADA accessibility. Along with the improvement to the sidewalks & alleys, CDBG funds were used to improve parks in the CDBG LMI neighborhoods.

Nonprofits providing direct services to LMI persons were funded and able to provide valuable services to area residents. As both a HUD mandate and an important component to affirmatively furthering fair housing choice, an allocation of \$10,000 was utilized by the Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council (MMFHC) to ensure fair housing practices. The Fair Housing Council was able to provide educational services through presentations and direct assistance, manage fair housing complaints, and distribute information on fair housing laws and illegal discrimination.

Minor inspection violations such as junk, trash, pet waste, grass and weed control, and vehicles in the front yards are becoming a major problem in the Impact Areas. In 2011, CDBG funds were allocated to fund a full-time inspection position that was responsible for performing inspections and conducting problem resolution in CDBG eligible areas.

A final component of the City's 2011 CDBG funding to provide suitable living environments for LMI income persons was to allocate funding to a Community Service Interns program. This program has been a very successful component in decreasing crime in the City's CDBG eligible neighborhoods. Interns assist the Police Department by attending neighborhood events, picking up found bicycles and logging them into police evidence, conducting vacation checks for residents gone for extended periods of time, providing translation services, making referrals to the Inspection Department, and creating a police presence in neighborhoods.

**Expanding economic opportunities in downtown Green Bay.**

The Economic Development Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) continued to serve as a catalyst for new business in Green Bay. In 2011 one business received a loan to purchase equipment. The loan will create 18 jobs 10 of which are available to LMI persons.

- b) Provide a breakdown of the CPD formula grant funds spent on grant activities for each goal and objective.

*\*If not using the CPMP Tool: Use Table 2A, 2B, 3B, 1C, 2C, 3A*

*\*If using the CPMP Tool: Use Needs Tables, Annual Housing Completion Goals, Summary of Specific Annual Objectives. (Use of these tables is sufficient, additional narrative is not required.)*

**Providing decent and affordable housing for low-and-moderate income persons.**

Homebuyer Counseling Program	\$10,000.00
Impact Area activities	\$263,399.67
Fair Housing Services	\$10,888.61

**Providing suitable living environments and crime prevention for low-and-moderate income persons.**

Parks Department activities	\$121,137.91
Department of Public Works - Sidewalks	\$133,200.70
Department of Public Works – Alleys	\$70,152.00
Community Service Interns Program	\$88,761.73
Preservation Inspector	\$33,133.23
Juvenile Crime Prevention	\$5,600.00
Juvenile Job Training Program	\$12,000.00
Community Policing Center	\$15,535.36

**Expanding economic opportunities in downtown Green Bay.**

ED Revolving Loans	\$217,000.00
Olde Main Street	\$44,005.11

- c) If applicable, explain why progress was not made towards meeting the goals and objectives.

N/A, goals and objectives have been met.

### 3) Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

- a) Provide a summary of impediments to fair housing choice.
- b) Identify actions taken to overcome effects of impediments identified in the jurisdiction's Analysis of Impediments.

PY 2011 CAPER General Questions # 3a & b response:

The City of Green Bay has submitted an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice to the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity in Milwaukee. Below is an executive summary of staff findings and recommendations.

**Impediment: Discrimination by housing providers against racial and ethnic minorities and women with children.**

**Recommendation: Increase knowledge of Fair Housing Law, particularly to protected classes and social service providers.** As previously mentioned in this report, the city works with the Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council (MMFHC) to provide fair housing education to the general public and housing providers. Besides holding conferences and trainings, the MMFHC provides referral services regarding non-fair housing issues such as evictions, code violations, tenant rights, and landlord assistance. The MMFHC currently participates in local interagency meetings regarding housing issues. These meetings help MMFHC and city staff better understand what types of fair housing issues are currently affecting residents. However, many local service agencies that are not necessarily directly involved in housing are as ignorant to fair housing laws as their clients. It is important to educate all types of agencies that work with LMI persons so they can identify and help victims of unfair housing practices.

**Impediment: Language barriers for Hispanics and Southeast Asians.**

**Recommendation: Expand offerings of Fair Housing Materials in languages other than English.** Lack of proficiency in the English language can be a huge barrier for immigrant populations in gaining access to affordable housing. Non-English speaking households are unable to communicate effectively with landlords, real estate agents, banking officials, and city employees. Recent discussions with city inspectors has revealed that they are in great need of translators in order to help explain standards for housing upkeep to non-English speaking residents. After several discussions between Planning and Inspection staff, a new position has been created to work with non-English speaking residents. The Neighborhood Preservation Inspector will be funded with CDBG dollars in order to work with non-English speaking residents in LMI areas of the city.

The Green Bay Area Housing Guide, fair housing information business size cards, and a brochure entitled “Landlords & Tenants Rights and Responsibilities,” have all been distributed in English, Spanish, and Hmong. This information is readily available at various public outlets including the Clerk’s office, Human Services, Integrated Community Solutions, the Brown County Library, the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection, and NeighborWorks® Green Bay’s Homeownership Center. These guides are also distributed at all Landlord Training Seminars and Neighborhood Impact meetings. The Community Housing Resources Board provided funding for reprinting of an updated Green Bay Fair Housing Guide. Planning Dept. staff provides a staff member to this board.

**Impediment: Lack of adequate household income among racial and ethnic minorities, women with children and large families to obtain and/or maintain housing.**

**Recommendation: Improve family self-sufficiency among low-income families, particularly those that are racial and ethnic minorities, women with children and large families with children.** Financial literacy, education with help of nonprofit agencies, better coordination between service agencies to identify needs of these persons and ensure better service. It is important for the City to continue to provide funding to NeighborWorks® Green Bay for their Homebuyer Counseling program. This program is vital in that it provides information at no cost to LMI persons on purchasing a home including financing, loan applications, foreclosure avoidance, and fair housing laws.

The Housing Authorities and ICS established the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program in 1993 in order to assist families receiving assistance in becoming self-supporting so they will no longer need to rely on public assistance. The FSS Program is a cooperative program that provides support and assistance to LMI families for up to five years. HCV program households that participate in the FSS program set an action plan that identifies the family’s employment goals. The plan outlines the activities and services required to achieve the goals. FSS Coordinators assist the families in staying on track with their goals and monitoring their progress. FSS families earn escrow accounts as their earned income increases.

**Impediment: Concentration of poverty in central city.**

**Recommendation: Continue to investigate opportunities to deconcentrate poverty in the central city.** It is the City’s and Green Bay Housing Authority’s (GBHA) policy to provide for deconcentration of poverty and encourage income mixing by bringing higher income families into lower income developments and vice versa. All housing is affirmatively marketed to all eligible income groups. Lower income residents are not steered toward lower income developments and higher income people will not be steered toward higher income developments.

Prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, the GBHA analyzes the income levels of families residing in each of its developments, the income levels of the census tracts in which the developments are located, and the income levels of families on the waiting lists. Based on this analysis, GBHA determines the level of marketing strategies and deconcentration incentives to implement. To further combat the

concentration of low-income housing, the GBHA and BCHA has taken steps to request waivers from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in order to limit the number of HCV program recipients that are going into downtown neighborhoods.

The revitalization of downtown Green Bay is a major step in creating mixed-income neighborhoods in the central city. Phase one construction on the City Deck, was completed in 2009. This is a \$12 million development that will turn a deteriorating and vacant riverfront into an urban plaza and new community-gathering place to reconnect citizens to the Fox River. It will feature a river walk, four piers and over \$70 million of new construction offering a variety of restaurants, shops, offices, and housing. Construction on the housing component has already begun with the help of CDBG, HOME, and WHEDA financing.

**Recommendation: Encourage neighboring communities to work to further equal access to affordable housing.** The small percentage of minorities living outside of Green Bay is clearly a cause for concern. Minorities may wish to live and work in the suburbs, but may be deterred by lack of affordable housing options and integrated neighborhoods. Green Bay's metro communities need to work with the city to create additional affordable housing, both rental and owner, in all areas of Brown County. A few steps that are already being taken are that a new policy has been put into place where by when the GBHA sells one of its current stocks of scattered site public housing units; it will purchase a new one outside of the city limits. It will work with the BCHA on choosing appropriate replacement housing. Also, the BCHA has been encouraging HCV program participants to find housing outside of the city limits.

#### **4) Address Obstacles to Meeting Underserved Needs**

Identify actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs.

PY 2011 CAPER General Questions # 4 response:

In 2011, the City met with the obstacle of decreased CDBG and HOME funding. This has become the main obstacle to meeting the needs of underserved populations. As funding levels decrease, so does the level of funding that can be provided for public service activities that provide direct services to underserved populations. This is one of the main reasons that the City decided to revise its allocation process by adopting the Impact Area concept. Staff focused a majority of its CDBG and HOME funding over the 2011 program year into smaller areas and also only focused on particular public service needs.

#### **5) Foster and Maintain Affordable Housing**

Identify actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing.

PY 2011 CAPER General Questions # 5 response:

Increasing and maintaining affordable housing for LMI persons is a high priority for the City of Green Bay. Poverty can have a crippling effect on individuals and

neighborhoods. To achieve healthy and stable neighborhoods in Green Bay, increasing homeownership is essential. In 2011, funds were provided to NeighborWorks® Green Bay to provide 23 deferred downpayment and/or closing cost assistance loans to LMI households. This program reduces the amount of cash needed up front for the purchase of a home, making homeownership affordable for the LMI families.

The City also funded a Single Family Residential Rehabilitation program, which funded 13 deferred, 0% interest loans for LMI household to assist them with maintaining their homes. The program makes it affordable for these LMI families to make repairs to their aging home.

## 6) Leveraging Resources

- a) Identify progress in obtaining “other” public and private resources to address needs.
- b) Describe how Federal resources from HUD leveraged other public and private resources.

PY 2011 CAPER General Questions # 6a & # 6b response:

The City was able to leverage non-federal funding through both the CDBG and HOME program. HOME funding was used in conjunction with private funding and other public funds to complete several LMI single-family housing projects. NeighborWorks® Green Bay, local Community Housing Development Organization, was able to complete the rehabilitation of six single-family rehabilitation project using \$107,554 NeighborWorks equity, \$264,098 Donations, \$90,116 CFRAH Grant and \$755,549 NSP funding. Further, their Downpayment/Closing Cost Assistance Program, which received a \$200,000 HOME allocation in 2010, leveraged \$4,627,355 in private mortgage loans, \$12,051 in NeighborWorks America funding, \$292,426 other Public funding, \$770,742 buyer's out of Pocket funds and \$159,117 in other grants/loans.

Staff funded through CDBG and HOME, worked directly with the Green Bay Neighborhood Leadership Council (GBNLC) to realize their goal of revitalizing Green Bay's older neighborhoods. The GBNLC is made up of presidents of Green Bay's 37 neighborhood associations and representatives from various entities including housing providers, neighborhood advocates, and neighborhood resource center directors. 2011 saw the creation of one new neighborhood association. Neighborhood Associations bring neighbors together to work cooperatively on neighborhood issues and projects as well as creating a stronger community.

CDBG staff also administered the Neighborhood Enhancement fund, which is funded with City money. The City was not allocated any new funds in 2011, however, continued to use existing Neighborhood Enhancement funds to purchase and remove blighted housing. Staff also administered the Conversion Grant and Conversion Loan Programs that encourages the conversion of multi-family housing back to its original single-family status. This year the program provided two conversion grants totaling \$10,000.00.

- c) Describe how matching requirements were satisfied.

PY 2011 CAPER General Questions # 6c response:

The City's 2011 HOME mach requirement was \$41,889.61. This match requirement was satisfied with the use of excess match from 2010 and the contribution of site preparation, construction materials and donated labor from Habitat for Humanity in 2011.

**7) Citizen Participation**

- a) Provide a summary of citizen comments.  
\*Please note that Citizen Comments and Responses may be included as additional files within the CPMP Tool.
- b) Describe how consideration was given to comments or views of citizens, received in writing or orally at public hearings, in preparing the CAPER.

PY 2011 CAPER Citizen Participation # 7a & 7b response:

The City of Green Bay has an adopted Citizen Participation Plan. In the plan, the City will provide citizens with reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment on performance reports. The following notice was published in the City of Green Bay local paper:

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

On Wednesday, April 4, 2012, at 5:00 p.m. in Room 604 of City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson Street, a Public Hearing will be held to allow interested citizens to ask questions and comment on the City of Green Bay's performance over the past year implementing the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program and the goals of the Consolidated Strategy for Housing and Community Development and identifying needs which may be addressed through future funded activities.

Since a primary objective of the CDBG program is to implement projects that benefit low- and moderate-income people, Public Hearing participation by representatives of low- and moderate-income residents is encouraged. Testimony presented at the hearing will be considered in the development of future CDBG programs and Consolidated Plans.

Performance report documentation and additional information regarding the CDBG Program and Consolidated Strategy and Plan for Housing and Community Development is available on or after April 4, 2012, for inspection at the Office of the Redevelopment Authority, Room 608, City Hall, or by calling Krista Baeten at (920) 448-3404. Public comments will be received through April 25, 2012. The final performance report documentation will be submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development by May 1, 2012.

Any person wishing to attend, who because of disability requires special accommodation, should contact the Mayor's Office at (920) 448-3005 at least 24 hours before the scheduled meeting time so that arrangements can be made. Also, non-English speaking residents who wish to attend should contact Krista Baeten at (920) 448-3404 at least 24 hours before the scheduled meeting time so arrangements can be made to have an interpreter present.

THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE  
CITY OF GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN  
By: Harry Maier, Chairman

Publication Date: Tuesday, March 13, 2012

Two representatives from the public attended the public hearing on April 4, 2012. Kristi Clover from the Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council and Noel Halverson from NeighborWorks Green Bay. Both commented on the City of Green Bay's performance in 2011 as being successful and on track to meeting the needs of the community. A couple of suggestions were made for possible goal and strategy changes for 2013. With the housing market in Green Bay, realizing homeownership is still very important but some focus should be made on looking to funding rental housing in the future. Kristi Clover, commented that they are seeing an increase in rental discrimination calls. Noel Halverson, commented on the increase of people attending their homebuyer counseling program and wanted to get into homeownership from last year. This increase being a positive component of continuing the goals and strategy of homeownership. He also commented on the number of foreclosed homes currently on the market and setting new goal and strategies to get those homes occupied., possibly looking at rental options to get those homes occupied and off the market. Vacant units can lead to vandalism, crime, and deteriorated neighborhoods.

Staff thanked the public for attending and commenting on the 2011 CAPER. Staff will include all comments expressed by the public about possible rental housing needs in the community during its development process of its 2013 Annual Action Plan, which will start in August 2012.

Citizens will be provided a period of not less than 15 days to comment on the performance report prior to submission to the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development. The City will consider any comments or views from citizens received in writing, or orally at the public hearing, in preparing the performance report.

No written comments were received during the 30 day comment period.

## **8) Institutional Structure**

Describe actions taken during the last year to overcome gaps in institutional structures and enhance coordination.

PY 2011 CAPER Institutional Structure # 8 response:

The City realizes the importance of bridging gaps within the institutional structure to better enhance coordination between groups and fulfill the objectives of the Consolidated Plan.

Interrelationships were an essential component of administering the CDBG and HOME funding for the City of Green Bay. As much as the Redevelopment Authority staff handles the day-to-day administration of the programs, input and work of many other City departments was necessary and critical in 2011 to maintain the integrity of the programs and help best serve the needs of the community. Staff met and corresponded with the following agencies to coordinate successful implementation of CDBG and HOME funded projects; Parks Department, Department of Public Works, Economic Development Department, Mayors Office, Inspection Department and Law Department.

Further, staff was also in constant contact with nonprofit and community service organizations to identify the needs of Green Bay. Staff members attend meetings of the Brown County Homeless and Housing Coalition, the Emergency Food & Shelter Program, and local neighborhood association meetings. They also helped to facilitate the Green Bay Neighborhood Leadership Council (GBNLC), a group made up of all the neighborhood association presidents that meet once a month to discuss neighborhood issues.

## 9) Monitoring

### **a) Describe actions taken to monitor the jurisdiction's performance in meeting objectives and outcomes set forth in its strategic plan.**

PY 2011 CAPER monitoring # 9a response:

The Community Development Specialist performs regular monitoring to ensure compliance with federal standards and performance in meeting the objectives and outcomes set for in the 2011 Annual Action Plan. In 2011, the following tasks were performed to monitor the CDBG and HOME programs:

- An examination of supporting documentation (i.e. invoices, time sheets) for all draws requests for eligibility and compliance.
- Review of quarterly reports submitted by subrecipients, reporting on the program performance and progress.
- Review of financial audits submitted by subrecipients.

b) Describe how and the frequency with which you monitored your activities, including subrecipients (including sponsors or administering agents).

PY 2011 CAPER monitoring # 9b response:

The Community Development Specialist performs monthly reviews and monitors the CDBG and HOME program activities. Along with the monthly reviews, on-

site monitoring sessions with subrecipients are conducted within the year by the Community Development Specialist and the Neighborhood Development Specialist. In 2011, three subrecipients were visited and on-site monitoring was performed.

- c) Describe the results of your monitoring including any improvements made as a result.

PY 2011 CAPER monitoring # 9c response:

2011 monitoring resulted in no findings by the Community Development staff. All Subrecipients programs are running effectively and meeting their national objectives and goals.

**d) Describe actions taken to insure compliance with program requirements, including requirements involving the timeliness of expenditures.**

PY 2011 CAPER monitoring # 9d response:

Staff is continually monitoring projects for timeliness of expenditures. Projects with slow moving accounts are addressed and, at times, funds can be reallocated to ensure funds are spent in a timely manner. All subrecipients have been made aware that their allocations can be pulled and put into other projects for failure to comply. In 2011, all projects were monitored for compliance and timeliness by the Community Development Specialist.

**e) Describe steps/actions taken to ensure long-term compliance with housing codes, including any actions or on-site inspections undertaken during the program year.**

PY 2011 CAPER monitoring # 9e response:

The City of Green Bay's Homeowner Rehabilitation Loan Program, First Time Homebuyer Program, and all programs funded by HUD, must meet or exceed local code, or HUD's Housing Quality Standards. In 2011, thirteen (13) Single Family Rehabilitation Program inspections were carried out during the project and a final inspection was conducted at the end of the project. Also, twenty-three (23) Downpayment Closing Cost Assistance loan inspections were carried out prior to closing of the loans. All inspections were signed off by staff and the subrecipients.

Procedures for the Homeowner Rehabilitation Loan Program also require that the Loan Note states as a condition of the loan that the homeowner must keep the home code compliant.

- f) What is the status of your grant programs?
- i) Are any activities or strategies falling behind schedule?
  - ii) Are grant disbursements timely?
  - iii) Do actual expenditures differ from letter of credit disbursements?

PY 2011 CAPER monitoring # 9f response:

Activities and strategies identified in the City's 2011 Annual Action plan are underway. All activities and subrecipients are timely and disbursing funds as scheduled. Draw requests and actual expenditures do not differ from the letter of credit disbursements.

**10) Antipoverty Strategy**

Describe actions taken during the last year to reduce the number of persons living below the poverty level.

PY 2011 CAPER Antipoverty Strategy #10 response:

Social, economic, political, and other environmental influences have been addressed by the City of Green Bay in order to reduce the number of persons living below the poverty level. Improving the housing environment, as provided in the City's 2011 Annual Action Plan, has been a large part of addressing the poverty issue in Green Bay's neighborhoods. The owner-occupied rehabilitation program has allowed 13 LMI homeowners to continue to occupy their homes by providing an affordable means to repair their homes during the 2011 program year. Also, downpayment/closing cost assistance loans were provided to 23 households in order to help make homeownership a reality for local LMI families. Staff continues to work in the city's most impoverished neighborhoods to address blighted housing and poor living conditions to create new, decent, and affordable housing for LMI households. The Economic Development Revolving Loan Fund has been used to give one business loan that created ten jobs for LMI individuals.

**Self-Evaluation**

**11) Provide an evaluation of accomplishments. This evaluation must include a comparison of the proposed versus actual outcomes of each outcome measure submitted with the strategic plan and explain, if applicable, why progress was not made toward meeting goals and objectives.**

***\*If not using the CPMP Tool: Use Table 1C, 2C, 3A***

***\*If using the CPMP Tool: Use Summary of Specific Annual Objectives.***

**(The following IDIS Reports will be reviewed to determine satisfaction of this requirement: PR03, PR06, PR23, PR80, PR81, PR82, PR83, PR84, PR85)**

**Consider the following when providing this self-evaluation:**

- a) Describe the effect programs had in solving neighborhood and community problems.**
  - b) Describe the progress made in meeting priority needs and specific objectives.**
  - c) Describe how activities and strategies made an impact on identified needs.**
  - d) Identify indicators that best describe the results of activities during the reporting period.**
-

**e) Identify barriers that had a negative impact on fulfilling the strategic and overall vision.**

**12) Identify whether major goals are on target and discuss reasons for those that are not on target.**

**13) Identify any adjustments or improvements to strategies and activities that might meet your needs more effectively.**

PY 2011 CAPER Self-Evaluation # 11, 12, 13 response:

The City of Green Bay continued to make progress in meeting priority needs and specific objectives outlined in the Consolidated Plan and the Annual Action Plans. Activities that were undertaken in 2011 have helped to revitalize the City's business and residential communities. The Impact Area concept continues to make big strides in revitalizing LMI neighborhoods in Green Bay.

Activities in the Impact Areas have been limited to acquisition, demolition, and relocation. However, this has laid the path for the elimination of blighted properties and the creation of new, affordable, single-family housing in the city.

The Economic Development Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) continues to make strides toward creating a stronger business sector in downtown Green Bay. One business received a loan through the RLF in 2011, creating ten jobs for low-to-moderate income persons. Creating unskilled jobs or jobs that provide training to unskilled persons and have a livable wage is an essential goal of the Consolidated Plan.

The City of Green Bay has also continued its dedication toward sustaining the infrastructure in its neighborhoods. The Department of Public Works was able to replace 2,100 linear feet of sidewalk in LMI neighborhoods. Sidewalks in these areas were deteriorated and presented safety hazards to residents. They were also able to remove and replace 3,187 linear feet of deteriorated asphalt pavement in alleys located in LMI neighborhoods. Both of these infrastructure improvements help sustain our older neighborhoods. The Parks Department used their 2011 allocation for projects that improved Parks in LMI neighborhoods.

As discussed in the monitoring section, staff continually monitors projects for timeliness of expenditures. Projects with slow moving accounts are addressed and, at times, funds are reallocated to ensure funds get spent in a timely manner. All subrecipients have been made aware that their allocations could be pulled and put into other projects for failure to comply.

Further, all projects that involve the creation or rehabilitation of LMI housing are monitored by staff throughout the project. Inspection staff is also an integral part of this process ensuring that projects meet local and state codes.

In 2011, no barriers with a negative impact impeded the City from carrying out their goals and visions identified in its 2011 Annual Action Plan.

All major goals set at the beginning of the City's 2011 Program Year are on target.

While the City and its subrecipients continually explore opportunities to improve community development, affordable housing and homelessness, no adjustments to the programming resulted in 2011.

## HOUSING

### Affordable Housing

14) Evaluate progress in meeting its specific affordable housing objectives, including:

- a) Comparison of proposed numeric goals (from the strategic plan and annual plan) with the actual number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income renter and owner households assisted during the reporting period.

*\*If not using the CPMP Tool: Use Table 2A, 3B, 2B, 1C, 2C, 3A)*

*\*If using the CPMP Tool: Use Need/Housings, Needs/Community Development, Annual Housing Completion Goals, Summary of Specific Annual Objectives.*

PY 2011 CAPER Affordable Housing # 14a response:

CDBG Subrecipients	#Units	#Units	Resources	Resources
Annual affordable Rental Housing Goals (SEC.215)	Proposed	Actual	CDBG	HOME
Acquisition of existing units	1	0	0	0
Production of new units	0	0	0	0
Rehabilitation of existing units	0	0	0	0
Rental Assistance	0	0	0	0
Annual Affordable Owner Housing Goals (sec. 215)	Proposed	Actual	CDBG	HOME
Acquisition of existing units	3	4	4	0
Production of new units	3	3	0	0
Rehabilitation of existing units	15	14	0	14
Homebuyer Assistance	40	23	0	23
Annual Affordable Housing Goals (SEC. 215)	Proposed	Actual	CDBG	HOME
Homeless	0	0	0	0
Non-Homeless	0	0	0	0
Special Needs	0	0	0	0
Annual Housing Goals				

Annual Rental Housing Goals	1	0	0	0
Annual Owner Housing Goals	62	44	4	37

Please also see the *Housing Needs*, *Community Development Needs*, and *Summary of Specific Annual Objectives* documents.

- b) Report the number of households served meeting the Section 215 requirements of affordable housing (essentially meeting the definitions in 24 CFR 92.252 and 92.254 for renters and owners, respectively).

**\*If not using the CPMP Tool: Use Table 3A**

**\*If using the CPMP Tool: Annual Housing Completion Goals  
(Use of this table is sufficient no additional narrative is required)**

All units served with CDBG and HOME funds meet the section 215 definition of affordable housing. This includes the following programs:

- City of Green Bay Single Family Homeowner Rehabilitation Loan Program **(13 units)**
  - City of Green Bay Acquisition, Rehab, Resale Program **(1 unit)**
  - NeighborWorks of Green Bay Downpayment Closing Cost Assistance Program **(23 units)**
  - Habitat for Humanity of Green Bay **(3 Units)**
- c) Describe efforts to address worst case needs (defined as low-income renters with severe cost burden, in substandard housing, or involuntarily displaced).

PY 2011 CAPER Affordable Housing # 14c response:

The City of Green Bay worked with the Green Bay Housing Authority and Brown County Housing Authority to provide opportunities to families with worst case housing needs. These housing needs are addressed in a local assistance priority system for public housing and the Housing Choice Voucher program.

- d) Description of efforts to address the accessibility needs of persons with disabilities.

PY 2011 CAPER Affordable Housing # 14d response:

The City of Green Bay's Single Family Homeowner Rehab program gives loans to individual households that can be structured to meet their needs. When issues of accessibilities for persons with disabilities arise, the family, with assistance from the Neighborhood Development Specialist, may design the scope of work to address these accessibility barriers.

Additionally, NeighborWorks Green Bay a local CHDO recipient has experience in universal design and a working relationship with Options for Independent Living, a local nonprofit dedicated to improving accessibility for person with disabilities.

## Public Housing Strategy

15) Describe actions taken during the last year to improve public housing and resident initiatives.

PY 2011 CAPER Public Housing #15 response:

The Housing Authority of the City of Green Bay is responsible for developing housing to assist low- and moderate-income households throughout the city. Presently it operates 153 units of senior citizen/disabled housing in its Mason Manor Retirement Community complex located at 1424 Admiral Court, as well as 42 scattered site properties consisting of 8 two-family homes and 34 single-family homes for a total of 50 family units. The properties are administered as affordable rental units for low- to moderate-income families. The Housing Division of the Planning Department provides staff for the Housing Authority and works with investors and not-for-profit developers to meet the city's housing and neighborhood revitalization needs.

In 2011, the Green Bay Housing Authority received \$204,829 in federal capital improvement grant funds for modernization, which allows for appliance replacements, common area furniture replacement, carpeting, window treatments, technology and security upgrades, elevator maintenance, and concrete repairs at Mason Manor. Improvements to the scattered site family housing properties include roof, siding, window and door replacement, flooring, foundation repairs, remodeling of properties, appliance replacement, carbon monoxide detectors, security lighting, cabinet and countertop replacement, painting, and tree removal.

2011 was the first full year of use of a 10,000 square foot addition to Mason Manor, which served to add a large-sized elevator and much-needed resident storage space. This \$1.5 million project was funded in part by American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding. These amenities improve the quality of life for the residents and ease the transport of large items or residents in need of emergency medical care within the building.

The Housing Authority portfolio includes financing of 731 mixed-income rental units, utilizing tax-exempt Housing Mortgage Revenue Bonds, and has assisted in the development of 1,521 units of private and not-for-profit federally-assisted housing.

The Brown County Housing Authority administers monthly Housing Choice Voucher rental assistance payments to 3,018 families, averaging \$1,235,800 per month, and has provided over \$247 million in rent subsidies since its inception. Each household is income certified and the rental unit they occupy is inspected and certified to pass Housing Quality Standards upon initial receipt of assistance and annually during program participation. The program completes approximately 4,300 housing inspections annually with over 168,300 inspections completed since its inception. The Authority offers a Family Self-Sufficiency Program, which focuses on guiding low-income families out of poverty, and a Housing Choice Voucher Home Ownership Option, which has prepared and assisted 139 households to become homeowners.

The Brown County Housing Authority, through its not-for-profit partners NeighborWorks® Green Bay and Catholic Charities, administers homeownership counseling and down payment assistance loans and a matching deferred payment

---

Down Payment and Closing Cost loan program that assists homebuyers in the purchase of qualified properties. The Brown County Housing Authority, through its statutory authority, has financed the development of 600+ mixed-income housing units through tax-exempt bonding. The Housing Division of the department provides staffing for the Brown County Housing Authority, and provides coordination of services and guidance to public, private, and not-for-profit agencies in the affordable housing industry.

## Barriers to Affordable Housing

16) Describe actions taken during the last year to eliminate barriers to affordable housing.

PY 2011 CAPER Barriers to Affordable Housing #16 response:

As stated, the City of Green Bay has continued its partnership with the Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council (MMFHC). During Program Year 2011, this organization provided referral services to people with non-fair housing issues such as evictions, code violations, tenant rights, and landlord assistance. They also investigated fair housing complaints that were placed in Green Bay.

In 2011, the City also continued to produce and distribute “The Green Bay Area Housing Guide,” fair housing business size cards, and a brochure entitled “Landlords & Tenants Rights and Responsibilities.” All of these documents are available in Spanish and Hmong. This information is readily available at various public outlets including the Clerk’s office, Human Services, Integrated Community Solutions, the Brown County Library, and NeighborWorks® Green Bay’s Homeownership Center. These guides are also distributed at all Landlord Training Seminars.

The City’s Downpayment/Closing Cost Assistance Program helps eligible LMI households by providing downpayment and closing cost assistance in the form of a deferred, no-interest loan. In 2011, 23 loans were made to LMI families.

The Brown County Housing Authority offers the Housing Choice Voucher Program (formerly known as the Section 8 Housing Program), to eligible LMI households. The Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCV) aids income-eligible families with the price of rent so that they are paying no more than 30% of their income toward housing.

The Authority offers a Family Self-Sufficiency Program, which focuses on guiding low-income families out of poverty, and a Housing Choice Voucher Home Ownership Option, which has prepared and assisted 139 households to become homeowners.

Once a LMI family becomes homeowners, it is important to keep them in their homes. The Single-Family, Owner-Occupied Rehab Loan Program provides deferred, no-interest loans to LMI households in order to make repairs to their homes. Many of these repairs are necessary to make the home code-compliant. In 2011, 13 single-family rehabs were completed.

The Economic Development Revolving Loan Fund Program provides opportunities for LMI persons to rise out of poverty through the creation of good-paying jobs

---

created specifically for LMI persons. In 2011, ten jobs were created for LMI persons.

## **Lead-based Paint**

17) Describe actions taken during the last year to evaluate and reduce lead-based paint hazards.

### PY 2011 CAPER Lead-based Paint #17 response:

Due to the aging housing stock in the City's neighborhoods, lead-based paint education and outreach efforts continue to be a high priority. The City presumes that lead is present in any home that is rehabilitated, unless the homeowner requests to have their property tested or there is good reason to believe the property is free of lead. (Staff provides each home owner with a copy of the EPA publications "Protect Your Family from Lead in Your Home" and "Renovate Right".) The Redevelopment Authority works with several lead certified companies for all rehab and renovation work, and has local resources available if risk assessment is needed. Numerous firms have also been identified statewide, to provide these services as well. The City of Green Bay has two staff persons that are certified Lead Hazard Investigators. Currently, twenty-two local contractors are identified for lead hazard reduction activities.

All 2011 loan recipients (owner and renter) were provided a lead-based paint pamphlet and asked to certify to the receipt of such document. In the event of a risk assessment, lead-based paint inspection (or paint testing report), within 15 calendar days a written notice is provided to occupants containing a summary of the nature, scope, and results of the evaluation and a contact for more information is provided. Clearance tests are conducted by certified staff after each rehab is complete and the results sent to an independent lab for analysis. Once results are received the home owner and contractor are notified of the result by mail within 10 days of receipt of the results.

Relocation from the home is often encouraged or required depending upon the work scope, projected length of time to complete rehabilitation activities, and dangers to health and safety of the occupants. If staying with family or friends is not possible, three local accommodations have been identified for extended stays that include kitchen and laundry facilities. Costs associated with stays at local accommodations are added as a soft cost to the homeowner's deferred loan, or the homeowner can elect to make his own arrangements for payment of such services.

Staff has also spearheaded the campaign to form a coalition among Brown County health care professionals and government agencies to raise community awareness and educate the public on the dangers of lead poisoning in our community. Working in conjunction with the State Department of Health and Family Services the coalition's goal is to raise awareness of the damaging health effects to children and the long-term social costs of this environmental hazard.

## HOMELESS

### Homeless Needs

18) Identify actions taken to address needs of homeless persons.

PY 2011 CAPER Homeless Needs #18 response:

As described in the 2011 Annual Action Plan, homelessness is a priority need that has been addressed in the City's Consolidated Plan. Federal funds applied for under the HOME and CDBG programs are available to address homeless needs and to prevent homelessness. However, the City has chosen not to use these funds directly to fund shelters or transitional housing. The City has instead made the decision to use its federal allocations to help prevent homelessness through the promotion of homeownership and affordable low-income housing. HOME funds are used to fund the Single-family Rehabilitation Loan Program that provides no-interest, deferred loans to LMI households to repair code violations on their homes. For some families, this could mean the difference between imminent homelessness and keeping their home. The City also supports the Brown County Homeless and Housing Coalition with staff being a member and attending monthly meetings. The Brown County Homeless and Housing Coalition did not apply for HUD funding to directly support homeless activities. Brown County Human Services employs two staff persons for outreach to individuals and families threatened by homelessness. They provide assistance and referral services to persons in order to help them avoid homelessness. The City of Green Bay has in previous years provided assistance to homeless persons in the form of maintaining the facilities that presently exist and supporting applications for operating funds by agencies offering services for the homeless. However, during program year 2011, the city did not receive any applications for this type of assistance.

19) Identify actions to help homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living.

PY 2011 CAPER Homeless Need #19 response:

Although federal funding did not directly assist homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, the City of Green Bay does support the local continuum of care administered by the Brown County Homeless and Housing Coalition.

The City of Green Bay has in previous years provided assistance to homeless persons in the form of maintaining the facilities that presently exist and supporting applications for operating funds by agencies offering services for the homeless. However, during program year 2011, the city did not receive any applications for this type of assistance.

20) Identify actions taken to implement a continuum of care strategy for the homeless and new Federal resources obtained during the program year, including from the Homeless SuperNOFA.

*\*If not using the CPMP Tool: Use Table 3B, 1C*

*\*If using the CPMP Tool: Use Needs/Homeless, Needs/Non-Homeless, Annual Housing Completion Goals, Summary of Specific Annual Objectives.*

PY 2011 CAPER Homeless Needs #20 response:

The City of Green Bay did not obtain any new federal resources for Homeless activities. The Brown County Homeless and Housing Coalition continues to coordinate the local Continuum of Care. The Brown County Homeless and Housing Coalition did not receive any new recourse through the City of Green Bay's CDBG or HOME funds.

## **Specific Homeless Prevention Elements**

21) Identify actions taken to prevent homelessness.

PY 2011 CAPER Specific Homeless Prevention #21 response:

In order to prevent homelessness, particularly in our LMI neighborhoods, the City of Green Bay through its 2011 CDBG and HOME funds allocated funding to the following programs:

- Single Family Rehabilitation Program - this allowed low-income homeowners to stay in a code compliant house, which also may have prevented them from losing their home.
- Fair Housing program - the Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council (MMFHC) was able to provide educational services through presentations and direct assistance, manage fair housing complaints, and distribute information on fair housing laws and illegal discrimination.

The Brown County Housing Authority also offers a Family Self-Sufficiency Program, which focuses on guiding low-income families out of poverty. The program teaches these households how to not be dependent on public housing with an end goal of the household becoming responsible homeowners.

## **Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG)**

22) Identify actions to address emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless individuals and families (including significant subpopulations such as those living on the streets).

PY 2011 CAPER ESG # 22 response:

N/A, the City of Green Bay does not receive ESG funds.

23) Assessment of Relationship of ESG Funds to Goals and Objectives

- a) Evaluate progress made in using ESG funds to address homeless and homeless prevention needs, goals, and specific objectives established in the Consolidated Plan.

*\*If not using the CPMP Tool: Use Table 2A, 3B, 2B, 1C, 2C, 3A)*

*\*If using the CPMP Tool: Use Need/Housings, Needs/Community Development, Annual Housing Completion Goals, Summary of Specific Annual Objectives.*

PY 2011 CAPER ESG Evaluate Progress # 23a response:

N/A, the City of Green Bay does not receive ESG funds.

- b) Detail how ESG projects are related to implementation of comprehensive homeless planning strategy, including the number and types of individuals and persons in households served with ESG funds.

PY 2011 CAPER ESG # 23b response:

N/A, the City of Green Bay does not receive ESG funds.

#### 24) Matching Resources

- a) Provide specific sources and amounts of new funding used to meet match as required by 42 USC 11375(a)(1), including cash resources, grants, and staff salaries, as well as in-kind contributions such as the value of a building or lease, donated materials, or volunteer time.

PY 2011 CAPER ESG # 24 response:

N/A, the City of Green Bay does not receive ESG funds.

#### 25) State Method of Distribution

- a) States must describe their method of distribution and how it rated and selected its local government agencies and private nonprofit organizations acting as subrecipients.

PY 2011 CAPER ESG # 25 response:

N/A

#### 26) Activity and Beneficiary Data

- a) Completion of attached Emergency Shelter Grant Program Performance Chart or other reports showing ESG expenditures by type of activity. Also describe any problems in collecting, reporting, and evaluating the reliability of this information.

PY 2011 CAPER ESG # 26a response:

N/A, the City of Green Bay does not receive ESG funds.

- b) Homeless Discharge Coordination

- i) As part of the government developing and implementing a homeless discharge coordination policy, ESG homeless prevention funds may be used to assist very-low income individuals and families at risk of becoming

homeless after being released from publicly funded institutions such as health care facilities, foster care or other youth facilities, or corrections institutions or programs.

- ii) Explain how your government is instituting a homeless discharge coordination policy, and how ESG homeless prevention funds are being used in this effort.

PY 2011 CAPER ESG # 26b response:

N/A, the City of Green Bay does not receive ESG funds.

## NON-HOMELESS SPECIAL NEEDS

### Non-homeless Special Needs

\*Refer to the Non-homeless Special Needs Table in the Needs.xls workbook or Table 1C.

- 27) Identify actions taken to address special needs of persons that are not homeless but require supportive housing, (including persons with HIV/AIDS and their families).

PY 2011 CAPER Non-homeless Special Needs #26 response:

The City of Green Bay works with the Green Bay Housing Authority who administers an LMI elderly and disabled housing complex. This 153-unit complex provides affordable, quality housing for the LMI elderly and disabled. Residents live independently, but nursing staff is available in-house for medical and other special needs.

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

### Community Development Block Grant

- 28) Assessment of Relationship of CDBG Funds to Goals and Objectives

- a) Assess use of CDBG funds in relation to the priorities, needs, goals, and specific objectives in the Consolidated Plan, particularly the highest priority activities.

**\*If not using the CPMP Tool:** Use Table 2A, 3B, 2B, 1C, 2C, 3A)

**\*If using the CPMP Tool:** Use Need/Housings, Needs/Community Development, Annual Housing Completion Goals, Summary of Specific Annual Objectives.

- b) Evaluate progress made toward meeting goals for providing affordable housing using CDBG funds, including the number and types of households served.

**\*If not using the CPMP Tool:** Use Table 2A, 3B, 2B, 1C, 2C, 3A)

**\*If using the CPMP Tool:** Use Need/Housings, Needs/Community Development, Annual Housing Completion Goals, Summary of Specific Annual Objectives.

- c) Indicate the extent to which CDBG funds were used for activities that benefited extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons.

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG LMI Benefit # 28a, #28b, #28c response:

Funds were budgeted and expended for activities that were included as objectives in the 5-year Consolidated Plan. 2011 was another very successful year for the City in its work to revitalize its neighborhoods. See the tables below for additional information regarding CDBG funds, goals, objectives and number and income level of individuals served.

<b>Program</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Anti-Crime Programs</b>			
Improve safety within the City neighborhoods	High		
Community Service Intern Program		\$110,000	\$89,251
Neighborhood Preservation Inspector		\$30,000	\$33,133
Juvenile Crime Prevention		\$10,000	\$5,600
Juvenile Job Training			\$12,000
<b>Economic Assist to For-Profits</b>	High		
1 loans was given in 2011			\$217,000
<b>Street Improvements (people)</b>	High		
Infrastructure within CDBG eligible neighborhoods needs to be replaced. Asphalt was removed in LMI neighborhood alleys		\$90,000	\$70,152
<b>Sidewalk Improvements (people)</b>	High		
Infrastructure within older neighborhoods was improved through the replacement of deteriorated sidewalks. This improved the quality of LMI neighborhood infrastructure and also improved accessibility to neighborhood facilities such as parks.		\$60,000	\$133,200
<b>Public Facilities &amp; Improve.</b>	High		
Redevelopment of the Central Business District in order to continue to strengthen the City's overall economic and social fabric. This includes Main Street and Broadway Street.		\$0.00	\$46,732
<b>Parks, Recreational Facilities</b>	High		
Provided facilities in LMI neighborhoods including the rehabilitation of park shelters		\$150,000	\$121,137

and the creation of a multi-purpose trail.			
<b>Owner Occupied Housing</b>	High		
Using acquisition, rehabilitation, and new construction when necessary, the City has been able to increase the supply of affordable housing units.		\$391,970	\$263,399

29) Changes in Program Objectives

- a) Identify the nature of and the reasons for any changes in program objectives and how the jurisdiction would change its program as a result of its experiences.

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG #29 response:

In 2011, The City of Green Bay carried out activities as planned in the Annual Action Plans. Staff does review opportunities when provided, although 2011 program spending was consistent with the Annual Action Plans.

30) Assessment of Efforts in Carrying Out Planned Actions

- a) Indicate how grantee pursued all resources indicated in the Consolidated Plan.
- b) Indicate how grantee provided certifications of consistency in a fair and impartial manner.
- c) Indicate how grantee did not hinder Consolidated Plan implementation by action or willful inaction.

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 30 response:

- a) Resources - The City applied for and received funds under the Community Development Block Grant Program and HOME Program, as was indicated in the Consolidated Plan.
- b) The City has provided the requested certifications of consistency for HUD Programs in a fair and impartial manner, for which the City has indicated it would support applications by other entities.
- c) The City did not hinder Consolidated Plan implementation by action or willful inaction.

31) For Funds Not Used for National Objectives

- a) Indicate how use of CDBG funds did not meet national objectives.
- b) Indicate how use of CDBG funds did not comply with overall benefit certification.

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG #31 response:

During the report period, the City of Green Bay expended \$1,185,198 of CDBG funds on activities that are subject to the low-and-moderate income benefit requirement. Of those funds, 84% were expended on LMI activities. The remaining activities met the elimination of slum and blight objective or went toward administrative costs.

- 32) Anti-displacement and Relocation – for activities that involve acquisition, rehabilitation or demolition of occupied real property
- a) Describe steps actually taken to minimize the amount of displacement resulting from the CDBG-assisted activities.

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 32a response:

To ensure that the need for displacement of occupants is minimized, staff follows the Anti-Displacement and Relocation Plan as adopted by the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Green Bay. When property rehabilitation activities are assumed that are very extensive, temporary relocation is provided. Occupants are not permanently displaced. No CDBG funded activities in 2011 caused temporary displacement. Each property acquisition is evaluated to ensure that need exists to acquire the property. Only if acquisition is determined necessary for community benefit does acquisition and related displacement proceed. Whenever possible, staff will attempt to identify property acquisitions that will not cause displacement.

- b) Describe steps taken to identify households, businesses, farms or nonprofit organizations that occupied properties subject to the Uniform Relocation Act or Section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, and whether or not they were displaced, and the nature of their needs and preferences.

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 32b response:

All occupants subject to the Uniform Relocation Act or Section 104(d) are identified and interviewed to determine relocation needs and preferences. During the 2011 reporting period one property in the Fort Howard Impact Area required relocation assistance. The household were assisted by Neighborhood Development Specialists in locating replacement housing. The households were displaced from census tract 1. No temporary relocation assistance was needed during the reporting period.

- c) Describe steps taken to ensure the timely issuance of information notices to displaced households, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations.

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 32c response:

Staff uses the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Green Bay's Anti-Displacement Plan, Replacement Housing and Relocation Assistance policy to ensure the timely issuance of notices to displaced households and businesses for any HUD assisted acquisition, rehabilitation, demolition, and conversion projects. In all relocation cases, a relocation plan is prepared pursuant to State Statutes, which requires the City to identify displacees and determine their replacement housing/business needs. Those who are displaced are awarded relocation payments in accordance with Federal and State law and provided assistance by the City's relocation staff, as needed.

- 33) Low/Mod Job Activities – for economic development activities undertaken where jobs were made available but not taken by low- or moderate-income persons
- a) Describe actions taken by grantee and businesses to ensure first consideration was or will be given to low/mod persons.

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 33a response:

The City stresses the importance of not only providing but also creating jobs specifically designated for persons with low/moderate income households. Loan applications are thoroughly scrutinized for this aspect of the program, and the loan contracts have language with stipulated penalties if job creation does not occur within 18 months of the loan disbursement.

- b) List by job title of all the permanent jobs created/retained and those that were made available to low/mod persons.

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 33b response:

One business was given a loan during the reporting period and created the following positions to low/mod persons: line cooks and servers.

- c) If any of jobs claimed as being available to low/mod persons require special skill, work experience, or education, provide a description of steps being taken or that will be taken to provide such skills, experience, or education.

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 33c response:

The one Economic Development Revolving Loan that was issued in 2011 did not create any jobs that required special skills or work experience.

- 34) Low/Mod Limited Clientele Activities – for activities not falling within one of the categories of presumed limited clientele low and moderate income benefit
- a) Describe how the nature, location, or other information demonstrates the activities benefit a limited clientele at least 51% of who are low- and moderate-income.

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 34a response:

Community Service Interns: Provided funding for Community Service Interns (CSI's). These interns were able to be out on the streets checking vacant houses, licensing animals and bicycles, conducting park control, providing information to residents regarding City services, and meeting and greeting neighbors. Generally, they were an extra set of eyes and ears in downtown neighborhoods.

Fair Housing Council: During Program Year 2010, this organization provided referral services to people with non-fair housing issues such as evictions, code violations, tenant rights and landlord assistance. They investigated fair housing complaints that were placed in Green Bay. MMFHC gave presentations on fair housing in Green Bay in 2010. Staff also provided technical assistance, including clarification of fair housing laws, information on legal and administrative interpretations of fair housing laws, and information on housing discrimination.

NeighborWorks® Green Bay Homebuyer Counseling: NeighborWorks operated a very successful homebuyer-counseling program for households interested in purchasing a home. This program provides both pre- and post-purchase education to potential homebuyers. This program year, NeighborWorks® Green Bay was able to counsel 130 individuals.

My Brother's Keeper was awarded a \$10,000 allocation to administer a juvenile crime prevention program. This program provided group forum sessions for multiple juveniles at the High School and Middle Schools target areas.

**35) Program income received**

**a) Detail the amount repaid on each float-funded activity.**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 35a response:

No float-funded activities were repaid in 2011.

**b) Detail all other loan repayments broken down by the categories of housing rehabilitation, economic development, or other.**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 35b response:

Housing Rehabilitation Loan Repayments	\$18,058.00
Development Loan Repayments	\$12,750.45
Rental Revenue from Property	\$1,010.00
Economic Development Revolving Loan Payments	\$233,820.10

**c) Detail the amount of income received from the sale of property by parcel.**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 35c response:

No income was received from the sale of property in 2011.

**36) Prior period adjustments – where reimbursement was made this reporting period for expenditures (made in previous reporting periods) that have been disallowed, provide the following information:**

**a) The activity name and number as shown in IDIS;**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 36a response:

The City of Green Bay had no prior period adjustments in 2011.

**b) The program year(s) in which the expenditure(s) for the disallowed activity (ies) was reported;**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 36b response:

The City of Green Bay had no prior period adjustments in 2011.

**c) The amount returned to line-of-credit or program account; and**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 36c response:

No amount was returned to the line-of-credit or program account in 2011.

**d) Total amount to be reimbursed and the time period over which the reimbursement is to be made, if the reimbursement is made with multi-year payments.**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG # 36d response:

N/A, please see the response for 36a through 36c.

**37) Loans and other receivables**

**a) List the principal balance for each float-funded activity outstanding as of the end of the reporting period and the date(s) by which the funds are expected to be received.**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG #37a response:

The City of Green Bay did not have any active float-funded activities in 2011.

**b) List the total number of other loans outstanding and the principal balance owed as of the end of the reporting period.**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG #37b response:

**Loans Outstanding**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Balance Owed</u>
Deferred Loans	\$1,215,453.11
Rental Rehab Loans	\$55,424.10
Principal Reduction Loan	\$48,658.00
Encompass Child Care	\$60,000.00
Commercial Loans	\$972,859.01
Defaulted Loans	\$12,494.13
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,364,888.35</b>

**c) List separately the total number of outstanding loans that are deferred or forgivable, the principal balance owed as of the end of the reporting period, and the terms of the deferral or forgiveness.**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG #37c response:

The following is a list of outstanding loans as of the end of January 31, 2011:

CDBG Deferred Single Family Rehabilitation Loans: \$1,194,889.59

---

CDBG Deferred Multi Family Rehabilitation Loans:	\$55,424.00
HOME Deferred Single Family Rehabilitation Loans:	\$4,309,316.82
HOME Downpayment Closing Cost Loans	\$1,075,209.00

All homeowner are not obligated to repay their loans until they sell, transfer or vacate their home.

**d) Detail the total number and amount of loans made with CDBG funds that have gone into default and for which the balance was forgiven or written off during the reporting period.**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG #37d response:

Defaulted CDBG Deferred Single Family Rehabilitation Loans: \$85,935.36

**e) Provide a List of the parcels of property owned by the grantee or its subrecipients that have been acquired or improved using CDBG funds and that are available for sale as of the end of the reporting period.**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG #37e response:

At the end of the reporting period for 2011, the City owns the following properties that are for sale:

300 S. Clay St  
1004 & 1010 N Irwin Ave  
709 School Pl  
225 S. Ashland Ave  
823 Oregon St  
215 N Norwood

**38) Lump sum agreements**

**a) Provide the name of the financial institution.**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG #38a response:

The City of Green Bay did not have any lump sum agreements for this program year.

**b) Provide the date the funds were deposited.**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG #38b response:

N/A The City of Green Bay did not have any lump sum agreements for this program year.

**c) Provide the date the use of funds commenced.**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG #38c response:

N/A The City of Green Bay did not have any lump sum agreements for this program year.

**d) Provide the percentage of funds disbursed within 180 days of deposit in the institution.**

PY 2011 CAPER CDBG #38d response:

100% of funds were dispersed within 180 days of funds being deposited in the institution. Local policy is to issue checks first then be reimbursed from the US Treasury, ensuring that funds are dispersed in much less than 180 days. No US Treasury funds are requested without first utilizing all available program income.

---

## NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION STRATEGY AREA (NRSA)

39) Jurisdictions with HUD-approved neighborhood revitalization strategy must describe progress against benchmarks for the program year.

PY 2011 CAPER NRSA # 38 response:

N/A The City of Green Bay does not have any HUD-approved Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas.

---

## HOME/ADDI

### HOME/ American Dream Down Payment Initiative (ADDI)

**NA**

40) Assessment of Relationship of HOME Funds to Goals and Objectives

- a) Assess the use of HOME funds in relation to the priorities, needs, goals, and specific objectives in the strategic plan, particularly the highest priority activities.

*\*If not using the CPMP Tool: Use Table 2A, 3B, 2B, 1C, 2C, 3A)*

*\*If using the CPMP Tool: Use Need/Housings, Needs/Community Development, Annual Housing Completion Goals, Summary of Specific Annual Objectives.*

PY 2011 CAPER HOME Assessment # 40a response:

#### Assessment of HOME Funds to Goals and Objectives

**Housing Need:** Low and Very Low Income Rental Housing Units Rehabilitation

**Extent of Funds Distributed:** Due to a decision made by City Council, staff did not fund any rental projects with HOME funding.

**Housing Need: Low and Very Low Income Owner-Occupied Housing Rehabilitation & Homeownership Opportunities**

Extent of Funds Distributed: \$32,880.59 was spent on the creation of homeownership opportunities for low and very low-income households, including construction and/or rehabilitation of single-family housing. Owner-occupied property rehabilitation draws totaled \$211,317.64

**Housing Need: Assistance to Low and Very Low Income Homebuyers.**

Extent of Funds Distributed: \$92,421.13 was drawn during the program year to help 23 LMI homebuyers purchase housing.

**Housing Need: Non-Homeless Special Needs**

Extent of Funds Distributed: The 2011 Annual Action Plan did not anticipate funding of special needs projects during the report period.

- b) Evaluate progress made toward meeting goals for providing affordable housing using HOME funds, including the number and types of households served.

*\*If not using the CPMP Tool: Use Table 2A, 3B, 2B, 1C, 2C, 3A)*

*\*If using the CPMP Tool: Use Need/Housings, Needs/Community Development, Annual Housing Completion Goals, Summary of Specific Annual Objectives.*

PY 2011 CAPER HOME Progress Evaluation # 40b response:

- c) Indicate the extent to which HOME funds were used for activities that benefited extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons.

PY 2011 CAPER HOME # 40c response:

HOME funds were used for the following activities that benefited extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons:

HOME Single Family Rehab Program	\$211,317
HOME Downpayment Closing Cost Assistance	\$92,421
HOME Purchase, Rehab, Resale Programs	\$32,880

41)HOME Match Report

- a) Use HOME Match Report HUD-40107-A to report on match contributions for the period covered by the Consolidated Plan program year.

See attached HOME Match Report (HUD Form 4107-A).

42)HOME MBE and WBE Report

---

- a) Use Part III of HUD Form 40107 to report contracts and subcontracts with Minority Business Enterprises (MBEs) and Women's Business Enterprises (WBEs).

See attached Minority and Woman Business Report (Part III HUD Form-4107).

43) Assessments

- a) Detail results of on-site inspections of rental housing.

PY 2011 CAPER HOME Rental # 43a response:

Rental housing is not an activity outlined in the City's Consolidated Plan. In 2011, no on-site inspections of rental housing were performed.

- b) Describe the HOME jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions.

PY 2011 CAPER HOME # 43b response:

In 2011 all programs funded with HOME funds were marketed to LMI residents in accordance with Federal, State and local fair housing laws. The Downpayment and Closing Cost Assistance Program was specifically marketed to LMI areas of the City.

- c) Describe outreach to minority and women owned businesses.

PY 2011 CAPER HOME/ADDI # 43c response:

Marketing and outreach to minority and women owned businesses was achieved in 2011 by providing notice to contractors at certification meetings to recruit contractors to perform rehabilitation work for applicants receiving HOME and CDBG housing rehabilitation loans. The Neighborhood Division staff also met with the Department of Commerce staff to assist with outreach and marketing to minority and women owned businesses.

## HOPWA

### Specific HOPWA Objectives

44) Assessment of Relationship of HOPWA Funds to Goals and Objectives.

- a) Assess the use of HOPWA funds in relation to the priorities, needs, goals, and specific objectives in the strategic plan, particularly the highest priority activities.

***\*If not using the CPMP Tool:*** Use Table 2A, 1C, 2C, 3A)

***\*If using the CPMP Tool:*** Use Need/Housings, Summary of Specific Annual Objectives.

PY 2011 CAPER Specific HOPWA Objectives # 43 response:

N/A, the City of Green Bay does not receive these funds.

- b) Evaluate progress made towards meeting the goals of providing affordable housing using HOPWA funds, including the number and types of households served.

**\*If not using the CPMP Tool:** Use Table 2A, 1C, 2C, 3A)

**\*If using the CPMP Tool:** Use Need/Housings, Summary of Specific Annual Objectives.

PY 2011 CAPER Specific HOPWA Objectives # 43 response:

N/A, the City of Green Bay does not receive these funds.

*To report progress under the general and HOPWA specific requirements, the grantee may integrate the HOPWA elements in their standard CAPER report or establish a HOPWA-specific narrative by completing the following information. IDIS Report PR80 has useful financial and accomplishments information for end of year reporting.*

## **HOPWA EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 45) Provide an executive summary (1-3 pages) and a specific objectives narrative which address the following:
  - a) Grantee and Community Overview.
    - i) A brief description of the grant organization, the area of service, the name of the program contact(s), and a broad overview of the range/type of housing activities, along with information on each sponsor by name, main project site by zip code and related organization information.
  - b) Annual Performance under the Action Plan
    - i) Report on the actions taken during the year that addressed the special needs of persons who are not homeless but require supportive housing, and assistance for persons who are homeless.
    - ii) Evaluate the progress in meeting the project's objectives for providing affordable housing, including a comparison of actual outputs and outcomes to proposed goals and progress made on the other planned actions indicated in the strategic and action plans. The evaluation can address any related program adjustments or future plans.
    - iii) Include any assessment of client outcomes for achieving housing stability, reduced risks of homelessness and improved access to care.
    - iv) Report on the use of committed leveraging from other public and private resources that helped to address needs identified in the plan. Report the number of stewardship units of housing which have been created through acquisition, rehabilitation or new construction with any HOPWA funds.
    - v) Describe any other accomplishments recognized in the community due to the use of HOPWA funds, including any projects in developmental stages that are not operational.
    - vi) Provide an analysis of the extent to which HOPWA funds were distributed among different categories of housing needs consistent with the geographic distribution plans identified in its approved Strategic Plan.
  - c) Barriers or Trends Overview

- i) Describe any barriers (including non-regulatory) encountered, actions in response to barriers, and recommendations for program improvement;
  - ii) Describe any expected trends facing the community in meeting the needs of persons with HIV/AIDS, and provide any other information important in providing services to persons with HIV/AIDS.
  - iii) Note any evaluations, studies, or other assessments of the HOPWA program available to the public.
- d) Project Accomplishment Data:
- i) Complete and submit CAPER Performance Chart 1 Planned Goals and Chart 2 Actual Performance;
  - ii) Complete and submit CAPER Performance Chart 3 for Housing Stability Outcomes, HOPWA Outcomes on Access to Care and Support in conjunction with HOPWA-funded Housing assistance, Monthly Household Income in conjunction with HOPWA-funded Housing Assistance, and HOPWA Outcomes on Access to Care and Support not in conjunction with HOPWA-funded Housing Assistance.

PY 2011 CAPER HOPWA Executive Summary response:

N/A, the City of Green Bay does not receive these funds.

## OTHER NARRATIVE

Include any CAPER information that was not covered by narratives in any other section.

PY 2011 CAPER Other Narrative response: