Grantee: Minnesota

Grant: B-08-DN-27-0001

October 1, 2016 thru December 31, 2016 Performance

Grant Number:
B-08-DN-27-0001

Obligation Date:
03/20/2009

Award Date:
03/20/2009

Grantee Name:
Minnesota

Contract End Date:
03/24/2013

Review by HUD:
Reviewed and Approved

Grant Award Amount:
$38,849,929.00

Grant Status:
Active

QPR Contact:
Abigail Behl

LOCCS Authorized Amount:
$38,849,929.00

Estimated PI/RL Funds:
$15,386,941.64

Total Budget:
$54,236,870.64

Disasters:

Declaration Number

No Disasters Found

Narratives

Areas of Greatest Need:

Title III of Division B of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (hereinafter "HERA") provides emergency assistance to states and localities for the redevelopment of abandoned and foreclosed homes. The program is known as the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP). The focus of this program is the purchase, management and resale of foreclosed and abandoned properties for the purpose of stabilizing neighborhoods. Unless HERA provides otherwise, grants must comply with Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) requirements. Minnesota Housing is the grantee for the State of Minnesota NSP funds in the amount of $38.8 million. The plan describes Minnesota Housing's distribution plan, and eligible uses and activities for the stabilization of neighborhoods. Minnesota Housing will sub grant NSP funds to eligible local units of government with experience administering CDBG funds. Subrecipients are expected to be knowledgeable about and adhere to the laws and regulations governing the CDBG program as well as the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. Subrecipients must commit and expend funding in accordance with NSP funding guidelines and the targeting requirements described in the Action Plan.
July 15, 2013 - Action Plan Modified:
Minnesota Housing sub granted the $ 38 million to 21 local units of government. 13 remain active. Subrecipients have earned $12 million in program income and anticipate approximately $5 million in program income by the program's closeout. Including program income, the grant's total is currently $55 million. All activities will continue to be funded in accordance with NSP funding guidelines and the targeting requirements described in this Action Plan.
The plan is amended to include administrative recommendations to be presented to Minnesota Housing's Board of Directors at the June 2013 board meeting. The administrative strategies of this Substantial Amendment to the plan ensure the success of the grant, and improve the closeout timeline. Furthermore, the amended plan describes the methodology used to re-assess the areas of greatest need, and the proposed reallocation of funds and program income among the subrecipients who remain active under the grant.
Newly Established Areas of Greatest Need
With the end date approaching in March of 2013, Minnesota Housing re-examined the areas of greatest need to determine the best use of NSP funds in years to come. The examination was based on the HERA requirements of the grant and included here is the added methodology:
There are 54 zip codes that intersect the original NSP1 target areas that are current administrators and have not already completed NSP1 activities. These zip codes are evaluated and ranked in two steps. First, zip codes are evaluated based on foreclosure need. Second, the high need foreclosure zip codes are prioritized by lower incomes and older housing stock.
Step 1. Evaluation of Foreclosure Need
First, areas are evaluated for foreclosure need using the following three criteria and ranked by the sum of points:
• Area is presently a high need foreclosure zip code.
o 1 Point - The zip code's overall foreclosure index (based on each zip code's rate of loans in delinquency, foreclosure or REO status) is above 150 or 1 ½ tim

Areas of Greatest Need:

es greater than the average foreclosure rate in the state. Note Greater Minnesota zip codes are benchmarked to an overall Greater Minnesota rate, rather than a statewide rate. The data was from December 2012, which was the most current.
• Area has an increasing foreclosure problem since peak of the foreclosure crisis in late 2007.
o 1 Point – The zip code experienced at least a 30% increase in foreclosures during the five year period December 2007- December 2012.
• Area has experienced substantial home price declines since the housing market peak.
o 2 Points – Areas in the top 10% of zip codes or cities for price declines are defined as significant price decline areas. Zip codes

had at least a 56% decline in the foreclosure market (lender-owned sales); or zip codes or cities/townships had at least a 40% decline in the traditional market (excluding lender-owned and short sales).
OR
o 1 Point - Areas in the top 20% of zip codes or cities for price declines and not defined as “significant price decline” areas are defined as high price decline areas. Zip codes had at least a 52% decline in the foreclosure market; or zip codes or cities/townships had at least a 37.2% decline in the traditional market .
In total, 24 of the 54 zip codes achieve 2 or more points. Seven zip codes score 3 points and include areas in North Minneapolis, Brooklyn Center, East Saint Paul, Blaine, and South Saint Paul. All of these areas have a high need now, are in areas that have experienced median price declines in the top 20% of declines statewide, and had either an increasing foreclosure problem since the peak of foreclosures or a significant price decline (in the top 10% of price declines).
Step 2. Additional Prioritization Based on Household Income and Age of Housing Stock
The 24 high need foreclosure zip codes (those scoring 2 or 3 points) are further evaluated to prioritize areas most likely to need public investment   These zip codes are evaluated and ranked based on median household income and median age of housing, recognizing that lower income communities with older housing stock will be more challenged in accessing sufficient private capital to meet their needs. The high need foreclosure area maps visualize the ranking, with reds and oranges ranking higher than the greens and blues. Table1 describes each of these zip codes with regards to administrator and the details of the foreclosure need analysis and housing-stock and income prioritization.
Conclusion
The areas of greatest need are identified as the highest ranked six zip codes in table 1 for the City of Minneapolis, the City of St. Paul, and Hennepin County.

Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

Areas of Greatest Needs: HERA requires that grantees that receive NSP funding “…give priority emphasis and consideration to those metropolitan areas, metropolitan cities, urban areas, rural areas, low and moderate – income , and other areas with the greatest need, including those (A) with the greatest percentage of home foreclosures; (B) with the highest percentage of homes financed by a subprime mortgage related loan; and (C) identified by the State or unit of general local government as likely to face a significant rise in the rate of home foreclosures.” Except for certain limitations, all eligible uses identified in HERA will be eligible for State NSP funds. These activity needs are: · Financing Mechanisms · Acquisition and rehabilitation for homeownership; · Acquisition and rehabilitation for rental; · Establishing land banks; · Demolition of blighted structures; and · Redevelopment of demolished or vacant structures. · Administration costs Minnesota Housing will undertake an evaluation of the uses and outcomes achieved with NSP funding. The funding agreement will require certain information to be provided to assist Minnesota Housing in its evaluation efforts. Outlined below is the methodology that Minnesota Housing used to identify areas of greatest need and to assign initial maximum funding distributions around the state. To accomplish this task, Minnesota Housing analyzed foreclosure, real-estate-owned (REO), subprime, and delinquency data on a zip code basis and sheriff’s sales data on a county basis. The methodology is as follows: 1. Identify the 120 zip codes with the highest foreclosure/REO, subprime, and delinquency rates (problem loans per 100 households). 2. Initially, assign funds to the 120 high-need zip codes based on their number of foreclosures, delinquencies, and subprime loans, using the total funding level allocated to both the state and the five entitlement jurisdictions. 3. Adjust initial assignment to account for: o Rates of foreclosures, delinquencies, and subprime loans per 100 households (with a 20 percent cap). (The initial assignment in step 2 is based on the number of problem loans, not the rate per 100 households.) o Median family income level (with a 15 percent adjustment cap). o Median age of housing stock (with a 15 percent adjustment cap). 4. Assign funds to the 37 zip codes receiving more than $500,000 under the funding formula. 5. Do not assign but pool funds for the 83 zip codes that were to receive less than $500,000 under the funding formula; make pooled funds available in any one of the 23 highest-need counties on a competitive basis with separate pools for Greater Minnesota and the Twin Cities Metro Area. Thus, Minnesota Housing dropped the 83 zip codes and based the competition of the 23 high need counties. Communities in any one of the 23 high-need counties can compete for these funds. These competitive funds cannot be used in zip codes receiving funds under step 4. 6. Adjust the assignment in step 4 downward for the zip codes that fall in Anoka, Dakota, Hennepin counties and the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis to account for the funds that these localities will receive directly from HUD. 7. If funds are still available and not distributed to specific stabilization efforts after step 6, Minnesota Housing will supplement the allocations in steps 4 and 5 on a competitive basis. The NSP application will have a

Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

or upcoming monioring activities. Any balances remaining after the reimbursements are processed will be returned to Minnesota Housing for reallocation to other subrecipients. To date, the City is 99% expended, with only $19,506.46 remaining. The City has expended 28.48% to benefit low income households. It also has a revolving loan account for their contract for deed program.
Following closeout of Minnesota Housing's program, the City will maintain Program Income received through recapture and through its revolving loan account to revolve these funds in more eligible NSP activities. The City target area continues to include the same zip codes originally stated on the plan. The City has acquired, rehabbed, and resold 25 properties. Any funds remaining from administrative expenditures will be returned to Minnesota Housing for reallocation.

Faribault:
The City has sold its one remaining property to Habitat for Humanity, who will develop and resell this property to meet a national objective. The City is 118% expended with 56.9% of expenses dedicated to low-income housing. The City has no additional expenses related to the completion and close-out of properties but has remaining administrative expenses. The City will keep $6,710.83 for these administrative expenses. Any expenses remaining after the reimbursement of administrative expenses will be returned to Minnesota Housing for reallocation to other subrecipients. The City has completed and closed 5 properties. It has one property remaining to close. This property was sold to Habitat for Humanity who will develop and resell the property.

Hennepin:
The County is currently processing on their acquisition rehab activities. They completed all the homebuyer driven activities, which provided assistance directly to homebuyers in the purchase of foreclosed homes. To date, the City is 120% expended, with $1,039,388.70 of program funds and $418,396.47 of program income remaining. The City set aside 36.44% of funds for low-

income households. Following closeout of Minnesota Housing's program, the City will maintain Program Income received through recapture to revolve these funds into eligible NSP activities.
The City has primarily provided assistance directly to homebuyers for the acquisition of foreclosed homes. It also acquired, rehabbed, and resold four units for resale in the community. In total the city has processed 45 properties under its grant with Minnesota Housing. Any funds remaining will be returned to Minnesota Housing for reallocation to other subrecipients.

Minneapolis:
The City is currently processing its activities under the grant. Because most of their transactions only use NSP for gap purposes, not much program income has been generated. Their program includes land banking and demolition activities. Minneapolis will examine market conditions to determine whether to begin selling its land banked inventory this year. To date, the City is 102% expended, with $734,903.58 of program funds remaining. 44.07% is set aside to benefit low income households, 35.39% is expended. Following closeout of Minnesota Housing's program, the City will maintain Program Income received through recapture to revolve these funds into eligible NSP activities.
TheCity tart area cotnues toinlude thesame zipodes origially stat

Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

or stabilization efforts in any of the 23 highest-need counties. Minnesota Housing may use funds directly if such action is necessary to meet the 18 month timeline. 9. Limit funding to efforts that meet program goals, criteria, and requirements. The 120 highest-need zip codes (out of 872 statewide) each have a concentration of problems loans (foreclosures, delinquencies, and subprime loans) per 100 households that is at least 25 percent higher than the statewide concentration of problem loans. These 120 zip codes account for 57 percent of the state's loans in foreclosure or REO. After the assignment of maximum distributions is completed, Minnesota Housing will assign a maximum distribution to only 37 of these 120 zip codes. These 37 zip codes (which represent 4 percent of the state's 872 zip codes) account for 45 percent of the state's loans in foreclosure or REO. The 23 highest-need counties (out of 87 statewide) either rank in the top 19 in number of sheriff sales or in the top 19 in concentration of sheriff's sales per 100 households. Fifteen counties rank in the top 19 under both criteria, while 8 rank in the top 19 under one of the two criteria. The 19 counties with the highest concentration of sheriff sales each have at least as many sheriff's sales per 100 households as the overall statewide rate. Minnesota Housing has three goals for the NSP funding: 1) To maximize the revitalization and stabilization impact on neighborhoods; 2) To complement and coordinate with other federal, state and local investment in the targeted neighborhoods; 3) To preserve affordable housing opportunities in the targeted neighborhoods.

4-16-10: Enclosed is our revised action plan for your approval. April contract amendments representing deobligations and the reallocation of funds are being submitted today. The program continues to be fully budgeted and adjustments were made to individual activity budgets and unit counts as well.

Background: One of the unique requirements imposed under the NSP program is the obligation of 100% of program funds by September 20, 2010, 18 months from HUD's execution of Minnesota Housing's grant agreement. As part of subrecipient's contract with Minnesota Housing they were required to describe outcomes in terms of numbers of commitments entered into for acquiring, rehabilitating or demolishing properties within six months, nine months, and 12 months. Subrecipients evaluation of their progress/pace in meeting the projected numbers has been evaluated at regular intervals, with customer service staff assigned to help identify issues and help devise work out solutions. Other factors included in the evaluation was the subrecipient's strategy for obligating funds by the September deadline, their target area need, their program type, their ongoing capacity and developed expertise. Due to insufficient progress five subrecipients were recommended for deobligation. Also, five other subrecipients were selected to receive additional funds due to their high percentage of obligations reached and their continued need for NSP support: City of Buffalo, City of Elk River, City of Monticello-Otsego, City of Zimmerman, and $23 mllion was reallocated to the following five cities and counties:Anoka County, Scott County, City of Rochester, City of Duluth, and the City of Big Lake. The action plan modifications made hradestebugtcage

Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

of these 10 subrecipients.
June 21, 2009:

Enclosed is our latest submission of Action Plan changes. I am happy to report that our percentage obligated on the system is 63% of our total grant. Once we receive approval of these budget changes we will be able to post obligations that have been on hold. It is anticipated that our percentage obligated will increase to 71% after all postings are entered. Our low income percentage budget is 30.6% of the total grant and 60% of that total is obligated.
Measurements taken to increase obligations:
1) Approved activities to be conducted in the entire high need zip code.
In order to balance the interests of fully utilizing the NSP resources available to the state with the interests of maximizing neighborhood impact, Minnesota Housing authorized NSP subrecipients to expand the use of non-competitive funds to the entire high need zip code but continue to urge subrecipients to try to focus the use of the remaining funds in areas within the zip codes that are proximate to the existing smaller target areas they had previously outlined. This authorization is within the parameters of Minnesota Housing's Action Plan.
2) Provided a training webinar on April 22nd to our 21 subrecipients regarding the April 9th Federal notice on the new foreclosed and abandoned definitions.
3) Special meetings were conducted and communications were delivered .
St. Paul was notified during a meeting held on June 8th that they were behind in obligations by $800,000. Because of their slowness in obligating funds they are being required to obligate $2.2 million by July 1st to be in line with their schedules and projections previously provided. This will increase their current obligations from 53% to 88% (the 53% includes transactions not posted on the DRGR system yet, awaiting this Action Plan approval).
Other communications held with Dakota and Anoka evidence that the subrecipients are making much progress and obligations will be forthcoming shortly. We continue to stay in close contact with all our subrecipients and are currently awaiting more information updates from the City of Buffalo, the City of Big Lake, and the City of Zimmerman.
After this DRGR Action Plan is approved by HUD, the transactions placed on hold will be posted and our percentage of

obligations will increase to what we have actually received to date. Below are updates pending to be reflected in the system:
· Minneapolis – 74%
· Hennepin – 81%
· Ramsey – 82%;
· St. Paul–53.4%
· Zimmerman–65.5%
· Buffalo– 56.4%
· Monticello/Otsego–87%
4) Budget Amendments: The following Subrecipient's budgets were modified: Hennepin County, Monticello/Otsego, Zimmerman, Montgomery, St. Cloud, Buffalo, Princeton, Dakota County, Minneapolis, Isanti, St. Paul, Ramsey County, and Duluth. The reasons for these modifications are summarized as follow:
1) Some subrecipients merged their financing mechanism funds with their acquisition rehab funds. They will apply price discounts as needed by homebuyers on homes they have acquired and rehabbed instead of trying to provide a homebuyer driven activity that has been difficult to sell and or administrate. This is primarily evidencd wththCiyf S. PulanthHenep

Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

n County budget changes.

2) Financing mechanism funds for down payment assistance and rehab were merged primarily for down payment assistance use. Subrecipients with homebuyer driven activities are finding it faster to serve the needs for down payment assistance clients as they approach the deadline for obligations. This is primarily evidenced with the budget changes made for Isanti, Monticello/Otsego, Buffalo, and Zimmerman.
3) Several subrecipients have modified their budgets between activities due to the higher costs required to rehab or redevelop units. This is primarily evidenced with the budget changes made for Montgomery, St. Paul, Minneapolis, Princeton, Ramsey, Hennepin and Dakota. However, we have heard this as a consistent issue being experienced by all our subrecipients throughout the state.
4) Minneapolis, and Ramsey increased and or added the acquisition rehab rental activity to address the low income threshold requirement. Dakota is doing the opposite, for they have contracted with Habitat to address their homeownership units for the low income threshold requirement.
5) Other subrecipient budget changes were required to accommodate slight adjustments in costs and low income units as they are closed out. This is primarily evidenced through St. Cloud, Minneapolis, Hennepin, Princeton, Ramsey, and Duluth.
6) Unit count was for the most part a few more or a few less for each subrecipient, except for St. Paul who experienced a 60 drop count in units because of their move from buyer driven activities to acquisition rehab activities. The movement of $770,000 reserved for homebuyer assistance which originally was to serve 65 homebuyers, was transferred under the acquisition rehab activity to serve five more households. Although Minneapolis' unit count changed, they are still higher in unit count when compared to their original contract.
7) This last month we also processed a slight expansion in the target areas for St. Cloud and Minneapolis. Both requests approved are within the current parameters of our Action Plan.
2/26/2013 NSP1 Action Plan Summary:
The current status of our NSP1 grant is reviewed below.
The percentage obligated at this time is 121%
The percentage drawn as at this time is 113.6%.
Accomplishments this quarter are summarized below:

Confirming the National Objective:
NSP staff updated its closed out units in the action plan including the beneficiary information by March 15th. Although we have made some progress in the system, we still have a lot of posting to do, so I will explain these changes once the QPR is submitted. These updates will properly reflect the accomplishments of Minnesota Housing as it nears the end date of its NSP1 grant. There is still much data being reviewed and confirmed again and again with the subrecipients. Many of the budget changes below include an anticipated amount of funds being transferred primarily because once the project has closed it was confirmed that it was supposed to be listed under the LH activity or vice versa. Much more detail and supporting reports regarding this work will be provided prior to or on March 15th. The "other resources" data will be included some time in the next quarter.

Subrecipient developments:
Buffalo:
Budget amendments modified to accommodate thsaleof teirlasprojct.his r

Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

vised budget aims to reflect the reimbursements that will be posted on program income earned and expended on their last project. The admin category is increased to accommodate the 10% of program income earnings that are applicable to use on administrative expenditures.

Carver:
Budget amendments reflect program income earnings that were received and expended. This subrecipient has not completed its last sale, which should be going soon. More information regarding the status of this subrecipient will be provided in the upcoming QPR report.

Minneapolis:
Budget amendments were processed to accommodate program income funds recently transferred to Minneapolis from Carver County. The payments will be processed once the Action Plan is processed through HUD.

Big Lake:

Budget amendments were modified to reflect program income expenditures that the subrecipient had not reported. After the monitoring visit the subrecipient worked hard to catch up on their program income reporting which they submitted in December. The changes in these budgets reflect the accommodations to be made to process those transactions in DRGR once the Action Plan is processed by HUD.

St. Paul:
Multiple budget changes were addressed for St. Paul. Several changes resulting from the change in beneficiaries, but many changes are resulting from the increase in program income anticipated in the amount of $2,000,000. Many reimbursement requests are also pending process subject to the approval of this budget revision.

July 15, 2013 - Action Plan Modified:

Minnesota Housing sub granted the $ 38 million to 21 local units of government. 13 remain active. Subrecipients have earned $12 million in program income and anticipate approximately $5 million in program income by the program's closeout. Including program income, the grant's total is currently $55 million. All activities will continue to be funded in accordance with NSP funding guidelines and the targeting requirements described in this Action Plan.

The plan is amended to include administrative recommendations to be presented to Minnesota Housing's Board of Directors at the June 2013 board meeting. The administrative strategies in this Substantial Amendment will ensure the success of the grant, and improve the closeout timeline. Furthermore, the amended plan describes the methodology used to re-assess the areas of greatest need, and the proposed reallocation of funds and program income among the subrecipients who remain active under the grant.

Timelines:

The $38.8 million was granted in 2009. The program income has extended the end date of this grant for several years. Minnesota Housing has updated its NSP1 Timeline accordingly and will negotiate a closeout date with HUD 90 days before the actual closeout. And mail notice of the availability of the draft substantial amendment to the 2008 Action Plan and comment period is scheduled for May 30, 2013. The comment period is a 15 day period, ending June 14, 2013.

DISTRIBUTION ANUSES OF FUNDS – STATE NSP GOALS
Minnesota Housing has three goals for the NSP funding:
1)Tmaxiieheevtalztionnd stailizat

Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

on impact on neighborhoods;
2) To complement and coordinate with other federal, state and local investment in the targeted neighborhoods;
3) To preserve affordable housing opportunities in the targeted neighborhoods.

Administrative Strategies for Closeout
Minnesota Housing adds two goals to better focus the plan activities to secure a timely and successful closeout:
1) Expend all program funds.
2) Complete and closeout all properties invested with program funds.

Eligible Applicants
The program funds were sub granted to eligible applicants in March of 2009. See the 2008 Action Plan for additional information on eligible applicants under the plan. Of 21 awarded subrecipients, 13 remain active under the plan. They are: City of Minneapolis, City of St. Paul, City of Duluth, City of St. Cloud, City of Faribault, City of Rochester, City of Big Lake, City of Princeton, Hennepin County, Ramsey County, Dakota County, Anoka County, and Carver County.

The plan proposes reallocating program funds and program income among the subrecipients who will remain active under the grant's plan for years to come. NSP dollars will first be reallocated to subrecipients in need of more funds and second to subrecipients located in the high need target areas.

Table 3: NSP1 Eligible Uses
NSP Eligible Uses Correlated Eligible Activities From the CDBG Entitlement Regulations

(A) Establish financing mechanisms for purchase and redevelopment of foreclosed upon homes and residential properties, including such mechanisms as soft-seconds, loan loss reserves, and shared-equity loans for low- and moderate-income homebuyers. • As part of an activity delivery cost for an eligible activity as defined in 24 CFR 570.206.
• Also, the eligible activities listed below to the extent financing mechanisms are used to carry them out.

(B) Purchase and rehabilitate homes and residential properties that have been abandoned or foreclosed upon, in order to sell, rent, or redevelop such homes and properties. To be illustrated in DRGR as follows:
• B1 – for purposes of homeownership
• B2 – for purposes of rental
• 24 CFR 50.201() Acquisition, (b) Disposition, (i) Relocation, and (n) Direct homeownership assistance, including downpayment and closing cost assistance, mortgage interest rate reduction, lease/purchase, contract for deed (and as modified below);

• 24 CFR 570.202 eligible rehabilitation and preservation activities for homes and other residential properties.
• 24 CFR 570.203 Special economic development activities.

(C) Establish and operate land banks for homes and residential prpertis thathaveeen forelosed upon. Activity delivery costs for an eligible activity as defined in 24 CFR 570.206 and eligible activities defined below
• 24 CFR 570.201(a) Acquisition and (b) Disposition.

(D) Demolish blighted structures. CDBG eligible Activity • 24 CFR 570.201(a) Acquisition, (b) Disposition, and (d) Clearance for blighted structures only.

(E) Redevelop demolished or vacant properties as housing. To be illustrated in DRGR as follows
• E1 – for purposes of homeownership
Ativityelivryostforaneligble actvity asdefined

Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

in 24 CFR 570.206 and eligible activities defined below
• 24 CFR 570.201(a) Acquisition, (b) Disposition, (c) Public facilities and improvements, (e) Public services for housing counseling, but only to the extent that counseling beneficiaries are limited to prospective purchasers or tenants of the redeveloped properties, Relocation, and (n) Direct homeownership assistance (as modified below).
• 24 CFR 570.202 Eligible rehabilitation and preservation activities for demolished or vacant properties.
• 24 CFR 570.204 Community based development organizations.
• 24 CFR 570.203 Special economic development activities.

(F) Administration • 24 CFR 570.206
Big Lake:
The City will continue to utilize development partners who have participated in NSP1 activities to complete the last projects in their plan. To date the City is 116% expended. 28% of funds are set aside for lower income households, with 23% expended. The City will revolve program income as needed on the projects remaining. Once the last units are completed all excess program income will be returned to Minnesota Housing. The City target area continues to include the same zip codes originally stated on the plan. These are 55330, 55371, 55309, and 55398 The City has acquired 16 units, all single family homes of which eight were demolished with NSP resources. Redevelopment for homeownership purposes is planned for these last eight units to complete their program.. The subrecipient anticipates additional obligations of $ 265,000. With only $81,855.44 funds remaining, the subrecipient was identified as needing more funds to complete their projects. Additional program funds are being recommended for the successful completion of the program.
Carver:
The City currently has its last unit on the market. The sale of this unit is expected to generate $200,000 in program income. The City is 18% expended with 61.3% set aside for low-income households. The City's target area continues to include the same zip code originally stated on the action plan. The City has completed and closed 4 properties. It has one property remaining to sell. Program income generated from the sale of this project will be returned to Minnesota Housing for revolving to other subrecipients.

Dakota:
The County intends to develop the 3 land banked properties for resale within the next 3 years. A fourth land banked property will be sold to Habitat for Humanity for development in 2015. The County is 100% expended with 36.1% of expenditures dedicated to low-income houseolds.he Countwill kep its reaining funds to maintain and develop the four land banked properties. Upon the close of Minnesota Housing's program, Dakota will report any additional program income received directly to HUD. The County target area continues to include the same zip codes originally stated on the plan: 55024, 55075, 55044. The County has completed and closed 4 properties, and has met a temporary national objective by land banking an additional 4 properties. The Countintends to develop the 4 land banked properties by 2016.

Duluth:

The City just recently sold its last completed project. It is currently processing remaining reimursemenreqestsndis detmning aministraive expedítures

Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

d on the plan. Of 163 units, 47 are land banked and 59 are documented sold or rented. 43 land banked properties have met a temporary National Objective, leaving 57 units to be completed.

Cityf Princeton:

The City acquired, rehabbed, and resold 5 single family units. It acquired, demolished and land banked 1 unit. It also acquired and demolished 3 groups of 4 townhouse units with the intent to sell to a developer and redevelop a multifamily rental project of 16 units. The City continues to work with the options it has for the multifamily project. Lastly it has invested its last funds in two additional projects pending to be set up. The city has presented its case for land banking these units instead of redeveloping them right away. At this time Minnesota Housing has not classified them as land banks. Additional funds are being considered for Princeton to address the redevelopment of the Multifamily project and the two newly acquired blighted, foreclosed, and abandoned properties. To date, the City is 127% expended, with only $66,395.71 remaining. The City has set aside 61.86% to benefit low income households. This percentage is subject to the successful completion and rental of the 16 rental units. Of eight single family units acquired, the city has rehabbed and resold five. It demolished and land banked one, and is currently considering to land bank two additional units. The City recently advertised its RFP for the16 unity multifamily rental project, which did not generate interest. The City is pursuing additional options.

Ramsey:
The City is currently processing their acquisition rehab activities. They completed all the homebuyer driven activities, which provided assistance directly to homebuyers in the purchase of foreclosed homes. To date, the City is 183% expended, with $8,847.17 of program funds remaining. The City has set aside 44.58% of funds for low-income households and has expended has expended 33.5%. Following closeout of Minnesota Housing's program, the City will maintain Program Income received through recapture to revolve these funds into eligible NSP activities. The City target area continues to include the same zip codes originally stated on the plan. The City acquired, rehabbed, and resold units for resale in the community. In total the city has processed 20 properties under its grant with Minnesota Housing, and has four more remaining. It is anticipated that the City will require additional funds to complete the four properties remaining. Minnesota Housing will reallocate funds as neded.

Rochester:
The City has completed all its units and currently has its last three units on the market for sale. Any balances remaining after the sale of the last projects will be returned to Minnesota Housing for reallocation to other subrecipients. To date, the City is 219% expended, with $131,894.95 of program income remaining. 60.42% is set aside to benefit low income households and 43.87% is expended. Following closeout of Minnesota Housing's program, the City will maintain Program Income received through recapture to revolve these funds into eligible NSP activities.
The City target area continues to include the same zip codes originally stated on the plan. Of 28 propertiesonly 3 reman to be sod under teir acquistion, rehabprogram. A

Definitions and Descriptions:

. This subrecipient was not able to sell their last property to a low income buyer. The program income anticipated dollars were budgeted under the incorrect activity, so an adjustment was needed.

Ramsey: Staff adjusted program fund dollars and program income spent and anticipated dollars from each activity, accommodating budgets resulting from adjusted transactions after the first submission of 7.3 budget changes. The administration activity budget was slightly lowered. Staff then increased their program income budgets under the acquisition rehab rental activity and redevelopment single family activity. The acquisition rehab homeownership activity was slightly lowered also. It is most likely that the Ramsey program income anticipated is too high. We will follow up once we have resolved the monitoring questions outstanding.

Anoka: Saff shifted the program income funds from the demolition activity to the administrative budget as supported by the subrecipient expenditures and projected expenditures.
.
Faribault: Staff has shifted program income funds from the acquisition rehabilitation activity to the administrative activity to accommodate the program income expenditures and future expenditures.

Rochester: The program income anticipated amount was originally incorrect at $2.1 million. This amount was lowered to $600,000, but first we processed $185,396.51 in expenditures. In other words the original amount should have been closer to $800,000. At this time, staff has correctedhipated program income and has adjusted each budget accordingly to accommodate some program funds adjustments from the LH category to the non-LH category and program income expenditures.
Duluth: A neciiyapeduderDulutto beter dfineheir RLF loans. The RLF projects will be separated from their Land Trust projects. The $1 million program income anticipatedugedceto$206,500. Another activity was opened to distinguish the Contract-For-Deed transactions. Thiactiviy iscallethe Acquisin andRehab, HomeownershipCD CFDCNTY LH&ns;Beforete woriscomplted a fewmre adjtmens are needed to move transactions from the LH to non LH category.
Hennepin and Minneapolis: For these subrecipients, additional adjustments were completed on their program income anticipated budgets.
7.3 DRGR Release:

The program income accounts were properly classified for all subrecipientsexceptthee isorwork pending for Duluth, Big Lake, Ramsey, and Princeton. Regarding Duluth, we have a few more transaction adjustments to perform. Big Lake is calculating a better estimate of their program income anticipated number. Although we were hoping to get it incorporated this time, the information was not receivdintime.&ns;Ramsy&rsqu;snticipaed proram inome sems abit hig, soore dicussins arependig on tis.&m;nspPrincetohas soe fnal trnsactin adjusmets beore wean finalze ther budge.
&bp;
DRAWorm:
Th.3eleasempacted thforuas on or DRAW form&app;ap;nsp;Therefore, we reviseour DAW fom toleallthebugets.&ampsThe DAW form continues toa relibtoofoor councaion whheubriientsand te trackig ofall three budgts, i.e

Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

y funds remaining will be returned to Minnesota Housing for reallocation to other subrecipients.

St. Cloud:

The City just recently sold its last completed project. It is currently processing remaining reimbursement requests and is determining administrative expenditures for upcoming monitoring activities. Any balances remaining after the reimbursements are processed will be returned to Minnesota Housing for reallocation to other subrecipients. To date, the City is 104% expended, with only $19,770.52 of program funds and $10,282.90 of program income remaining. The City has expended 37.49% to benefit low income households. Following closeout of Minnesota Housing's program, the City will maintain Program Income received through recapture to revolve these funds into eligible NSP activities. The City target area continues to include the same zip codes originally stated on the plan. The City has primarily provided assistance directly to homebuyers for the acquisition of foreclosed homes. It also acquired, rehabbed, and resold four units for resale in the community. In total the city has processed 45 properties under its grant with Minnesota Housing. Any funds remaining from will be returned to Minnesota Housing for reallocation to other subrecipients.

St. Paul:
The City is currently processing its activities under the grant. Because most of their transactions only use NSP for gap purposes, not much program income has been generated. Their program includes land banking and demolition activities. The City will examine market conditions to determine whether to begin selling its land banked inventory this year. To date, the City is 104% expended, with $520,683.33 of program funds remaining. 52.77% is set aside to benefit low income households and 46.12% is expended. Following closeout of Minnesota Housing's program, the City will maintain Program Income received through recapture to revolve these funds into eligible NSP activities. The City target area continues to include the same zip codes originally stated on the plan. Of 64 units, 15 are land banked and 24 are documented sold or rented. 12 land banked properties have met a temporary National Objective. Currently St Paul has to complete 25 units. Minnesota Housing anticipates additional funds to be reallocated to the City to assist in the completion of units remaining.

OCTOBER 23, 2013

Following the extension, Subrecipient budgets were adjusted to more accurately reflect the funds that are available to successfully complete current properties, and for some Subrecipients, to start new properties. Subrecipients with pending properties were asked to estimate the program income they anticipated they will receive upon the closeout of each pending property. Based on these reports, Subrecipients activity budgets, and therefore overall budgets, were adjusted to reflect the new anticipated program income. Many Subrecipient budgets were reduced due to a decrease in anticipated program income. The goal in doing this is to ensure enough flexibility to complete properties while not inflating anticipated program income that a Subrecipient may not actually earn.
Subrecipients have continue tprogress in teir progams
Dkota CountyThe County povided cens

Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

s tract block group data to demonstrate that its land banks meet an area benefit national object. Upon review of the DRGR data, Minnesota Housing and the County are questioning whether the DRGR area benefit data provided include households up to 120% area median income (low/mod/middle income) or only up to 80% area median income (low/mod income). Further guidance from HUD will be appreciated. The County is 101.6% expended and has set aside 31.37% of its total funds for low-income households. The County has $18,127.37 in program funds and $124,202.22 in program income remaining. It will keep its remaining funds for the maintenance and future development of its four land banks.
Hennepin County: The County set up two new eligible use E multifamily redevelopment activities. Under this activity, the County set up the Crest, a multifamily project in Brooklyn Center. The County has proposed a total of 36 units, with 33 units targeted to low-income households. The Crest will be supported with Minnesota Housing NSP1 and NSP3 funds. The County is 127.25% expended and has set aside 28.59% of total funds for low-income households. It has $1,039,388.70 in program funds and $167,678.21 in program income remaining
Isanti: The City recaptured $4,625.13 from the resale of a property for which it provided down payment assistance in June 2010. The recapture amount is based on a 60 month forgivable loan, for which $7,874.87 was forgiven at the time of the resale of the property in August 2013. The $4,625.13 in program income received from recapture was reallocated to Ramsey County per the NSP1 extension.
Minneapolis: Minnesota Housing required the City to complete a report on all closed out properties to more accurately assess the City's progress. As suspected, the City has closed out more properties than it had previously reported. The City has closed out 158 units, including 48 land banks. The City is 101.94% expended and has set aside 33.8% of its total funds for low-income households. It has $734,903.58 in program funds and $0.00 in program income remaining.
Princeton: Minnesota Housing staff conferenced with the City and its technical assistance provider to discuss the progress of its pending projects, including the multifamily project. The City is seeking out additional financing for the project. Minnesota Housing also discussed alternative disposition options which the City will look into and consider. The City has completed the assessment of the gas station property, which it has not yet acquired, and found a number of environmental issues including asbestos and lead in the building. The City will need to develop a construction contingency plan before moving forward with acquisition and demolition of the project. The City is currently 126.5% expended and has set aside 56.3% of its total funds for low-income households. It has $729,254 in program funds and $16,000 in program income remaining.
Ramsey County: The County has completed 22 of 25 units. One of the remaining properties is currently on the market for sale and the other is a duplex that is under construction. The County is 206.8% expended and has set aside 35.04% of its total funds for low-income households. It has $8,846.17 in program funds and $4,625.13 in program income remaining. Minnesota Housing will provide additional funding as available through reallocation from other Subrecipientsto support the County incompleting theduplex.

Distribution and and Uses of Funds:

Rochester: Since the last report, the City of Rochester has closed out two of the three remaining properties, and the final property is scheduled to close on October 25, 2013. The City has $11,870.21 in program income and $1 in program funds remaining. Remaining funds will be returned to Minnesota Housing and reallocated to other subrecipients per the extension agreement.

St. Paul: The City has completed 53 of 64 units, including 14 land banks. The City is 107.9% expended and has set aside 41.83% of its total funds for low-income households. The City has $454,106.80 in program funds and $0.00 in program income remaining.

Definitions and Descriptions:

NSP1 Action Plan Updates 4-22-2013
Confirming the National Objective:
The following modifications were made to the Action Plan projected count.
City of Monticello/Otsego: The count was changed from 17 to 16. All units are complete and occupied by a household, homeowner.
City of Princeton: The land bank count was changed from 1 housing unit to zero housing units and the number of properties remained the same, equal to one.
Land Bank census track and blocks were modified from the original posting completed in March of this year. Staff entered the more detailed information for each subrecipient for this report for the City of Princeton, Dakota County, the City of St. Paul, and the City of Minneapolis. At this time, the City of Princeton and Dakota County's low income beneficiary percentage of people served is falling slightly below the 51% required to meet the temporary national objective for these land banked properties. The requirement is for at least 51% of the residents served to have incomes at or below 120% of median income. NSP staff will look into this issue to determine why some of the census information shown in DRGR didn't reflect a percentage higher than 51%.
Budget amendments:
Minneapolis:
Modified its budgets as a result of adjustments made to transfer projects from the low income activity to a non-low income activity and vice-versa.
Other budget changes:
The following budgets were modified to accommodate deficiencies due to reimbursement requests processed or program income expenditures processed. The subrecipients with modified budgets are: Rochester, Duluth, Ramsey, Hennepin, and St. Paul.

Subrecipient developments:

Princeton:
Princeton published an RFP for the multifamily project with no success. At this time Minnesota Housing is reviewing its options. NSP staff has been reviewing the possibility of other funding to assist this project in addition to NSP funding, but at this time we must regroup considering this new information. The City will be in contact with NSP staff this week to disclose what they have discovered as reasons why they did not receive an application.
Big Lake:
The City is currently developing an agreement with new developers for the eight projects remaining. At this time, we believe they will need additional monies to complete these projects even with the program income they will receive on these units. NSP staff will be reviewing their estimates as soon as ready.
Minnesota Housing staff is pending to receive the answers to a questionnaire sent to its subrecipients on April 25th which will provide more detailed information on all projects remaining. After this information is analyzed, it will assist staff in making recommendations on how to move forward during this middle period prior to the close out of the grant. These recommendations will be discussed with the subrecipients, HUD's field manager John Swanson, and with Minnesota Housing's Board prior to its implementation July 1st.

NSP1 Action Plan Updates: 7-14-2012

Enclosed is our latest submission of Action Plan changes. We conto make obligation and expenditure progress. As of today our percentage obligated is 119.1%. Our totalo

Definitions and Descriptions:

he progress of our subrecipients, especially those that have fallen behind in the development or sale of projects, and the recycling of program income. During the last few months, staff performed the following activities that impact this action plan and others to be processed in the future.
Program income not being recycled in a timely manner was recalled by Minnesota Housing and is in the process of being recycled to other subrecipients who can expedite the re-use on eligible NSP activities. Three subrecipients will return their program income. Although, Minnesota Housing staff is requesting the return of this program income, it is to be noted that these subrecipients, Montgomery, Big Lake, and Carver, have successfully completed all the activities and projects originally in their plan.
1) Big Lake has seven projects demolished, one more pending to be demolished, and two acq rehabs pending to be resold. After many conversations to help them, it became clear that close assistance was very much needed. Therefore, Minnesota Housing staff has asked for HUD-TA Assistance. This was approved just recently and the appointed TA Assistant has contacted Big Lake to begin the work at hand in helping them move forward.
2) Princeton has also been in conversations with Minnesota Housing NSP staff regarding different options to finish expending their $67,000 remaining. At this time, they are examining two blighted projects, one to be either sold or donated to Habitat for the rehab and re-sale to a low income household. The other is a blighted project next door for which they would like to donate to the future householder of the Habitat home. Much TA has been provided to help them progress. However, another issue was just recently learned. The contract with Central Minnesota Housing Partnership (CMHP) to acquire and rehab the last critical NSP project (multifamily low income rental) was cancelled due to the decision to not submit a tax credit application to Minnesota Housing this year, since last year's application was rejected. With the loss of Princeton's administrator much assistance has been required. Therefore, Minnesota Housing staff has asked for HUD-TA Assistance for Princeton. This was approved just recently and the appointed TA Assistant has contacted Princeton to begin the work at hand in helping them move forward. This multifamily project was originally targeted to generate 16 units of low income rentals.
3) Montgomery: This subrecipient has recently returned their program income earned, not expended.
4) Buffalo: This subrecipient has just placed under contract their last project. After this sale, they are interested in relinquishing their program income. Therefore, this income will be recycled by Minnesota Housing when received.
5) Carver: Minnesota Housing is waiting for the receipt of the last program income earned, not expended. The recycling will be

processed accordingly.Unompleted a series budget changes.   The following subrecipients modified their budgets. Included also are some of the next steps.
1) Montgomery: This subrecipient retundteprogram icomeretdtadnor-
sd.ns;Mngmeyaqieadrhbetrjet.ns;Drntirdherpormdrcoreie.&a;pbs;Wttechneisaf, they undewnsmcaaiyssewihloedonterctvte.npOtpotweerha

Definitions and Descriptions:

bed, their resale in the market became the hardest challenge. At this time they successfully sold the projects and have completed their activities. The return of their net program income in the amount of $177,520 is being recycled immediately to the subrecipient next in line for the processing of payments.
2) Minneapolis: This subrecipient received the full amount of program income returned by Montgomery. The budgets have been modified to accommodate additional obligations that were pending for many projects. After all payments are put through the system, Minneapolis will show that they have expended all their program income, including the new program income passed to them from Montgomery. Therefore, their budgets will reflect an increase in their anticipated program income in the amount of $100,000. Additionally, after the submission of multiple close-out documents, budgets were modified to accommodate projects that changed from low income to non-low income and vice versa.
3) Duluth: The budget was amended to accommodate the shift of one project to the low income household category. Now that the RLF account is properly classified in the system, in the next few days it should reflect the accumulated program income earned under this activity, approximately $31,000.
4) St. Cloud: This subrecipient has made some adjustments to their budgets to accommodate the shift of three projects to the low income category and one project to non low income category.
5) Princeton: This subrecipient has changed some of their budgets to accommodate the changes in their activities. The monies remaining have been positioned where expenditures are anticipated. Minnesota Housing will await the progress reports from the HUD-TA activities and subrecipient future check-in calls to learn of next steps.
Future updates to DRGR:
The following work is pending additional HUD policy guidance:
1) Separate the household count to reflect how many households are 50%, 80%, and 120% earners. At this time the DRGR system is only reflecting the household count with incomes up to 50% and the household count with incomes greater than 50% and up to 120%. According to DRGR trainers, Minnesota Housing NSP staff should wait for further HUD Policy guidance before project is started.
2) Separate the disposition costs from the acquisition costs. According to DRGR trainers, Minnesota Housing NSP staff should wait for further HUD Policy guidance before the project is started.
3) Update our Census track screens.
4) Add the property address to all activities impacted by the same address. This means adding the address more than once in many instances. Minnesota Housing staff is awaiting further guidance on this.
5) Performthe GEO coe validtoprcs.Aewfaueadewtte.3reease.
6) Update certain posting statuses to show completed. Also, show as deleted or closed activities that we are sure will not be used again by subrecipients.
NSP1 - Action Plan Modifications:
une26202</gtEncloeds oulaessubisioofAcioPnane≈np;e cntnutomae
oligioandexenitreprgrss&spAsfdayourperenagobigteis11.3.&sOtlxpeditrehaeeachd07.1.&m;bp;dditional updaesonourprgreswile
deiveedwitthJunendofquarerreor.</gt<&g;/p&at&l;am;g;Underthi

Definitions and Descriptions:

action plan, we completed several budget changes and completed a thorough update of our projected and actual unit count numbers. Our initial Action Plan projected count was incorrect for several reasons. The guidance received in early 2009 was to count the project under each activity it touched. This guidance was changed in 2010, when staff learned that the project could only be counted under the main activity, and not the string of other activities that it impacted.
The resulting total shows that Minnesota Housing’s NSP1 program is targeted to generate 543 units. This does not include projected units of anticipated program income. The 543 units are the total units obligated to date under the program. It is unclear whether HUD wants grantees to illustrate a projected count that includes the anticipated program income listed under each subrecipient, therefore, the updates did not include this count. Of this total 299 units are currently meeting a National Objective. This includes the land bank count. 24 more units from the City of Minneapolis will be posted this week, prior to the end of this quarter, as units closed and meeting a National Objective. This will bring our total units closed and sold, including land banks to 323 for the end of this quarter. An additional 19 units are closed and sold in the City of St. Paul, but Minnesota Housing is awaiting the documentation before they are posted in DRGR. It is likely that it will not be received before the end of this quarter. Including the St. Paul properties the program has closed and sold 342 units. The updates performed in DRGR included the following modifications:
·   Deleted the demolition count when it was associated with another activity, such as acquisition or redevelopment, therefore counting the unit only once.
·   If the costs were split between two activities such as homeownership assistance and additional rehab for homebuyer driven units, staff deleted the count under the rehab assistance, counting the unit only once.
·   If the costs were split between two designated rehab labels, it was also deleted under one activity and counted only once.
·   All land bank units were modified on the Action Plan to be counted as one property. Therefore, deleted the count of housing units under land bank, since it is unknown how many units will be generated once the project is moved out the land bank. At that time, staff will receive a change in use and the project will be categorized and counted under a rehabor redevlopment
acivty&ns;ltougwerietoenerthegegrahiinfrmaionundr the land bank to show the area benefit, DRGR created an error message. Therefore, staff did not enter the census date information at this ttaff will discuss this issue at the DRGR training in July to determine what to dto
rmedythi.∓iddot nbsp nbs;&nb;&np;&sp&p;;Stfftesomeissus wenpdatig te Acualumerswheretheownr iforatin ws dffilto mainainfer te
fat.&sp;hisssuewilalsobeddresedatheDRGRtrng./p&;Staffas reisied itintrnalros foposing Actual accomlismens anhasmadeevisinso
itsrocessohat te inormaton inDRGconiueoetniblancewih the inforatio

Definitions and Descriptions:

that is kept and maintained outside of DRGR in the internal files of the department.
In this Action Plan we amended the budgets for Princeton, Duluth, Rochester, Ramsey, Faribault and Minneapolis. In all cases, we transferred funds from low income accounts to non-low income accounts together with the program income anticipated proportions under those activities. The 7.3 release did make things easier because staff can adjust these balances now, when it was not possible before the release. However, there will continue to be adjustments to the budgets as needed when projects are found to be listed in the wrong activity.
Upcoming changes:
1) Possible changes to the Big Lake program. We are currently reviewing a proposal from Big Lake that requests we allow the land banking of eight projects.
2) St. Paul is undergoing critical staff turnover. Their NSP1 manager since the beginning of the program is retiring. Staff has met with their staff to better understand how the program will be managed going forward.
3) Princeton is awaiting the review of an RFP application entered by one of the buyers of their project, intended to generate 16 low income rental units. The purchase of the project is subject to the approval of the tax credit application.
4) Buffalo, Montgomery, and Carver will be returning their program income to Minnesota Housing.
See attached data report from DRGR – tally of unit count.

4/24/2012 - NSP1 Action Plan Report:
The action plan submitted today includes the following modifications:
1. The Hennepin project was divided into two projects to enable the revolving of program income in accordance with the local subrecipient agreement held by Hennepin with the City of Richfield.
2. The City of Duluth was divided into two projects to enable the revolving of the RLF account program income to only revolve within the RLF account.
3. The program income anticipated for Big Lake was corrected. It is now more realistic of what they will receive.
All changes were related to the 7.3 Release. No other changes were processed.

4/10/2012 – NSP1 Action Plan Report:
Brief Update:
Below is a summary of our NSP1 grant modifications completed during the last few weeks. Our progressnumbersare as
follo:</gt;&t;>/p&gt/p&;</&t;
he prcenagebligated as of April 9thequals 116.6% (including program income drawn).
Staff is pleased to report that Minnesota Housinhasxceded00% expenditures for their NSP1 gat&ma;sp;The percentage drawn as of April 9theqals 10.4%.
˙strong>Moificaions icrported inhe pa:&nb;
&nb;
Mst othebdgetsave ben corectedueto te flexbiliy beefitof te 7.Relese.&s;Witout theanticpaed prgramncomeugete woulhaveot ben ableto mke may ofthchangs speifiednirort.&bsp;&nbs;&sp; </&gt
p&t;Budgets chnged/p&gt</>/p>
&lt&g;nbsp;
&l;&gMontgomer:ampns;Sfhd alusromtheH activtyo the non-LHctivit

Definitions and Descriptions:

, program funds, program income earned and spent, and program income anticipated. These were sent out again last week incorporating the changes made to DRGR.

Additional information:

In the next two months, a couple of our subrecipients will face the de-obligation of their program income remaining. Minnesota Housing has made the determination that it is best to move the program income where it is needed and where it can be spent faster. Therefore, a couple subrecipients have been notified of our intent to take back their program income and reallocate those funds to other subrecipients that can spend the funds immediately. The two subrecipients considered hae completed their target number of homes, which means that for the most part they were in compliance with the NSP requirements. The only issue being experienced was the slowness in using their program income.

Big Lake has been in communication with Minnesota Housing staff for several months since they lost their key staff administrator last year. We continue to be in contact with them regarding the projects that are currently demolished pending rehabilitation. It is probable that a change in use may be requested due to the saturated foreclosure market. There appears to be some concern as to the ability to sell the homes once they are built. NSP staff will continue to connect with Big Lakstfftpoie guidance as needed.

Princeton has written an agreement with a non-profit developer in the region interested in developing one of their projects into a multifamily rental for low income households. his agreemnt is subject to the approvaoax crit appcinwtMinnsotaHousin. he appicatiofailed in last year’s round, but they will submit again this year. We will awat thoutomths apliatiobefore we know what course Princeton will take on this project. On another note, Princeton is considering sendig the lat dolars oftheir grantoddrss a bighted home that is vcant anhas beena nisnce in teeighborood.nbsp;Mre informaiowill beaailabe in the near future.

The Montgomery home that had been on the market for a very long time, has just sold. We are still working to see whether the Buffalo home has sold or not. Intensive TA was provided.

Technical issues with the new format:

1) Some of the reports are not printing correctly. We have submitted two report issues to the HUD Headquarters help desk and those matters are being investigated. At this time, we have not seen the correction put through.

October 27, 2011
Enclosed is our latest submission of Action Plan chang.&nbp; Wcotinueo make oligaion andxpenditue progrss.&nbp;As of toay ourpercentge oblgated i110.9%nbsp;ofoural grat, includng progrm inome dran. Ourotalexpendtures hae reached91.8%.&bsp;Once aain wearsubmtting bdget changes for a fewubrecipiens. We did&rsuo;t adjust Montmeryrsquo;sudget this tme, deo DRGR liitatios.sFor Montgomer, one otheirrojectsiaoinomhouseod ad thother isap;suo;t.nbsp; At this time we hvebothndertheloincomhoueholdciviy.&bs; Forttely temoies peding tbe adjustd arenot substantialso it re

Acquisition and Relocation:

cipients in March of 2009. $3.8 million of the NSP funds granted to Minnesota Housing were allocated to administration and planning. An additional 10% of earned program income may be used for administrative expenditures.
Nearly $35 million of the funds and $12 million generated in program income is dedicated for projects. Based on the expected average per unit cost to NSP of $50,000, Minnesota Housing anticipates that up to 700 units will be assisted. Of those 700 units, at least 194 units will be available for households at or below 50% AMI. This estimate assumes that all of the $35 million will be used for value and affordability gap assistance. If funds are used for other purposes, such as loans or land banking, the number of units will be lower.

Definitions and Descriptions:

lly doesn't impact the big picture of the low income household percentage.
In this Action Plan we amended the budgets for four subrecipients. They are St. Cloud, Princeton, Dakota County, and Anoka County. The changes were made for various reasons. I am listing them below:
1) St. Cloud - Moved residual funds remaining in the amount of $4,906.64 to the financing mechanism activity so they can provide buyer-driven assistance to one or two more buyers in their target area.
2) Princeton –earranging funds in accordance with monies expended under each activity. We anticipate another minor shift of funds, most likely next month, once we process the remaining Close out documents.
3) Dakota County – approved the change from a B2 Activity to a B1 Activity for project 1008 Livingston. We are changing it from Acquisition Rehab Rental LH to Acquisition Rehab Homeownership, non-LH.
4) Anoka – rearranging funds in accordance with monies expended under each activity.
We anticipate the need for more Action Plan changes in the future to accommodate adjustments and the shifting of funds frm thLHateory(bneiting low income households) to the non-LH category (benefiting 120% middle income households) or vice versa as properties are resold in the market. We have found that a few subrecipients have changed the beneficiary at the last minute. Wnormally do't learn about these chagesnithehve snt theiCoseutdocuetto us.nbsp;At thistime were stratgizingn how to learn about these changes early on befre thy actallyelle huse.nbspWe curently are receiving some input from a few subrecipients that marketing on certain projects is not going well. Therefore, we will be brainstorming wth thm to detemine wether oher alternatieshouldbe consdered. This mighlead toore changesfromthehomeownerhipactivityto threntalctivity in te fture
<gt;

July 15, 2010
Enclosed is our latest submission of Action Plan changs. I ahappy trepot tat our percentage obligated on the system is 74% of our total grant, including program income drawn it equals 77%. Once we receive approval of these budget changes we will be able to post obligations and expenditures that are expected submitted through the end of this week which should substantially improve the numbers of three highest awardees, Minneapolis, St. Paul and Hennepin. Our three top suitments of our NSP dollars, with the exception of some contracts still pending to be signed by St. Paul later this month and some rehab bids that are pendingswell. t is anicipatedhat oupercentagobligatedwill incease sustatially fothe Julmonth en. &nsp;&bsp;/p>/>Measurementsaken to inreaseobligatins: </&g;</></>1) &nbp &bsp&nbp;nbsp;&nbp; Thisonth we havesent leterso allur subrecipients to ntfy thm of theipercentage obigated2)   &m;am;sp;nbsp; &nbp;&nsp;&bsp;Wealso ha ononne with eh aso theunds remanntobigate tgage the status of eachbligatonendingnd undetand ife needto recomed aeobliatin of funtoreallcattosubrecipent thacan use itmmediatly.
In seaking wit

Definitions and Descriptions:

each one we have discovered that they were behind in their posting but not behind in obligating the funds. Therefore, we have required them to submit their paper work by July 16th to ensure that our numbers are updated for when we submit our QPR report.
At this time, we are feeling confident that the funds will be obligated as needed. We will be addressing any shortfalls with Management next week to determine if any deobligation is necessary, although, at this timewe don't see any. We will know better once the documentation is received this week.
6 budget amendment requests were processed. The following subrecipient budgets were modified: Monticello/Otsego, Zimmerman, Buffalo, Princeton, St. Paul. The reasons for these modifications are summarized as follow:
1) Financing mechanism funds for down payment assistance and rehab were merged primarily for down payment assistance use. Subrecipients with homebuyer driven activities are are adjusting their final dollars to be available only for down payment as we are getting closer to the obligation deadline of September 20th. Thiss primrilyevidncewitthe budget changes made for Monticello/Otsego, Buffalo, and Zimmerman.

2) Several subrecipients have modified their budgets between activities due to the higher costs required to rehab or redevelop units. This is pimarily evidenced with the budgt chans mae for. Paul.nbsp;FurhermoreS. Pul islocaing mainenanceand delier costshich theyad not prviously conted oobligaing ths eal,butith HU&rsqu;sew guidance they moved forward on this opportunity.
3) Other subrecipient budget changes were required to accommodate slight adjustents.&bsp;&nsp;Our lowncome householdpercntageas adjustd accordingly for eachubrecipientand confirmeto met threquiremens ofntract.&nspChanges tunit counts wre nt experiendin this round of changes.
8-26-10
<>Enclosedre thectioPlan changes for the month of August. We are happy to report that we have reached 94.6% in NSP program funds obligated. This amount when added to the program income drawn is 97.6% in total obligations. After these changes our low income budget is 33.43% of the total grant amount, with 13.78 percent expended out of the total grant budget, which translatest4%olwicmfndepndd&ml/&mapt&ml/&m;pt
Most of our subrecipients are nearing or have reached 100% in obligations. This month we have received a significant amount of transactions as we approach the September 20th deadline. Those that have reaced100% ae:&bs; Minnapolis, StPaul, Hnnepin, Ramey, Scott,nd Carver.nbsp; Iftheystem doesot show thm at the 10% markt is due tthe fal astmets pending this acton plan.&nbp;Our recors show tt Aoipending three rehbids to becompeteloblgated andDakota is awaiting thanswer on ther final obliatin whch will have a demolitiobias wel. Thfollowing subreipientsin te Greater Minnesotaareaavahed the 100% mark:ochestr, StCloudIsati, Moniello/Osego,Zimmerman,nFaribalt.&nbs; Big Laehasfinalacquisiton in progress, and so doePrinceton&bsp;uffalo isiishing uptheir lst obligtioand Dluth iworkng with thNtionl ComunitStabiization Trst on thobligation oftheir lat acquisition. Rasey's

Definitions and Descriptions:

budget still needs another adjustment, for all the adjustments could not be accommodated through this action plan.
Although we have completed 14 budget modifications, we anticipate the need to do one more adjustment to the budgets in early September. Subrecipient budgets modified are St. Paul, Hennein, Minneapolis, Ramsey, Anoka, Carver, Faribault, St. Cloud, Buffalo, Isanti, Zimmerman, Princeton, and Big Lake.
The Action Plan contains the following changes for this month:
· The shifting of properties to benefit the low income household versus the middle (120%) income household. Some of these shifts are known, while some are still projections for what is expected in the future based on the total development costs and anticipated future price of the home. Several subrecipients such as St. Cloud, Zimmerman, Buffalo, Isanti, and Hennepin have homebuyer driven programs and therefore have been able to confirm sooner wheher thbenefitng hoseholis alow icome or middle income household. Other subrecipients such as Duluth, Rochester, and Scott have community land trust properties or rental properties where they can confirm this information sooner as well. The rest of the subrecipients continue to confirm this informaion at theime the property is re-sold to thhomebuye s werecive proprty closeoutswe thn fce te challee ofhifting fuds witha budgethat is a100ornearingt./p>
p&m;t;&iddt;&nbs As subrecipients determine the rehab bids on their last properties these may be slightly different than projected which will ultimately have an impact on the buget totls.&nbsShiftings necessary to exctlyllocatehe funds uner each activity. /p>
p>As surecipiets gefuteacive wih thepropertiesinreparation fr rehab or redeelopmnt, some haeund that the best option for the neighborhood and their program is to landbank thepropety.nbsp;Some have been in certain locations where there is major construction of the light rail or other impeding factors that make it difficult to resell the property right after its rehabilitation.   This and other reasons resulting from due diligence work has caused subrecipients to switch the project from its original activity to another mreappopiae atiit,uchasromednnmanbakigo rehab or from rehab to redevelopment or from demolition to non-demolition-rehabilitation. The budgets are therefore impacted.
September 14, 2010
Enclosed is our latest submission of Action Plan changes. We continue to make progressinur obligtions&bsp;As of todayour percetage obligatd is 102%&nbp;of outotal grat, inluding progrm income drwn. Oce againe are submiting budet cagehat wil accommodate transations pendinsubission.&nbp; Oncwrceivyurpproval we will procsshose transationsimmedately &nbp;Our low income bdget is at 33.4% of the totalrat aount, with 14.24% expended fom te totalrant budget,nbsp;which transltes to 4.5% epended from the totalow incomusudet.
In this ActionPlan weamendethe budet fosix subrciients.&bs; They are:arvr, Big Lke, Bufflo, PrinctonRmse, and Dkota.&nbs; The changes completedwere priarilto addrss obligatinsfinalizedith thesesubrecipints.nbsp; Wanticipte theneed for moe Ation Panhanges ithe futre to accomodate adjstments and theshiftingf funds from the LHcategory (be

Definitions and Descriptions:

efiting low income households) to the non-LH category (benefiting 120% middle income households) or vice versa as properties are resold in the market. Additionally, the last few dllars obligated could also warrant the need for yet another contract amendment. We don't expect any budget changes caused by the movement of a project from one activity to another.   The reason we have seen this before is because a detailed due diligence on the project has driven a different strategy for that project. Exceptions to this could be corrections to posting mistakes, or movements resulting from program income used.
Below is a brief overview of some of the information we are beginning to review, now that we are approaching September 20th.   Given the fact that our project and unit count is incorrect on DRGR because of the orignal insructionseceived(add te proprty adress to each new activity expended under that property); we are providing an estimate count that we maintain in another data base at the agency.
· Our subrecipients have invested in 466 properties, translatedto a count o510 units.
· &bsp;&am;nsp;amp;nbs;nbsp;&nbs; &bs; Thmediapropertyurhase pice is $68,00 (sub-ecipient aquisition anhomebuyedrivetrnsctionswith doaymentassitance).nsp;
o High of $238,000 (a multifamily lot of 12 units in Princeton), to be demolished, resold, and redeveloped to a 16 unit multifamily rental.
o Low of $1
&midot;nsp; &nsp; &nsp;&nsp;&sp; The median discount i4%.·&nbp;&nsp &nsp nbsp; The aveage discount is1% (a lt higher becusef99.999% discount on properties bought for $1)./p>
<>With the DRGR 7.0 release provided last week, Minnesota Housing staff hopes to be able to correct the cumulative property and unit counts across activities.

Thank you for your review of our Action Plan changes this month.

January 24, 2010
Enclosed is our latest subisson oActonlan cangs.&bspThisis oufirstsubissiceheptm20h oligaeadne≈m;spThechages submitted today will correct budgets to accommodate some of those residual amounts remaining under each activity, further adjust for last obligations posted, accommodate the shifting of funds from the LH category (benefiting low income households) to the non-LH category (benefiing20% middleincme husehols) or vice vrsa as proerties were rsold in the mrket, anaddress minr postng errors.&nbp; Lastl, some adjusments to te budgets werbecausef the displacement of program funds caused by the useof program income.
Subrecipients continue to make progressin their grant activities. As of today our percentage obligated is 106% of our totalgrant, including program income drawn. The total expended is 51% ofthe grant,not including program income. Expendituresincluding program income equal 54% percent. Ourlow income budget is at 33.42%of the totalgrantamount.
In this Action Plan amendment eightbudgets were revised. Changessubmitted were for the Cityof Monticello/Otsego,the City of St.Paul, the City ofSt. Cloud, the Cityof Duluth, theCity of Rochester,Ramsey County, Anoka County, and ScottCounty. Below is a briefoverview of th

Definitions and Descriptions:

e changes submitted for each subrecipient.
1) Anoka County: Some minor adjustments were made to adjust the budgets in accordance with last transactions posted on September 20th. Changes also reflect an increase in the LH budget and a slight increase in the demolition budget.
2) Scott County: Their admin budget was adjusted downward to accommodate one more property. Changes also reflect a shift in funds from the LH budget to the non-LH budget.
3) Ramsey County: The subrecipient has begun revolving their program income and therefore changes in the budget reflect this impact accordingly. Funds show an increase in their LH budget and a decrease in their redevelopment activity.
4) Monticello/Otsego: Changes reflect a slight decrease in their LH budget therefore shifting funds to the non-LH budget.
5) St. Paul: Changes reflect the movement of $13,100 posted in error under the redevelopmentbudget and therefore, moved to the B1 AcquisitionRehabbudget.
6) St.Cloud: Changes reflectminor adjustments toseveral budget activitiesasa resultof the last obligationsmade before September 20th. All were concentrated in the homebuyer driven activities.
7) Duluth: Changes reflect a slight decrease to the LH budget, required to correctlyposttheir last obligation prior toSeptember20th.
8) Rochester: The subrecipienthas revolvedasignificant amount of program income andtherefore thedisplacement of program funds has been adjusted accordingly under the activities where it is needed.
One of the budgets, Washington County, remained unchanged. Our research shows that they have not obligated $1,687.07. We will need to provide the subrecipient more time to check their records, so we will postpone any actionon their budgetat this time.
Withthe DRGR7.0 release staffwillbegincorrectingthecumulativeproperty and unit count numbers across activities. During the last couple months we conducted a re-review of our records so that the numbers we enter in DRGR is clearly reflective of what our property count and unit count is for each subrecipient. We anticipate completing the posting by the end ofnext month,but wewill notifyHUD once thecorrectionsare in the DRGRsystem.
Thank you for your review of our Action Planchanges.

Low Income Targeting:

Minnesota Housing requires each Subrecipient to expend 25.4% of its Grant Funds and Program Income expenditures to households below 50% AMI.

Acquisition and Relocation:

July 15, 2013 - Action Plan Modified:
Minnesota Housing sub granted the $ 38 million to 21 local units of government. 13 remain active. Subrecipients have earned $12 million in program income and anticipate approximately $5 million in program income by the program’s closeout. Including program income, the grant’s total is currently $55 million. All activities will continue to be funded in accordance with NSP funding guidelines and the targeting requirements described in this Action Plan.
The plan is amended to include administrative recommendations to be presented to Minnesota Housing’s Board of Directors at the June 2013 board meeting. The administrative strategies of this Substantial Amendment to the plan ensure the success of the grant, and improve the closeout timeline. Furthermore, the amended plan describes the methodology used to re-assess the areas of greatest need, and the proposed reallocation of funds and program income among the subrecipients who remain active under the grant.
ACQUISITIONS AND RELOCATIONS
In accordance with HUD’s Closeout Notice issued November 27, 2012, activities under the plan are authorized to continue beyond the original end date of the grant until all grantees have completed all units with NSP program fund investments, and these units have met the National Objective requirement of the plan. To accomplish a timely and successful closeout of the plan Minnesota Housing developed the following administrative strategies:
1) Minnesota Housing may reallocate uncommitted/unused program income and program fund balances, first: To provide more funds to subrecipients in need, and second to be revolved in the newly established areas of greatest need. The uncommitted/unused dollars will be recaptured from subrecipients who expended program funds and program income equal to at least 100% of their grant amount.
2) New acquisitions made after July 1, 2013 will be located in the newly established areas of greatest need, except for those acquisitions where due diligence was already in progress by the subrecipients within their current target area, prior to July 1.

3) Following the original proportionate methodology used in March of 2009, Minnesota Housing will distribute reallocated dollars

in accordance with the proportionate percentages listed below:
a. Minneapolis 54.5%
b. St. Paul 31.2%
c. Hennepin 14.3%
4) Subrecipients receiving reallocated program income may retain 10% of this total for administrative expenditures.
5) Minnesota Housing may exchange uncommitted/unused balances of program funds and program income among subrecipients as needed for the success of the grant and to achieve an earlier closeout date.
6) Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Hennepin may keep and reuse current and future program income, including recaptured dollars and income from established revolving loan accounts.
7) Other Subrecipients may return their future program income to Minnesota Housing, including recaptured dollars for the purpose of revolving it back to subrecipients in need or subrecipients located in areas of greatest need.
8) All other flexibilities provided by HUD may apply.
Minnesota Housing awarded its NSP funds to subre

Public Comment:

On May 20, 2013, Minnesota Housing mailed its draft substantial amendment to the 2008 Action Plan to depositories to be made available for public comment, and posted it and a notice of the draft's availability on its website. The notice of the draft's availability was sent to 2,500 stakeholders by "E-News Alert," a Minnesota Housing email publication of items of interest. Offical legal notices were published in teh Thursday, May 30, 2013 statewide edition of teh Minneapolis Star Tribune. Minnesota Housing did not receive public comments on its draft substantial amendment.

Overall	This Report Period	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	$54,536,400.54
Total Budget	$81,241.90	$54,236,400.54
Total Obligated	$157,179.47	$52,520,699.23
Total Funds Drawdown	$178,808.75	$51,198,805.00
Program Funds Drawdown	$0.00	$37,042,593.34
Program Income Drawdown	$178,808.75	$14,156,211.66
Program Income Received	$126,395.08	$15,427,710.18
Total Funds Expended	$165,903.81	$51,185,900.06
Match Contributed	$0.00	$35,000.00

Progress Toward Required Numeric Targets

Requirement	Required	To Date
Overall Benefit Percentage (Projected)		0.00%
Overall Benefit Percentage (Actual)		0.00%
Minimum Non-Federal Match	$0.00	$35,000.00
Limit on Public Services	$5,827,489.35	$0.00
Limit on Admin/Planning	$3,884,992.90	$3,020,044.27
Limit on State Admin	$0.00	$3,020,044.27

Progress Toward Activity Type Targets

Progress Toward National Objective Targets

National Objective	Target	Actual
NSP Only - LH - 25% Set-Aside	$9,712,482.25	$20,117,119.89

Overall Progress Narrative:

The State of Minnesota's Subrecipients with active NSP1 programs continue to progress in their projects. Below are some notable updates for the quarter ending 12/31/6:

The City of Big Lake completed construction on its remaining projects and sold them to income eligible households. Remaining NSP funds have been expended and the City does not intend to start any new projects. Necessary paperwork and reporting is being completed in an effort to move towards grant closeout.

The City of Duluth continues to slowly accrue funds through its revolving loan fund (RLF). Once the RLF accumulates enough funding, the City will develop an additional project.

The City of Minneapolis continues to advance in its Green Homes North Initiative, setting up 22 New Construction projects on vacant landbanked lots from its inventory. Development of the lots is slated to begin in spring 2017, with an anticipated construction period of 4-6 months. In an effort to move towards grant close out, the City has placed priority on completing necessary paperwork and reconciling costs of existing projects.

The City of Princeton submitted an updated disposition plan to Minnesota Housing after learning that their proposed multifamily project was not selected to receive Low Income Housing Tax Credits. The plan outlines proposed NSP activity, including the redevelopment of vacant lots through a partnership with Habitat for Humanity.

The St.Cloud Housing and Redevelopment Authority (HRA) set up an additional project during the past quarter and construction continues on their other two active projects. The HRA has partnered with Habitat for Humanity as a developer for many of its projects and has experienced great success. Funds will be intermittently expended throughout the construction process.

The City of Saint Paul solicited bids and proposals for the development of two lots from its inventory, through a Request for Proposal (RFP) Process.The RFP has closed and proposals are being evaluated; the City continues to assess its next steps. The development of three New Construction projects continues through a partnership with Habitat for Humanity.

Dakota County continues to strategize its next steps in the development of its remaining three landbanked lots. The County will submit an updated disposition plan to Minnesota Housing next quarter.

Hennepin County completed three projects and sold them income eligible households. Costs for these projects are being reconciled before final draws can be made. The County has obligated all of its remaining funds on existing projects and is considering requesting additional NSP funding from Minnesota Housing.

Ramsey County completed its active projects, sold them to income eligible households and expended remaining NSP funds. The County is working on competing necessary paperwork and reporting in an effort to move towards grant closeout.

This concludes the State of Minnesota's NSP1 report for the quarter ending 12/31/2016.

Project Summary

Project #, Project Title	This Report Period	To Date	
	Program Funds Drawdown	Project Funds Budgeted	Program Funds Drawdown
Anoka, Anoka County	$0.00	$5,571,913.30	$2,838,449.64
Buffalo, City of Buffalo	$0.00	$450,207.66	$374,822.00
Carver County, Carver County	$0.00	$1,021,612.14	$728,532.00
City of Big Lake, City of Big Lake	$0.00	$1,839,339.91	$1,214,170.86
City of Minneapolis, City of Minneapolis	$0.00	$10,464,800.59	$7,792,117.27
City of Minneapolis - Revolving Fund, City of Minneapolis -	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
City of Princeton, City of Princeton	$0.00	$1,090,242.07	$733,064.89
Dakota, Dakota County	$0.00	$1,176,771.75	$999,802.63
Duluth, City of Duluth	$0.00	$1,527,500.00	$1,527,500.00
Duluth-Contract for Deed, Duluth-Contract for Deed	$0.00	$533,238.79	$457,500.00
Elk River, City of Elk River	$0.00	$266,134.99	$168,370.52
Faribault, City of Faribault	$0.00	$1,341,539.19	$770,862.78
Hennepin, Hennepin County	$0.00	$6,060,434.18	$3,538,035.58
Hennepin - Richfield, Hennepin - Richfield	$0.00	$1,540,037.34	$851,885.43
Isanti, City of Isanti	$0.00	$552,855.00	$552,855.00
Minnesota Housing, Minnesota Housing	$0.00	$500,000.00	$500,000.00
Montgomery, City of Montgomery	$0.00	$398,184.23	$385,000.00
Monticello/Otsego, Monticello/Otsego	$0.00	$404,840.50	$380,873.00
Ramsey, Ramsey County	$0.00	$2,810,420.25	$1,378,753.00
Rochester, City of Rochester	$0.00	$4,499,564.50	$1,984,999.00
Scott, Scott County	$0.00	$1,079,084.83	$1,034,988.00
St. Cloud HRA, St. Cloud HRA	$0.00	$2,222,652.65	$1,880,229.48
St. Paul, City of St. Paul	$0.00	$8,594,871.32	$6,286,288.23
St. Paul - Revolving Fund, St. Paul - Revolving Fund	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Washington Cnty, Washington County	$0.00	$294,509.62	$290,434.03
Zimmerman, City of Zimmerman	$0.00	$373,060.00	$373,060.00

Activities

Project # / Title: City of Big Lake / City of Big Lake

Grantee Activity Number:	**B1. Acq Rehab CD Zip - Big Lake**
Activity Title:	**B1. Acq Rehab CD Zip - Big Lake**

Activitiy Category:
Rehabilitation/reconstruction of residential structures

Activity Status:
Under Way

Project Number:
City of Big Lake

Project Title:
City of Big Lake

Projected Start Date:
09/29/2008

Projected End Date:
06/30/2016

Benefit Type:
Direct (HouseHold)

Completed Activity Actual End Date:

National Objective:
NSP Only - LMMI

Responsible Organization:
City of Big Lake1

Program Income Account:
Big Lake

Overall	Oct 1 thru Dec 31, 2016	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	$614,824.45
Total Budget	$0.00	$614,824.45
Total Obligated	$0.00	$614,824.45
Total Funds Drawdown	$0.00	$614,824.45
Program Funds Drawdown	$0.00	$338,906.01
Program Income Drawdown	$0.00	$275,918.44
Program Income Received	$0.00	$233,952.65
Total Funds Expended	$0.00	$614,824.45
City of Big Lake1	$0.00	$614,824.45
Match Contributed	$0.00	$0.00

Activity Description:

Funds to be used for acquisition rehab city driven activities. October amendment moved the funds from this activity to allow the redevelopment activity which was more in demand for the subrecipients target area. Unit count was adjusted accordingly. December amendment reverses some funds back into acq rehab from redevelopment based on transactions already in the pipeline. Property count increased by one. March contract amendment increases the budget under this activity and reduces the redevelopment budget and demolition budget. Units remain the same. Low income percentage is adjusted to 26.05%. June 2015 amendment shifts funds to redev cd zip lh & acq rehab cd zip. Aug 2015 amendment shifts funds from acq rehab to redevelopment zip.
The Minnesota Housing Board approved a reallocation of NSP funds to be granted to the City of Big Lake, at the March 25th board meeting. Big Lake’s funds were increased by $273,844.86, resulting in a new budget totaling $1,214,520.86. The budgets under each activity were revised to accommodate the subrecipient’s program. Unit numbers were adjusted accordingly reflecting the increase. September amendment shifts funds to redevelopment and down payment assistance. June 15, 2012: Corrected projected property, unit, and household count. Original projections were entered in error. Feb 2013 amendment shifts funds to acq rehab. Aug amendment adds funds to admin and acq rehab

activities. Dec amendment shifted funds to acg rehab lh activity. Feb 2015 amendment shifts funds to Redevelopment activity. Nov 15 amendment shifts funds to Redevelopment CD Zip. 02/16 amendment shifts funds from acq rehab to redevelopment. June 2016 amendment shifts funds from redevelopment cd zip to acq rehab cd zip.

Location Description:

High need zip code locations.

Activity Progress Narrative:

Accomplishments Performance Measures

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Properties	2	5/5

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Housing Units	2	5/5

Beneficiaries Performance Measures

	This Report Period			Cumulative Actual Total / Expected			
	Low	Mod	Total	Low	Mod	Total	Low/Mod
# of Households	0	0	2	0/0	1/1	5/5	20.00
# Owner Households	0	0	2	0/0	1/1	5/5	20.00

Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources	Amount
No Other Funding Sources Found	
Total Other Funding Sources	

Grantee Activity Number:	**E. Redevelopment CD Zip - Big Lake**
Activity Title:	**E. Redevelopment CD Zip - Big Lake**

Activitiy Category:
Construction of new housing

Activity Status:
Under Way

Project Number:
City of Big Lake

Project Title:
City of Big Lake

Projected Start Date:
09/29/2008

Projected End Date:
06/30/2016

Benefit Type:
Direct (HouseHold)

Completed Activity Actual End Date:

National Objective:
NSP Only - LMMI

Responsible Organization:
City of Big Lake1

Program Income Account:
Big Lake

Overall	Oct 1 thru Dec 31, 2016	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	$413,694.89
Total Budget	$0.00	$413,694.89
Total Obligated	$21,000.00	$413,344.89
Total Funds Drawdown	$21,000.00	$413,344.89
Program Funds Drawdown	$0.00	$247,065.67
Program Income Drawdown	$21,000.00	$166,279.22
Program Income Received	$0.00	$269.61
Total Funds Expended	$21,000.00	$413,344.89
City of Big Lake1	$21,000.00	$413,344.89
Match Contributed	$0.00	$0.00

Activity Description:

The subrecipient's contract is amended in October to accomodate this NSP eligible use - Redevelopment, activity E, for the redevelopment of vacant homes. The environment review was updated as well. December amendment reverses some funds back to acq rehab for properties already in process. Therefore the property count decreased to 3. March contract amendment decreased funds under this activity by $30,000 to move it to the Acq Rehab 120% household activity.
Dec 2014 budget amendment shifts funds from LH activities to non-LH activities.
The Minnesota Housing Board approved a reallocation of NSP funds to be granted to the City of Big Lake, at the March 25th board meeting. Big Lake’s funds were increased by $273,844.86, resulting in a new budget totaling $1,214,520.86. The budgets under each activity were revised to accommodate the subrecipient’s program. Unit numbers were adjusted accordingly reflecting the increase. September amendment shifts funds to redevelopment and down payment assistance. June 13, 2012: Corrected projected property, unit, and household count. Original projections were entered in error. Feb 2013 amendment shifts funds to acq rehab. Feb 2015 amendment shifts funds to Redevelopment activity. June 2015 amendment shifts funds to redev cd zip lh & acq rehab cd zip. Aug 2015 amendment shifts funds from acq rehab to redevelopment zip. Nov 15 amendment shifts funds to Redevelopment CD Zip. Feb 2016 amendment shifts funds from acq rehab to redevelopment activity. June 2016 amendment shifts funds to acq rehab cd zip.

Location Description:

Properties will be located in the high need zip code areas of Big Lake and identified in subrecipient's contract map.

Activity Progress Narrative:

Accomplishments Performance Measures

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Housing Units	1	4/4
# of Singlefamily Units	1	4/4

Beneficiaries Performance Measures

	This Report Period			Cumulative Actual Total / Expected			
	Low	Mod	Total	Low	Mod	Total	Low/Mod
# of Households	0	0	1	0/0	0/0	4/4	0.00
# Owner Households	0	0	1	0/0	0/0	4/4	0.00

Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources	Amount
No Other Funding Sources Found	
Total Other Funding Sources	

Project # / Title: Duluth-Contract for Deed / Duluth-Contract for Deed

Grantee Activity Number: B1. Acq Rehab CD CFD Cnty LH- Duluth
Activity Title: B1. Acq Rehab CD CFD Cnty LH- Duluth

Activitiy Category:
Rehabilitation/reconstruction of residential structures

Activity Status:
Under Way

Project Number:
Duluth-Contract for Deed

Project Title:
Duluth-Contract for Deed

Projected Start Date:
09/29/2008

Projected End Date:
06/30/2016

Benefit Type:
Direct (HouseHold)

Completed Activity Actual End Date:

National Objective:
NSP Only - LH - 25% Set-Aside

Responsible Organization:
City of Duluth

Overall	Oct 1 thru Dec 31, 2016	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	$350,238.79
Total Budget	$0.00	$350,238.79
Total Obligated	$0.00	$274,500.00
Total Funds Drawdown	$0.00	$274,500.00
Program Funds Drawdown	$0.00	$274,500.00
Program Income Drawdown	$0.00	$0.00
Program Income Received	$3,040.55	$110,053.11
Total Funds Expended	$0.00	$274,500.00

Match Contributed	$0.00	$0.00

Activity Description:

Funds to be used for City driven acquisition rehab activities for homeownership purposes. Funds to be used to house individuals or families with income at 50% AMI or below.
The Minnesota Housing Board approved a reallocation of NSP funds to be granted to the City of Duluth, at the March 25th board meeting. Duluth's funds were increased by $385,000, resulting in a new budget totaling $1,985,000. The budgets under each activity were revised to accomodate the subrecipient's program. Unit numbers were adjusted accordingly reflecting the increase. December adjustment shifts funds from low income to 120% DPA.
June 2012 amendment due to overall reduction in the total anticipated program income amounts.
June 15, 2012: Corrected projected property, unit, and household count. Original projections were entered in error. June 2014 amendment shifts funds between Acq Rehab CD CFD and LH category. Feb 2016 amendmend increases acq rehab CFD Cty LH category due to increased program income.

Location Description:

High Need County locations.

Activity Progress Narrative:

Accomplishments Performance Measures

	This Report Period Total	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected Total
# of Properties	0	2/2

	This Report Period Total	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected Total
# of Housing Units	0	2/2
# of Singlefamily Units	0	2/2

Beneficiaries Performance Measures

	This Report Period			Cumulative Actual Total / Expected			
	Low	Mod	Total	Low	Mod	Total	Low/Mod
# of Households	0	0	0	2/2	0/0	2/2	100.00
# Owner Households	0	0	0	2/2	0/0	2/2	100.00

Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources	Amount
No Other Funding Sources Found	
Total Other Funding Sources	

Project # / Title: Hennepin / Hennepin County

Grantee Activity Number: B1. Acq Rehab CD Zip- Hennepin
Activity Title: B1. Acq Rehab CD Zip- Hennepin

Activitiy Category:
Rehabilitation/reconstruction of residential structures

Activity Status:
Under Way

Project Number:
Hennepin

Project Title:
Hennepin County

Projected Start Date:
09/29/2009

Projected End Date:
06/30/2016

Benefit Type:
Direct (HouseHold)

Completed Activity Actual End Date:

National Objective:
NSP Only - LMMI

Responsible Organization:
Hennepin County1

Program Income Account:
Hennepin

Overall	Oct 1 thru Dec 31, 2016	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	$2,679,609.22
Total Budget	$0.00	$2,679,609.22
Total Obligated	$105,719.61	$2,586,565.52
Total Funds Drawdown	$144,903.81	$2,357,424.81
Program Funds Drawdown	$0.00	$1,043,530.80
Program Income Drawdown	$144,903.81	$1,313,894.01
Program Income Received	$123,354.53	$1,878,937.18
Total Funds Expended	$144,903.81	$2,357,424.81
Hennepin County1	$144,903.81	$2,357,424.81
Match Contributed	$0.00	$0.00

Activity Description:

Acquisition rehabilitation activities City or developer driven for homeownership purposes.
January contract amendment increases funds under acq rehab budgets increasing units from 8 to 10 for 120% category June contract amendment shifts funds to LH categories and redevelopment. August contract amendment shifts funds to redevelopment and low income.
03/12 amendment increases activities for anticipated program income. 06/12 amendment shifts funds to acq rehab zip and redevelopment zip.
May 22, 2012: Corrected projected property, unit, and household count. Original projections were entered in error.
3/13/2013: Modified projected property count and units from 15 to 18. April 2013 amendment shifts funds to Acq Rehab CD Zip LH. Oct 2013 amendment shifts funds between activities and adjusts for decreased program income. June 2014 amendment shifts funds from acq rehab to acq rehab lh. June 2015 amendment increases funds due to increased program income. 09/15 amendment shifts funds to admin expenses. 03/16 amendment shifts funds to admin.

Location Description:

High need zip code pool.

Activity Progress Narrative:

Accomplishments Performance Measures

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Properties	3	22/25

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Housing Units	3	22/25
# of Singlefamily Units	3	22/25

Beneficiaries Performance Measures

	This Report Period			Cumulative Actual Total / Expected			
	Low	Mod	Total	Low	Mod	Total	Low/Mod
# of Households	0	0	3	0/0	3/3	22/25	13.64
# Owner Households	0	0	3	0/0	3/3	22/25	13.64

Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources	Amount
No Other Funding Sources Found	
Total Other Funding Sources	

Project # / Title: Hennepin - Richfield / Hennepin - Richfield

Grantee Activity Number: B1. Acq Rehab CD Cnty- Hennepin Richfield
Activity Title: B1. Acq Rehab CD Cnty- Hennepin Richfield

Activitiy Category:
Rehabilitation/reconstruction of residential structures

Activity Status:
Under Way

Project Number:
Hennepin - Richfield

Project Title:
Hennepin - Richfield

Projected Start Date:
09/29/2008

Projected End Date:
06/30/2016

Benefit Type:
Direct (HouseHold)

Completed Activity Actual End Date:

National Objective:
NSP Only - LMMI

Responsible Organization:
Hennepin County1

Program Income Account:
Hennepin - Richfield

Overall	Oct 1 thru Dec 31, 2016	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	$891,632.64
Total Budget	$25,000.00	$891,632.64
Total Obligated	$84,500.00	$888,817.07
Total Funds Drawdown	$0.00	$796,817.07
Program Funds Drawdown	$0.00	$489,042.12
Program Income Drawdown	$0.00	$307,774.95
Program Income Received	$0.00	$593,336.34
Total Funds Expended	$0.00	$796,817.07
Hennepin County1	$0.00	$796,817.07
Match Contributed	$0.00	$0.00

Activity Description:

Funds are to be used to perform acquisition rehab activities city or developer driven for homeownership purposes.
January contract amendment increases acq rehab activity budgets and increases units to 4. June contract amendment shifts funds to LH categories and redevelopment.
03/12 amendment increases activities for anticipated program income. 06/12 amendment shifts funds to acq rehab zip and redevelopment zip.
May 22, 2012: Corrected projected property, unit, and household count. Original projections were entered in error. Oct 2013 amendment shifts funds to the Acq Rehab CD County-Hennepin activity. June 2014 amendment increases amounts in CD categories due to program income adjustments. Sept 2014 amendment shifts funds to Acq Rehab LH category. Dec 2014 amendment shifts funds from LH category. June 2015 amendment increases funds due to increased program income.
December 2016 amendment due to increased program income

Location Description:

High Need County eligible areas.

Activity Progress Narrative:

Accomplishments Performance Measures

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Properties	1	5/5

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Housing Units	1	5/5

Beneficiaries Performance Measures

	This Report Period			Cumulative Actual Total / Expected			
	Low	Mod	Total	Low	Mod	Total	Low/Mod
# of Households	0	1	1	0/0	2/2	5/5	40.00
# Owner Households	0	1	1	0/0	2/2	5/5	40.00

Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources	Amount
No Other Funding Sources Found	
Total Other Funding Sources	

Project # / Title: St. Cloud HRA / St. Cloud HRA

Grantee Activity Number: A. Financing Mechanism BD Cnty - St. Cloud

Activity Title: A. Financing Mechanism BD Cnty - St. Cloud

Activitiy Category:
Homeownership Assistance to low- and moderate-income

Activity Status:
Under Way

Project Number:
St. Cloud HRA

Project Title:
St. Cloud HRA

Projected Start Date:
09/29/2008

Projected End Date:
06/30/2016

Benefit Type:
Direct (HouseHold)

Completed Activity Actual End Date:

National Objective:
NSP Only - LMMI

Responsible Organization:
St. Cloud HRA

Program Income Account:

St Cloud

Overall	Oct 1 thru Dec 31, 2016	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	$639,544.54
Total Budget	$34,005.27	$639,544.54
Total Obligated	($62,596.58)	$441,621.45
Total Funds Drawdown	$0.00	$441,621.45
Program Funds Drawdown	$0.00	$431,621.45
Program Income Drawdown	$0.00	$10,000.00
Program Income Received	$0.00	$175,172.14
Total Funds Expended	$0.00	$441,621.45
Match Contributed	$0.00	$0.00

Activity Description:

Funds to be used for down payment assistance and closing costs on buyer driven activities for homeownership purposes. March contract amendment shifts funds between activities, primarily redistributing the budgets under the financing mechanism activities. The budget under this activity is increased by $64,990.00. Unit count adjusted accordingly to market need.
June amendment shifts funds among CRV categories. August amendment shifts funds to rehab activities. December budget amendment shifts funds between all budget categories. March 2011 amendment shifts funds to Fin Mech BD Cty activity. Oct 2011 amendment shifts funds from acq rehab cd cty fund.
May 22, 2012: Corrected projected property, unit, and household count. Original projections were entered in error. Sept 2012 amendment adjusts for increased program income.
03/13/2013: Corrected projected property and unit count from 31 to 32. May 2013 budget adds funds due to program income. Dec 2013 budget amendment adds funds due to program income. March 2015 amendment adjusts for program income. Aug 2015 amendment increases fin mech due to increased program income. June 2016 amendment increases Fin Mech BD Cty and admin budget due to increased program income. Dec 2016 amendment shifts funds from acq rehab to fin mech, acq rehab lh and admin.

Location Description:

High need county locations.

Activity Progress Narrative:

Accomplishments Performance Measures

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Housing Units	0	32/32
# of Singlefamily Units	0	32/32

Beneficiaries Performance Measures

	This Report Period			Cumulative Actual Total / Expected			
	Low	Mod	Total	Low	Mod	Total	Low/Mod
# of Households	0	0	0	0/0	20/32	32/32	62.50
# Owner Households	0	0	0	0/0	20/32	32/32	62.50

Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources	Amount
No Other Funding Sources Found	
Total Other Funding Sources	

Grantee Activity Number:	B1. Acq Rehab CD Cnty - St. Cloud
Activity Title:	**B1. Acq Rehab CD Cnty - St. Cloud**

Activitiy Category:
Rehabilitation/reconstruction of residential structures

Activity Status:
Under Way

Project Number:
St. Cloud HRA

Project Title:
St. Cloud HRA

Projected Start Date:
09/29/2008

Projected End Date:
06/30/2016

Benefit Type:
Direct (HouseHold)

Completed Activity Actual End Date:

National Objective:
NSP Only - LMMI

Responsible Organization:
St. Cloud HRA

Program Income Account:
St Cloud

Overall	Oct 1 thru Dec 31, 2016	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	$98,116.17
Total Budget	($47,559.48)	$98,116.17
Total Obligated	($47,559.48)	$98,116.17
Total Funds Drawdown	($47,559.48)	$98,116.17
Program Funds Drawdown	($47,559.48)	$98,116.17
Program Income Drawdown	$0.00	$0.00
Program Income Received	$0.00	$0.00
Total Funds Expended	($47,559.48)	$98,116.17
St. Cloud HRA	($47,559.48)	$98,116.17
Match Contributed	$0.00	$0.00

Activity Description:

Funds to be used for acquisition rehab city driven activities for the purpose of homeownership. December amendment increases this budget for acq rehab in the amount of $137,343.00. The budget in demolition was adjusted to accomodate this change. March contract amendment shifts funds between activities, redistributing the budgets under the financing mechanism activities and lowering the demolition budget to increase the acq rehab activities. The budget under this activity is increased by $138,000. Unit count is proportionate to market need. After all adjustments are made the low income household percentagDecember budget amendment shifts funds between all budget categories.e is adjusted to 36.23%. August amendment shifts funds to rehab and demo activities. March 2011 amendment shifts funds to Fin Mech BD Cty activity. Oct 2011 amendment shifts funds to fin mech bd cty.
May 22, 2012: Corrected projected property, unit, and household count. Original projections were entered in error. Sept 2012 amendment adjusts for increased program income. Oct 2012 amendment adjusts for decreased program income.
3/13/2013: Modified property count and unit count from 4 to 3. Dec 2013 budget amendment adds funds due to program income. June 2014 amendment shifts funds to lh category. Dec 2016 amendment shifts funds from acq rehab to acq rehab lh.

Location Description:

High need county locations.

Activity Progress Narrative:

Accomplishments Performance Measures

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Properties	0	2/2

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Housing Units	0	2/2
# of Singlefamily Units	0	2/2

Beneficiaries Performance Measures

	This Report Period			Cumulative Actual Total / Expected			
	Low	Mod	Total	Low	Mod	Total	Low/Mod
# of Households	0	0	0	0/0	2/2	2/2	100.00
# Owner Households	0	0	0	0/0	2/2	2/2	100.00

Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources	Amount
No Other Funding Sources Found	
Total Other Funding Sources	

Grantee Activity Number:	**B1. Acq Rehab CD LH Cnty- St. Cloud**
Activity Title:	**B1. Acq Rehab CD LH Cnty- St. Cloud**

Activitiy Category:
Rehabilitation/reconstruction of residential structures

Activity Status:
Under Way

Project Number:
St. Cloud HRA

Project Title:
St. Cloud HRA

Projected Start Date:
09/29/2008

Projected End Date:
06/30/2016

Benefit Type:
Direct (HouseHold)

Completed Activity Actual End Date:

National Objective:
NSP Only - LH - 25% Set-Aside

Responsible Organization:
St. Cloud HRA

Program Income Account:
St Cloud

Overall	Oct 1 thru Dec 31, 2016	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	$641,980.26
Total Budget	$69,022.81	$641,980.26
Total Obligated	$69,022.81	$641,980.26
Total Funds Drawdown	$69,022.81	$641,980.26
Program Funds Drawdown	$57,211.95	$630,169.40
Program Income Drawdown	$11,810.86	$11,810.86
Program Income Received	$0.00	$0.00
Total Funds Expended	$57,211.95	$630,169.40
St. Cloud HRA	$57,211.95	$630,169.40
Match Contributed	$0.00	$0.00

Activity Description:

Funds to be used for acquisition rehab city driven activities to house individuals and families with incomes at 50% AMI or below. August amendment shifts funds to rehab and demo activities. March 2011 amendment shifts funds to Fin Mech BD Cty activity and acq rehab cd lh county.
May 22, 2012: Corrected projected property, unit, and household count. Original projections were entered in error. Sept 2012 amendment adjusts for increased program income. Oct 2012 amendment adjusts for decreased program income.
3/13/2013: Modified projected property and unit count from 4 to 5. June 2014 amendment shifts funds to lh category. Dec 2016 amendment shifts funds from acq rehab to fin mech, acq rehab lh and admin.

Location Description:

High need county locations.

Activity Progress Narrative:

Accomplishments Performance Measures

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Properties	0	5/8
# ELI Households (0-30% AMI)	0	0/0

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Housing Units	0	5/8
# of Singlefamily Units	0	5/8

Beneficiaries Performance Measures

	This Report Period			Cumulative Actual Total / Expected			
	Low	Mod	Total	Low	Mod	Total	Low/Mod
# of Households	0	0	0	5/8	0/0	5/8	100.00
# Owner Households	0	0	0	5/8	0/0	5/8	100.00

Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources	Amount
No Other Funding Sources Found	
Total Other Funding Sources	

Grantee Activity Number:	**D. Demolition Cnty - St. Cloud**
Activity Title:	**D. Demolition Cnty - St. Cloud**

Activitiy Category:
Clearance and Demolition

Activity Status:
Under Way

Project Number:
St. Cloud HRA

Project Title:
St. Cloud HRA

Projected Start Date:
09/29/2008

Projected End Date:
06/30/2016

Benefit Type:
( )

Completed Activity Actual End Date:

National Objective:
NSP Only - LMMI

Responsible Organization:
St. Cloud HRA

Program Income Account:
St Cloud

Overall	Oct 1 thru Dec 31, 2016	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	$58,764.12
Total Budget	$0.00	$58,764.12
Total Obligated	($9,652.47)	$49,111.65
Total Funds Drawdown	($9,652.47)	$49,111.65
Program Funds Drawdown	($9,652.47)	$49,111.65
Program Income Drawdown	$0.00	$0.00
Program Income Received	$0.00	$0.00
Total Funds Expended	($9,652.47)	$49,111.65
St. Cloud HRA	($9,652.47)	$49,111.65
Match Contributed	$0.00	$0.00

Activity Description:

Funds to be used for demolition purposes of blighted properties. December amendment transfers funds out of demolition to be used for acquisiton rehab under eligible use B. Acquisition funds were budgeted by mistake under this activity. March contract amendment shifts funds between activities, redistributing the budgets under the financing mechanism activities and reducing the demolition budget by $138,000 to increase the acq rehab budget. Unit count is proportionate to market need. After all adjustments are made the low income household percentage is adjusted to 36.23%.   August amendment shifts funds to rehab activities. December budget amendment shifts funds between all budget categories. March 2011 amendment shifts funds to Fin Mech BD Cty activity.

May 22, 2012: Corrected projected property, unit, and household count. Original projections were entered in error.

Location Description:

High need county locations.

Activity Progress Narrative:

Accomplishments Performance Measures

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Properties	0	0/0

	This Report Period	Cumulative Actual Total / Expected
	Total	Total
# of Housing Units	0	0/0

Beneficiaries Performance Measures

No Beneficiaries Performance Measures found.

Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources	Amount
No Other Funding Sources Found	
Total Other Funding Sources	

Grantee Activity Number:	**F. Admin Costs - St. Cloud**
Activity Title:	**F. Admin Costs - St. Cloud**

Activitiy Category:
Administration

Activity Status:
Under Way

Project Number:
St. Cloud HRA

Project Title:
St. Cloud HRA

Projected Start Date:
09/29/2008

Projected End Date:
06/30/2016

Benefit Type:
( )

Completed Activity Actual End Date:

National Objective:
N/A

Responsible Organization:
St. Cloud HRA

Program Income Account:
St Cloud

Overall	Oct 1 thru Dec 31, 2016	To Date
Total Projected Budget from All Sources	N/A	$135,375.34
Total Budget	$773.30	$135,375.34
Total Obligated	($3,254.42)	$130,347.62
Total Funds Drawdown	$1,094.08	$125,258.42
Program Funds Drawdown	$0.00	$113,577.10
Program Income Drawdown	$1,094.08	$11,681.32
Program Income Received	$0.00	$0.00
Total Funds Expended	$0.00	$124,164.34
Match Contributed	$0.00	$0.00

Activity Description:

Funds to be used for administration costs purposes. 8% of total grant funds will be used to cover administration costs. May 2013 budget adds funds due to program income. Dec 2013 budget amendment adds funds due to program income. June 2016 amendment increases Fin Mech BD Cty and admin budget due to increased program income. Dec 2016 amendment shifts funds from acq rehab to fin mech, acq rehab lh and admin.

Location Description:

High need county locations.

Activity Progress Narrative:

Accomplishments Performance Measures

No Accomplishments Performance Measures

Beneficiaries Performance Measures

No Beneficiaries Performance Measures found.

Activity Locations

No Activity Locations found.

Other Funding Sources Budgeted - Detail

No Other Match Funding Sources Found

Other Funding Sources	Amount
No Other Funding Sources Found	
Total Other Funding Sources	