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INTRODUCTION

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006, allocated $11.5 billion to States for disaster recovery. The U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development was designated by Congress as the administering agency.

In accordance with Act 5 of the 1st Extraordinary Session of 2006, the Louisiana Recovery Authority (LRA) approved for public comment on February 20th, 2006 a proposed action plan for Supplemental Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, which was developed under its guidance by the Office of Community Development (OCD), Disaster Recovery Unit of the LA Division of Administration (DOA). The LRA and OCD are developing the proposed action plan with regard to the $6.21 billion federal grant for Hurricanes Katrina and Rita disaster recovery and rebuilding efforts administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). According to Act 5, in addition to LRA approval, the proposed action plan is subject to legislative approval. The Proposed Action Plan proposes the allocation of Supplemental CDBG funds for the following programs: $1.1875 billion for state and local infrastructure, $332.5 million for short and long-term economic recovery, $4.37 billion for housing programs, $310 million for administration, $9.5 million for planning, and $500,000 for technical assistance.

Purpose of the Proposed Programs

- To meet urgent community recovery needs including redevelopment and revitalization of housing and infrastructure in the affected areas;
- To meet long-term economic recovery needs including redevelopment and revitalization of the affected areas;
- To eliminate the blighting effects resulting from the storms of 2005.

The proposed Action Plan was published on March 10, 2006 in five MSA newspapers. A ten day comment period was provided for public comment. In addition, the plan was presented and approved by the LRA Board on February 20, 2006. All board meetings are open to the public for comment. A summary of comments received and the State’s response to these comments is found in Appendix 12.
ACTION PLAN

Impact of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita on the State of Louisiana

Hurricane Katrina hit the State of Louisiana on August 29, 2005, and Rita slammed into the state on September 24, 2005. They were the second and third Category 5 hurricanes of the 2005 hurricane season. Although the numbers are not final, Hurricane Katrina will most likely be categorized as the third deadliest and the costliest storm in U.S. history. While hurricane Rita exacted a lower death toll it was the second most powerful hurricane of the 2005 season and the fourth most intense ever to cross the Atlantic Basin. Together these storms wrought catastrophic destruction on the Louisiana coast, exacting an enormous toll on the material, financial and emotional resources of thousands of Louisianians.

While the impact was widespread and indiscriminate of income and social status, the impact of the hurricanes on the poor was particularly devastating, especially in Orleans Parish where the U.S. Census in 2000 reports only a 46.5% homeownership rate (compared to 67.9% in the State), a median household income of $27,133 (compared to $32,566 in the State), and a poverty rate of 27.9% (compared to a state rate of 19.6%). In contrast, while Calcasieu, Cameron, Plaquemines and St. Bernard Parishes sustained major damage, they had higher homeownership rates (ranging between 71% and 85%), higher median incomes (ranging between $34,000 and $38,000) and lower poverty rates (12% to 18%).

The concentration of the poor in extreme poverty neighborhoods exacerbated the negative impact on the poor principally in New Orleans. According to the Brookings Institution (October 2005), one out of every four neighborhoods in the city of New Orleans was classified as an “extreme-poverty” neighborhood, with at least 40% of its residents living below the federal poverty threshold. These 47 neighborhoods were home to nearly 100,000 residents and had an average household income which lagged the City’s by over $17,000. The Congressional Research Service calculates that the poverty rate in the flooded and damaged areas in the State of Louisiana was 21.4%, confirming the widespread sentiment that high poverty neighborhoods were disproportionately flooded (CRS, November 4, 2005).

The social impacts were also greater for those most vulnerable before the storms. These individuals were less connected to the workforce, had educational disadvantages, were elderly or disabled, or were children. Nearly 90,000 persons aged 65 and older were likely displaced by the storms, many of whom lived alone and had at least one disability. Displaced aged persons also were poor (an estimated 15%) and one quarter lacked vehicles. The child poverty rate in the areas affected by the hurricanes was over 30%
The fragility of the most affected populations places a greater burden on the federal, state and local resources available for recovery efforts. The poor standing of the impacted population before the hurricanes severely stretches Louisiana’s state and local resources, making the need for federal assistance even more critical.

The current and projected financial impact on Louisiana from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita has reached into the tens of billions of dollars, according to estimates from a number of groups, think tanks and government agencies. Given the extensiveness of the damage, there is a great deal of uncertainty regarding estimates of the impact on property, on governments and on the economy. The variation in the estimates of different organizations creates a greater challenge for the State in assessing its needs and the resources necessary to address those needs.

For example, according to preliminary estimates from the Louisiana Recovery Authority (LRA), the Governor’s Statewide coordinating body for all recovery efforts, the 2005 hurricanes had an impact of $75 - $100 billion on property and infrastructure and $15 - $20 billion in temporary relief services. However, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) projects an $18 - $25 billion impact on property and infrastructure. For the State’s economy, the LRA states that the storms are expected to inflict from $50 - $70 billion in losses to Louisiana’s economy (defined as nominal Gross State Product) and cause $8 - $10 billion in lost state and local revenue over the next five years. On the other hand, the Louisiana Legislative Fiscal Office projects a $40 - $60 billion impact on the economy and a $4 - $8 billion in lost revenues.

Even before the hurricanes, the State was in a precarious situation, with many unmet needs in the areas of infrastructure, education, economic investment, health care and social services. The impact of the storms on the executive budget and on state revenues makes it even more difficult to deal with the critical needs caused by the hurricanes without substantial assistance from the federal government. The Louisiana Division of Administration (DOA) projected that the State budget for State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2005-2006 was affected by $1 - $1.5 billion, necessitating the reduction of approximately $1 billion from the State budget. Additional impact in the following years is estimated at $4 - $5 billion through 2009. Local city and parish governments fare no better, with a projected shortfall of $4 - $5 billion through 2009. These figures do not take into account the FEMA funding match that is still being required.

Major rating firms have already downgraded the State’s credit rating on general obligation bonds, and the debt held by local governments and quasi-governmental entities is under increasing risk of default. While state government still has relatively good liquidity and the ability to borrow from various funds in order to meet bond obligations, local governments face lost property and sales taxes and will probably not be able to generate other revenue streams to pay off bonds.
The storms of 2005 displaced over 780,000 individuals. As of January 2006, 586,000 of those displaced remain out of state. When compared to the July 2005 U.S. Census population estimate of 4.5 million, the total state population is estimated to have decreased by 8.4%, and is now estimated at 4.1 million as shown in Appendix 1 (LA Department of Health and Hospitals, January 2006 estimate). Several of the most devastated parishes still have greatly reduced populations. January 2006 data when compared to the 2005 population estimate reveals the following: Cameron (-17.8%); Jefferson (-20.6%); Orleans (-65.9%); Plaquemines (-41.1%); and St. Bernard (-89.7%). These figures mask the fact that many of the current parish residents are disaster recovery workers, and are not necessarily original residents.

According to FEMA, the total number of applicants for FEMA assistance related to hurricanes Katrina and Rita was 1.89 million as of January 10, 2006. These applicants have received individual level assistance such as clothing, food, and temporary housing as described below. Additional resources are needed for the estimated 900 families or 2,700 people that have exhausted the subsidized hotel room assistance as of February 7, 2006.

**Impact on Infrastructure**

The storms severely affected the infrastructure of many of our communities, some of which continue to suffer from the lack of electricity, telephone and gas service. The total impact on roads, bridges and utilities, including debris removal, is estimated at $15 to 18 billion.

As of October 17, 2005, parishes that were the hardest hit have large percentages of service outage, such as 42% in Orleans, over 63% in Cameron, 69% in Plaquemines and 100% in St. Bernard. Telephone service is still spotty with 60% of Orleans, 100% of St. Bernard, and 24% of Plaquemines customers with no service. These parishes represent those whose infrastructure requires extensive repairs or needs to be completely rebuilt before power can be restored. (Source: Emergency Operations Center, Service Outage Report, October 17, 2005). Only $405 million is available through FEMA and insurance proceeds to cover the projected $1.89 billion needed to restore electricity, gas and telecommunications infrastructure (see Appendix 2). The LRA tags the cost of restoring levees to pre-Katrina levels at $3 billion, which excludes the projected $20 to $30 billion necessary for Category 5 hurricane protection and coastal restoration.

Twenty-three publicly owned and thirteen privately owned wastewater treatment facilities are (as of February 6) in various stages of recovery, from completely non-functional to functionally impaired. The estimated cost to restore wastewater treatment systems severely damaged by storm surge, flooding and/or wind damage is over $1.78 billion according to the LA Department of Environmental Quality and the LRA. While
FEMA will cover approximately $1.4 billion of that cost, and insurance for another $21 million, a gap of $341 million in unmet need remains to restore this critical infrastructure component. This brings the total non-FEMA eligible costs for restoring these two infrastructure components (drinking water and wastewater) to $389 million.

Other significant non-FEMA eligible costs include cost to reconstruct 20 un-sewered coastal communities (estimated at $60 million), costs to operate public and private wastewater systems until re-population occurs (unknown, but believed to be significant based on previous FEMA experiences), and indirect impacts to existing systems due to population shifts (unknown).

Both hurricanes generated an enormous amount of debris (22 million tons or 55 million cubic yards for Katrina and 2.6 million tons or 6 million cubic yards for Rita). Debris includes vegetative waste and construction and demolition/woodwaste. White goods, vehicles, household hazardous waste and electronic goods associated with the debris management process are managed utilizing recycling methodologies. Limited landfill capacity as well as landfill location and transportation/logistics all have implications for the effectiveness and efficiency of the debris removal process.

State owned buildings suffered approximately $1.75 billion of damage as a result of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, $1.71 billion from Hurricane Katrina and $43 million from Hurricane Rita according to the Louisiana Office of Facility Planning. Funding for repairs through the FEMA Public Assistance program will require a state match. Insurance funds carried by the State, which are available separately for each disaster, amount to $500 million, of which $200 million is for business interruption purposes. Thus, the unmet need for building repair costs from Hurricane Katrina stands at roughly $1.5 billion. As reported by the LRA, as of December 21, 2005, various hospital associations report that 10 hospitals and mobile health centers are closed, with 3 already announcing that they have no intention of reopening. In the State, the projected number of beds closed in affected facilities is 2,623.

The Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals (LDHH) reports that as of February 15, 2006, there are some components of 3 large surface water systems in southeast Louisiana that are operating on boil advisories, 5 systems that are classified as active that must be rebuilt, and 63 systems classified as inactive (no plans to rehabilitate). Estimates to drinking water system damages compiled by LDHH indicate that $390 million is needed for system repairs, 90% of which is eligible for FEMA funding. The remaining $39 million represents the Louisiana share of the repair costs.

The Louisiana Department of Education reports that as of January 9, 2006, seventeen percent, or over 110,262 of the students enrolled in K-12 schools in Louisiana, are displaced from their original locations. November 17, 2005, figures show that another 72,000 are thought to be displaced out of state. The estimated number of damaged
schools tops 830 while another 40 were completely destroyed according to the LRA. For postsecondary institutions 12 universities were either destroyed or damaged, and 34% remain displaced, just under two-thirds of whom are not reported to have gone back to school. Not only have students been displaced, but recovery is hindered by the displacement of teachers and faculty. The estimated loss of revenue to public campuses totals over $150 million, and damage to facilities and infrastructure ranges between $400 and $500 million.

Impact on Housing Stock

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that the hurricanes made about 0.2 percent of the housing stock in the nation uninhabitable (CBO, Letter to Chairman, September 29, 2005). President Bush’s Office of Gulf Coast Rebuilding estimates of the impact of the storms on the housing stock ranges from 338,038 (homeowners sustaining some damage) to over 599,703 (including rental units as well as owner occupied housing). An estimated 127,969 owner-occupied homes received major or severe damage, while 210,069 received minor damage. The breakdown for rental units was 133,367 severely damaged and 128,298 with minor damage. LRA estimates for the cost to repair or rebuild the damaged homes, as well as to replace other property lost such as vehicles, boats and household items, ranges from $27 - $35 billion. It is estimated that over 780,000 residents are displaced. The Louisiana Housing Finance Agency (LHFA) values the housing units flooded by both hurricanes at over $32 billion and projects the need for low income housing will approach 115,000 units.

The number of displaced families places a great responsibility to provide temporary housing in the form of mobile homes, travel trailers, hotels and rental case assistance. There are currently approximately 10,000 families in mobile homes and other temporary housing units, according to an LRA estimate, and more than 160,000 displaced families living with family or friends at a cost of $500 million each month. Based on FEMA registrant data, projections of displaced residents out of state show that the bulk are in Texas (over 550,000), Mississippi (over 290,000), Georgia (approximately 37,000), and Florida (nearly 29,000).

There is an initial indication that between 25 and 40 percent of homeowners in the City of New Orleans had flood insurance. FEMA figures show that there were 127,969 owner-occupied homes that received major or severe damage, 25,183 or 19.7% of which were without insurance (see Appendix 3). Contrast that figure with the total of 133,367 rental units which sustained major or severe damage, and that 126,568 or 94.9% were not insured. Borrowers with no insurance may face extended unemployment and very likely experience greater difficulty in rebuilding their lives. Lastly, about 1,700 homes, or about one-third of the severely and repetitively damaged homes in America, are in Louisiana. These are structures that have suffered damages of $1,000 or more on at least
four occasions or suffered damages of more than 50 percent of their value on two or more occasions.

Estimates are available for the City of New Orleans regarding the impact of Hurricane Katrina on housing occupied by low to moderate income residents which are defined as those below 80% of the average median income (AMI). Those estimates produced by the Greater New Orleans Community Development Center show that 65% of the owner occupied units that are damaged or destroyed belonged to low to moderate income families. Low to moderate income families rented 89% of the rental units that were damaged or destroyed. An estimated total of 119,770 owner occupied and rental units serving the low to moderate income population, or 88.7%, were damaged or destroyed.

Not only did the hurricanes greatly affect the availability of housing, it also affected the capacity of the non-profit infrastructure as well as the private home building industry to address the needs arising from this crisis. Prior to the storms of 2005, the non-profit sector accounted for 5.6% of the State’s total workforce, a substantial force on the State’s economy. A large percent of those jobs fell within the State’s metropolitan statistical areas, and 55% of all non-profit jobs are in the health care industry. The fact that 70% of these jobs were located in the parishes most devastated by the hurricanes call into question the state’s capacity to offer critical services related not only to housing, but also to the areas of health care, social services, education and nearly more.

Impact on the Economy

The economic impacts of business losses and structural damage are compounded by unemployment, reduction of public services, costs of cleanup and recovery, damage to crops and livestock and public sector budget deficits. According to the LRA the total value of lost businesses and commercial property ranges from $25 - $29 billion. The estimate for damage to infrastructure including roads, bridges, utilities and debris removal is $15 - $18 billion. Over 20,000 businesses are thought to have been affected with 90% of those affected businesses receiving catastrophic damage. This represents ten times the number of affected businesses in other states impacted by the hurricanes. According to another estimate by the U.S. Census Bureau, 18.9% of Louisiana businesses fell within a FEMA designated damage zone, with 17.4% of the State’s businesses located in a damage zone classified as “flooded”.

The agriculture and seafood industries were hard hit by the storms. The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries estimates the impact on Louisiana’s seafood industry to be between $800 million and $1 billion. Eighty-five percent of the nation’s sugar cane producing parishes were affected by the storms (CBO letter to the Chairman, September 29, 2005). The Louisiana State University Agricultural Center estimates that a total of 4.7 billion board feet and 1.6 million acres of timber were damaged by both
storms. The total estimated loss of these natural resources is over $1 billion. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that direct losses to marketable goods and services range from $28 - $44 billion, and that the vast majority of production losses are due to revenue lost from oil and gas production and from damage to refineries.

Damage to the energy industry will also place demands on the state and local governments working toward recovery as they have to contend with higher energy prices. On January 25, 2006, the Mineral Management Service reported that 12% of manned offshore stations remain evacuated, and one quarter of the daily production of oil in the Gulf of Mexico remains shut down. The CBO projects that utilities operating in the states affected by both hurricanes would need $3.5 billion in assistance to address losses for damages and lost sales. The LRA estimates that the impact to private utilities in Louisiana is $1.425 billion which is not reimbursed by FEMA.

The impact of the 2005 storms on Louisiana’s economy was catastrophic and lingering. The Louisiana Economic Outlook (2006 and 2007) suggests that Katrina and Rita negated about 11 years of employment growth in the state (Scott, L, and Richardson, J., 2005). The Louisiana Department of Labor (LDOL) reported that as of January 28, the number of active claims resulting from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita was 125,895. In November, active unemployment claims reached a peak of 284,717. Active claims have continued to fall since November 27 when the Labor Department re-imposed a federal requirement that claimants call the department weekly to report they have looked for work and that they are available for employment.

The December 2005 seasonally adjusted employment in Louisiana was 1,718,117. The number unemployed was 116,763, a 6.4% rate (LDOL’s Labor Market Information Bulletin, January 25, 2006, release date.) The same November figures were 1,710,548 employed and 236,490 unemployed, for a 12.1% unemployment rate. Some of the drastic change from November to December 2005 was caused by the reporting requirement changes mentioned above. A 112,159 decrease in the labor force from November to December, and the accompanying 119,727 decrease in the number unemployed are certainly due to the reporting change more than to any dramatic increase in employment, which were only 7,569 over the same period. Both the Louisiana labor force and number employed are still significantly below the level of December 2004, a labor force of 2.07 million and a number working of almost 1,952,000.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) reports that immediately following the hurricanes, over 220,000 net jobs were lost in the State, with New Orleans suffering the brunt of these losses. However, job growth has begun related to clean-up and rebuilding efforts, with the State and New Orleans adding back 32,000 and 15,000 jobs respectively, through November. The speed of recovery of the State’s economy will depend largely on the timely and effective use of all the resources and aid the State can obtain.
The areas affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita referred to in this report are those parishes designated by FEMA through September 30, 2005. An area was considered “affected” if it was designated by FEMA for any type of assistance. An area was defined as “most affected” if it was designated for both individual and public assistance (see Appendix 4).

All units of local governments, entitlement and non-entitlement local governments, as well as federally recognized Indian tribes are eligible for assistance. However, funding will be directed to those areas that has been most impacted by Hurricanes Rita and Katrina. The majority of Louisiana’s allocation is being allocated to housing activities to repair, rebuild or restore homes damaged and destroyed by the hurricanes. However, due to the very nature of the activity, funding will be directed to those units of local governments that were most impacted by the hurricanes since those are the areas with the most destroyed housing and infrastructure. The same principle applies to the monies allocated for infrastructure repair. Based on parish damage assessments provided by the LRA for housing and infrastructure, one can readily see that the disaster recovery supplemental funding will be distributed to those areas most impacted. (See Appendix 5)

Federal, State and Non-profit Response to the Hurricanes

An enormous amount of aid has gone out to the affected parishes referenced above to address the immediate needs arising after the hurricanes. Temporary housing assistance totaling $7.5 billion was provided to support evacuees in hotels or mobile homes. Approximately 1.4 million housing assistance checks were issued by FEMA totaling $3.2 billion, and over 256,000 checks for other assistance were allocated to address needs such as medical care, funeral and clothing expenses. Social services, including disaster unemployment, crisis counseling and legal services provided ranges from $4.5 - $6 billion. Emergency assistance and other services including road clearance, food, etc., approaches $3 - $5.5 billion. In all, the value of temporary relief services provided to date ranges from $15 to $20 billion.

Louisiana’s Financial Response to Hurricane Recovery

- Governor Kathleen Babineaux Blanco issued Executive Order KB 2005-38 on September 19, 2005, to proactively slow state expenditures and conserve state resources in the current fiscal year. With only limited, selective exemptions—such as direct hurricane recovery and rebuilding efforts—this executive order imposed a spending and hiring freeze for Executive Branch agencies through June 30, 2006.
• The Blanco Administration moved immediately to ensure financial accountability related to federal funds for hurricane recovery.

  o Set up special activity codes (KATR for Hurricane Katrina and RITA for Hurricane Rita) in our statewide accounting system and for higher education agencies to capture state agency expenditures for state rescue, recovery, and rebuilding.
  o Embedded auditors from the Office of the State Inspector General and Office of the Legislative Auditor in the process for FEMA applications and reimbursements for state and local agencies.
  o Worked with the State Treasurer to set up an efficient distribution process, following strict accountability protocols, for FEMA reimbursement funds flowing to Louisiana state and local governments.
  o After a thorough search process, Deloitte & Touche, LLP, one of the big four international accounting firms, was selected to provide accounting services in Louisiana’s receipt and disbursement of FEMA recovery funds. UHY, LLP was selected to perform an independent examination level assessment of the State’s internal controls, processes and procedures over the receipt and disbursement of FEMA disaster recovery funds, as well as additional assistance in the area of fraud detection, investigation and mitigation. Contracts with each firm are being developed.

• Governor Blanco established the LRA by Executive Order KBB 2005-63, on October 17, 2005, to plan for the recovery and rebuilding of Louisiana.

Executive Order 2005-63 was issued by Governor Blanco in response to the need for new federal resources to be coordinated, targeted and leveraged with traditional resources to maximize their impact as well as improve efficiency and avoid duplication of efforts. The executive order created the LRA, which answers to a board of directors, to perform the following duties related to hurricane recovery and rebuilding efforts:

Develop short-term priorities for recovery including initial 30-day and 100-day agendas; and one and five year long-term plans for redevelopment.

Coordinate between all levels and branches of government to develop and implement plans.

Identify funding sources and/or innovative financing alternatives to adequately fund recovery and redevelopment
Set priorities and offer broad direction to state agencies and organizations regarding funds made available for recovery and any special congressional appropriations associated with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

Set priorities, assist in community planning and coordinate resource allocations as it pertains to issues that may include, but are not limited to the following: 1) economic and workforce development; 2) environmental quality and review; 3) temporary and permanent housing; 4) healthcare; 5) infrastructure and transportation; 6) education; 7) fiscal stability; 8) family services; and 9) law and order.

The LRA has now been cemented in its role as the coordinating hub of Louisiana’s recovery and rebuilding efforts. In a special session of the Louisiana legislature which concluded on February 17, 2006, the LRA was established statutorily. As Governor Blanco stated on that date: “I created the Louisiana Recovery Authority to oversee this recovery effort. The size and the scope of the disaster dictated the need for an agency to coordinate the recovery. Our citizens demand – and Congress expects – us to have an independent, non-political agency operating at the highest ethical standards to oversee the recovery.”

- Governor Blanco established the Louisiana Disaster Recovery Foundation (LDRF) to provide resources for the relief, recovery, and betterment of Louisiana’s people and communities, building upon its residents’ strength of spirit to transform the disaster into unprecedented opportunity. The foundation supports and works with private, nonprofit organizations in the areas of economic development, housing, education, health care and legal services.

- Housing is a key component of Louisiana’s economic recovery. In one of many efforts to address the housing crisis caused by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, Governor Blanco and the LHFA announced new programs to help bring Louisiana families home. Through executive orders, issued on November 21, 2005, Governor Blanco directed the LHFA to dedicate $195 million of bond funds to promote homeownership for displaced citizens and to finance the repair and construction of affordable rental housing.

- Due to the end of the FEMA-funded sheltering in February 2006, Governor Blanco has instructed state agencies, including the Department of Social Services, to open emergency shelters and has established a toll free number to assist hurricane victims who will be evicted by FEMA from motels and hotels. According to the Louisiana Hurricane Housing Task Force, FEMA estimates that 900 families in Louisiana will lose their hotel privileges on February 7 and another 2,200 families will lose the privileges on February 13.
• The Blanco Administration provided a $32.7 million TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) grant to the Louisiana Family Recovery Corps (LFRC), an independent non-profit organization launched in November 2005 to coordinate recovery services provided to displaced Louisiana families with children.

• The State’s $10 million Rapid Response Fund for economic development has been allocated for a loan program to provide immediate relief for small businesses struggling to recover and rebuild.

• The Blanco Administration worked with the State’s Interim Emergency Board to earmark most of the State’s $16 million emergency fund to provide immediate financial grant assistance to the most severely affected parishes, municipalities and law enforcement districts. As a result, 22 municipalities, four parishes and five sheriff’s offices will receive a total of a little more than $14.6 million in interim assistance.

• The State has amended its current Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program to redirect unspent project funds and the economic development revolving loan fund (about $2.85 million) to local government needs arising from the devastation caused by Katrina and Rita.

• Governor Blanco has partnered with Operation HOPE to implement Project Restore HOPE in Louisiana. The program is managed through HOPE’s economic recovery and response division HOPE Coalition America, and offers registered disaster victims one-on-one financial counseling and advice through on-the-ground assistance, toll-free financial help lines, informational resources and online case management.

• To help Louisiana’s displaced workers:
  o Executive Order KBB 2005-38 directed state agencies to make best use of our state workforce by redeploying displaced state employees.
  o In September, Governor Blanco issued an executive order waiving the weekly reporting requirement on job search efforts and work availability for victims of Katrina and Rita in order to get benefits to displaced workers as quickly as possible. Since that time, the LDOL has been holding job fairs, offering training programs and using whatever means available to get people back to work.
  o Through October 10, 2005, the LDOL paid $156,174,727 in Regular Unemployment Claims (UI), serving 201,094 Louisiana citizens; and $35,974,730 in Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA) Payments, serving 80,716 Louisiana citizens.
  o In November, active claims reached 284,717. However, active claims have continued to fall since November 27, 2005, when the LDOL re-imposed the
federal requirement that claimants call the department weekly to report they have looked for work and that they are available for employment.

- As of January 28, 2006, the number of active claims resulting from hurricanes Katrina and Rita was 125,895. A review of the UI and DUA claims shows that 62,770, or 51 percent, of the active claims were filed by people living in Louisiana. The rest, 60,958, or 49 percent, have been filed by evacuees living in other states.

- As a result of the November 2005 Special Legislative Session, Governor Blanco signed Act 35 into law to expand the role of the Recovery School District (RSD) by authorizing the RSD to determine what schools will operate, close, relocate, or rebuild and the range of grades in each school. This law ensures that the reopening of schools is coordinated with the design and redevelopment of New Orleans as it is rebuilt and citizens return to their homes.

- As of Monday, February 13, 2006, reported state expenditures related to Katrina and Rita (state agency expenditures coded to KATR and RITA) topped $1 billion. By far, the largest expenditures were made by the Department of Military Affairs, which houses the Office of Emergency Preparedness, the state agency designated to receive and distribute FEMA funds. These expenditures include over $536 million in distributions of funds to local government agencies by the Department of Military Affairs but do not include most hurricane-related expenditures in Higher Education and the Health Care Services Division, which reported over $40 million in hurricane-related expenditures by mid-November.

### Louisiana’s State Budget Situation

- Louisiana’s Revenue Estimating Conference met on October 28, 2005, to revise the state revenue estimate. The FY 2005-06 forecast was reduced by $970.6 million from the $7.3 billion State General Fund revenue base. However, due to an unappropriated FY 2005-06 State General Fund balance of $1.5 million and a set aside in the October 28th forecast of $10 million as a reserve for the Rapid Response Fund for economic development, the true revenue deficiency was $959.1 million.

- On November 5, 2005, Governor Blanco issued Executive Order 2005-82 to solve more than $500 million of this shortfall. Governor Blanco’s deficit reduction strategy also included $153.9 million from tapping one-third of the Budget Stabilization Fund (“Rainy Day” Fund) as authorized by the Constitution.

- These actions exhausted the unilateral authority of the Governor to address the FY 2005-06 revenue shortfall; it was necessary for the legislature to meet in special session to address the remaining gap. The First Extraordinary Session of the
Louisiana Legislature convened on November 6 and adjourned on November 22, 2005.

- In HB 156 (now Act 67), Governor Blanco outlined reductions necessary to close the remaining gap—more budget cuts that would have caused further disruption in service delivery to Louisiana’s citizens.
- As an alternative, the Governor devised a plan to use the $252 million surplus from FY 2004-05 to fill the Rainy Day Fund—one of the options allowed for use of nonrecurring funds—so that the fund cap would be reached. This would allow an additional $189.3 million to flow over the cap into the State General Fund.
- The remaining shortfall was addressed by further budget cuts—many from utilization savings—and additional savings and unused account balances.
  - $98.7 million in cuts – many from utilization savings
  - $2.9 million in reductions offered by the Legislative and Judicial Branches
  - $9.2 million in addition savings and unused account balances

- Expenditures critical to Louisiana’s recovery and rebuilding efforts—the Transportation Trust Fund, the Wetlands Conservation & Restoration Fund, revenue sharing, supplemental pay to local police and firefighters, and the Rapid Response Fund—were shielded from cuts in both Executive Order KBB 2005-82 and Act 67.

**Federal Disaster Assistance**

The following section summarizes the extent of Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act assistance disbursed as of January 31, 2006:

- Twenty-six Disaster Recovery Centers were opened in Louisiana.

- Approximately 36,675 travel trailers and manufactured housing units were allocated to Louisiana. In all, more than 62,800 units are temporary homes for Katrina victims—nearly triple the number of units used after all of last year’s Florida hurricanes and far exceeding any housing mission in FEMA’s history. Approximately 663 additional units are being occupied on a daily basis to address an estimated need of 83,000.

- LA Swift, the free emergency bus system between Baton Rouge and New Orleans for displaced residents, has served in excess of 43,000 daily riders since October 31, 2005 and has an average of 530 riders daily.

- FEMA’s Disaster Medical Assistance Teams during the peak of patient movement operations treated 49,000 patients. The team gave 65,000 immunizations and provided crisis counseling to 5,800 individuals, among other medical services.
• There are more than 81,737 damaged roofs that have been temporarily covered under FEMA’s “Blue Roof” program, operated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

• More than 108,000 claimants have been approved for disaster unemployment assistance. $130 million in unemployment assistance has been provided to eligible hurricane victims in Louisiana who signed up during the application period.

• FEMA has completed over 1 million housing inspections. The inspection process includes a complete overview for structural damage.

• FEMA has provided more than $4.5 billion directly to Katrina victims for financial and housing assistance through the Individuals and Households Program (IHP). This is more than the $1.2 billion used for IHP after last year’s Florida hurricanes. FEMA projects a $7.7 billion payout for the individuals and households program. To date, FEMA has issued 1.4 million housing assistance checks, totaling $3.2 billion. $1 billion has been approved to individuals for Other Needs Assistance. FEMA has paid or reimbursed more than $325 million for hotel and motel rooms for those without housing.

• FEMA projects $17 billion in payments under the National Flood Insurance Program to policyholders in Louisiana. To date, over $11 billion has been paid out in Louisiana.

• The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has removed 32 million cubic yards of debris. FEMA has reimbursed the State at 100 percent for this expense and will continue to do so through June 30. More than $1.2 billion in federal dollars have been allocated for Public Assistance projects, such as debris removal and emergency services in Louisiana.

• FEMA has approved $558 million in Community Disaster Loans in Louisiana to help keep essential services online in the hardest hit communities, including a $120 million loan to the City of New Orleans. The SBA has approved more than $2.1 billion in disaster assistance loans to business owners, homeowners and renters in Louisiana, representing 29,800 loans.

_Gulf Coast Aid Package_

A total of $29 billion was allocated to the states affected by Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Wilma in a hurricane relief package passed at the end of 2005. That money is to be shared among different constituent groups across six states that had hurricanes in 2005.
Below is a breakdown of the amount of funding for specific purposes. Where available, the State’s allocation is noted.

The following are programs which Louisiana will seek funding from in order to meet the needs of the State:

• **Rural Recovery and Development**

A total of $618 million to assist farmers and ranchers affected by the recent hurricanes and to rebuild rural communities has been allocated for the following:

$200 million for the Emergency Conservation Program for farmers and ranchers to rehabilitate farmland damaged by the 2005 hurricanes;

$300 million for the Emergency Watershed Protection program to undertake emergency recovery in damaged waterways or watersheds;

$118 million to assist rural communities repair and rebuild housing, water and sewer systems, community facilities, and electrical infrastructure.

• The package provides $4.7 billion to cover costs and repair damage to facilities and replace equipment owned by the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security.

• The bill provides $135 million to repair damages to national parks, wildlife refuges, and forests, as well as to address damages to other Department of the Interior facilities, state and private forestry damages, and for the leaking underground storage tank program managed by the Environmental Protection Agency.

• The Department of Social Services (DSS) received an allocation of $220 million for the Social Services Block Grant to provide child care, mental health and other social services to devastated individuals and communities. The Office of Community Development (OCD) is coordinating with DSS and Department of Health and Hospitals to determine the priorities in getting health care services back as close to normal as possible in many parishes.

• $1.6 billion is provided for education hurricane recovery. Funds are provided for the following:

  $645 million for impacted schools (schools that took on students);
$750 million for recovery schools (schools that were heavily affected by one or more of the hurricanes and need to restart their activities);

$5 million for Homeless Education program;

$200 million for Higher Education ($95 million was allocated to the Louisiana Board of Regents)

- Emergency Highway Relief—To repair damaged roads, bridges and other transportation infrastructure, $2.75 billion is provided, $425 million above the requested amount.

- USDA

On January 26, 2006, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) announced $2.8 billion in aid to assist victims of the 2005 hurricane season. The USDA will provide $1.2 billion in aid to agricultural producers; primarily in Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Texas. The USDA will provide disaster payments to farmers, ranchers and others through eight separate programs. Funding is provided through (1) Section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 and (2) The Department of Defense, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations to Address Hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico, and Pandemic Influenza Act, 2006.

Foundation Resources

Additional resources are available in limited amounts from the non-profit and private sectors. Examples include the Bush-Clinton Fund which collected a total of $100 million and has allocated $24.4 million to the State to date. Louisiana is projected to receive 61% of the funding distributed by that foundation. Approximately $13 million of that allocation will support higher education institutions to provide missing and critical pieces of integrated community recovery and rebuilding. The Louisiana Disaster Recovery Foundation will continue to support and work with private, nonprofit organizations in the areas of economic development, housing, education, health care and legal services that are focused on rebuilding.

State Promotion of Short and Long Term Recovery Planning

To promote sound short and long-term recovery planning at the state and local levels that impacts land use decisions which reflect the need for responsible flood plain management and growth, the State, through the LRA, is leading long-term community planning efforts
in its most affected parishes. Dubbed “Louisiana Speaks” this effort is a multifaceted planning process to develop a sustainable, long-term vision for South Louisiana in the wake of the destruction caused by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The community planning process accomplishes the following:

- Supports a deliberate and democratic process that relies on active participation,
- Empowers local communities to develop plans that meet individual needs,
- Establishes priorities at the local level to guide decisions,
- Supports communities with the best national planning experts working in partnership with local architects, planners and engineers, and
- Provides a user-friendly interface to enable development of individual plans.

The LRA’s long-term community planning process will combine the efforts of many experts, stakeholders and groups into a three-track approach:

1) Local recovery planning and design workshops
2) The development of a toolkit for architecture
3) A long-term regional vision

Louisiana Speaks has four key initiatives that will unfold over the next year:

1. **Parish Recovery Plans**

The goal of the Parish Recovery Plans is to develop a comprehensive plan that integrates both parish plans (coordinated with the support of FEMA technical assistance) and regional recovery plans. The LRA collaborated with planners from FEMA to develop a parish level planning process to address numerous recovery issues pertinent to the long-term recovery of severely damaged parishes. A total of 26 parishes throughout Louisiana were identified to participate in this planning process, which runs from November 2005 through March 2006. The following parishes are receiving technical assistance to draft plans: St. Tammany, Orleans, Jefferson, Plaquemines, Lafourche, Vermilion, Calcasieu, Cameron, Vernon, Beauregard, Allen, Jefferson Davis, Iberia, St. Mary, St. Charles, Tangipahoa, Washington and Sabine. Louisiana Recovery Planning Day was an important part of the parish level planning process. On January 21, 2006, which was proclaimed Louisiana Recovery Planning Day by Governor Kathleen Babineaux Blanco, the LRA and FEMA’s Long-Term Community Recovery (LTCR) team hosted a series of open houses to provide Louisianans with an opportunity to express their needs and to help define a community-based vision for Louisiana’s recovery.

The parish level planning process will result in the development of initial parish recovery plans, which will be used to set funding priorities for the recovery effort. The final plans will include a community baseline, a needs assessment, a recovery
strategy including principles, vision, goals, a set of high value recovery projects and a strategic recovery timeline. The final section will describe opportunities for the integration of the local plan with regional and statewide plans. The section will also include an inventory of local resources and government structures, and will describe the level of technical expertise needed to implement the plan. Emphasis in the planning process is on developing plans that are based on sound land use practices and plans that remain cognizant of the hazards of rebuilding in areas made more risky by new flood guidelines.

2. **Building a Better South Louisiana**

Over the next few years of reconstruction, hundreds of thousands of buildings will be built or rebuilt in a short time. In order to fully recover, we want to make sure that Louisianans rebuild the best possible structures – safer, stronger, and smarter. Urban Design Associates (UDA) will develop a comprehensive toolkit of ideas to be used by homeowners and businesses as they rebuild. UDA pioneered the revival of Pattern Books© as a means of communicating urban and architectural values to the building industry. These Pattern Books will be widely distributed and available for use on both residential and commercial projects and will feature sections on sustainable design and "green" building techniques, as well as tools for financing mixed-income housing.

3. **Developing Better Neighborhoods**

To help local communities rebuild and improve their neighborhoods, Duany Plater-Zyberk & Company (DPZ) will host a series of local neighborhood workshops called charrettes. This process will engage three local jurisdictions in the development of exemplary plans for recovery and redevelopment. Founded in 1980, DPZ has designed more than 300 new and existing communities.

People from the area will be encouraged to help develop detailed plans for their neighborhoods, with an emphasis towards rebuilding them better than before. These will also become building blocks for the regional vision, demonstrating how big ideas can be implemented at the local level, one neighborhood at a time.

4. **The South Louisiana Regional Vision**

Calthorpe Associates will develop a regional vision using the best scientists and planners from Louisiana and around the country. Calthorpe Associates has led a number of major regional planning efforts throughout the United States and abroad. Their innovative regional process has set a new standard for comprehensive and highly inclusive large-scale planning.
The regional plan will evaluate the economic, environmental and social forces that shape South Louisiana and explore alternative ways that growth and development can be accommodated in the context of varying environmental, economic and cultural patterns.

Results of the Louisiana Recovery Planning Day

The Louisiana Recovery Planning Day, described in the Parish Level Planning section above, allowed individuals attending the open houses on Louisiana Recovery Planning Day to prioritize planning principles, make tough choices on how to rebuild and identify what they most treasured in their communities. Participants considered issues relating to housing and community development, environmental and coastal issues, economic development, human services, and transportation and infrastructure. They shared their ideas through one-on-one conversations with Louisiana Speaks staff members, who encouraged participants to write down and post their ideas so that others could see and respond to them.

The Planning Day report summarizes responses from all 37 open house meetings, held both inside and outside the state of Louisiana. State and local officials and parish planners began using this data immediately after the meetings to identify recovery projects and draft plans that will jump-start Louisiana's recovery. As the building blocks for developing Louisiana's regional vision, these plans will be used to help establish funding priorities for recovery over the next several years.

The public input showed that residents across Louisiana strongly agree on several things, including the need for safety. For instance, input from participants across the United States made it clear, by a two-to-one margin, that rebuilding levees is a top priority. Restoration of coastal areas, which can help buffer the effects of hurricanes as they make landfall, also made it to the top 3 statewide priorities. Of the fifteen survey options asked, the top 3 represents 40% of all the responses.

QUESTION – If you were in charge of the rebuilding and could work on only three (3) top priorities, what would they be?
#1: Build better levees & other hurricane protection
#2: Encourage development on new housing
#3: Restore Coastal Areas

All participants were asked how safe their community must be before they would consider returning, rebuilding or reinvesting. The overwhelming majority of south Louisiana citizens sought safety for themselves, their families, homes and their communities. The participants also focused on the safety of their investments to avoid loss in future storms.
QUESTION – When will they return?
63% - When it is safer than before
16% - When there is the same level of safety as before
21% - They are ready to move back now

The need for safety and protective measures will be a required component of any investment or expenditure. The emphasis on safety at every level is a clear indicator that the public expects investments made in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita to be used in ways to reduce or eliminate the risk of future damages from natural hazards.

Planning Day participants agreed that both public and private investments should be protected from future losses, that some locations are too at risk to rebuild and that high-risk areas should not be the first areas to be reconstructed. Participants also expressed a desire to exercise some control (through zoning and land use plans) over the rebuilding process. This shows an understanding that building back in a different way than before may help accomplish goals of reducing future risk and ensuring safety.

The majority of participants agreed that they were willing to modify the plans of their particular parish in order to address broader regional issues. Looking at the interrelationship between parish plans and taking a more regional approach as appropriate, will provide more stability and help communities be more resilient.

Participants’ responses were evenly split on whether people should be guaranteed the right to return to their original home sites. The percentage of respondents who were NOT willing to guarantee the right to rebuild on their old home sites is notable, given the strong commitment to property rights expressed by many in south Louisiana. This may indicate receptiveness in some locations to relocation or consolidation as part of the recovery. Additional work will be necessary to develop a broader consensus on this issue.

Planning Day participants were also divided over whether other parish needs (such as housing and transportation) should be sacrificed for purposes of improving levees or constructing new ones in the event that insufficient funding is available to do both. However, responses also indicate that they may not feel that this is an acceptable trade-off to make and that both should be supported.

WHERE RESPONDENTS STRONGLY AGREED:
98% agreed they should build back differently to address issues of poverty, hurricane/ flood risk and environmental protection
96% agreed they are open to changing their parish's plans to make the region stronger
85% agreed that zoning and land-use plans should be used to guide rebuilding
75% agreed to rebuild and reinvest first in low-risk areas
74% agreed that some places are too at risk to rebuild

WHERE RESPONDENTS WERE SPLIT:
51% believe that communities should guarantee a property owner's rights to return to their original home site, while 49% did not agree.

State Level Policy and Planning Advisory Leadership

In addition to Long Term Community Planning, the state, through the LRA, is guiding a Long Term Planning for policy considerations through Task Forces of the LRA Board. These task forces are comprised of board members and subject matter experts who advise and provide oversight for the LRA Board on policy matters in subjects including, Permanent Housing and Redevelopment, Economic and Workforce Development, Public Health and Health Care, Human Services, Long Term Community Planning, Environment, Infrastructure and Transportation, and committees of the Board on Audit and Coastal Protection. These task forces will develop strategic plans for policy recovery issues, which will be used to prioritize decision-making about recovery efforts. They will also develop and recommend specific recovery programs or policy initiatives, whether funded by CDBG or other federal and state sources, or initiatives for state agencies or the state legislature to consider. Examples of these recommendations have included the business bridge loan program, state housing related to blight and adjudicated properties, and consumer and business tax reductions for recovery needs.

State Promotion of Quality Construction

The State passed Act 12 during a special legislative session in December 2005. Before the passage of this law, Louisiana had never had a statewide building code. This bill sets a minimum statewide standard at the International Building Code (IBC) to ensure that homes and businesses are rebuilt to withstand the next hurricane. Through programs currently being designed such as the housing repair program, the State will urge jurisdictions, especially those along the coast, to set high building standards. Better building codes will also help home- and business-owners get the insurance they need to rebuild. The law also requires the following parishes to enforce, on an emergency basis, all wind and flood mitigation requirements prescribed in Act 12: Calcasieu, Cameron, Iberia, Jefferson Davis, Lafourche, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Tammany, Terrebonne and Vermilion.

The state will address the manner in which it will encourage construction methods that emphasize energy efficiency and mold resistance in a subsequent action plan containing the State’s housing plan. RS 51:911.22 and RS 51:911.21 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes contain standards relative to manufactured housing construction and installation.
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Louisiana has adopted HUD standards under the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974, as amended.

Programs that are included in this proposed action plan require quality construction and safety. For example, the matching program for local government emergency infrastructure will only be available to parishes which have adopted the latest available base flood elevations of the FEMA Flood Recovery Guidance, and to those that have adopted, implemented, or are in the process of implementing, the new statewide building code standards adopted in Act 12 of the 2005 Special Session of the Louisiana Legislature. Similar to the way that CDBG is proposed in this plan to be used for local government match payments for FEMA public assistance projects, a similar need for match dollars will exist for local governments proposing mitigation efforts. The State’s most damaged communities have very little resources to pay for match, and programs such as CDBG will play a crucial role in assuring the successful mitigation by these communities during this budget-constrained, post-disaster period.

In response to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the LRA has assumed the role of the State Hazard Mitigation Team, and is thus responsible for determining overall priorities for the use of Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) funds and for recommending projects for funding.

All parishes in the State of Louisiana are eligible to apply for assistance under the HMGP with priority given to the most severely damaged areas. At this time, the HMGP funds are estimated to rise to somewhere around two billion dollars. To access these hazard mitigation funds, parishes will submit proposals to OHSEP through their local Emergency Management offices. The funds, which are provided under the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, require a 25 percent match from parish governments or state agencies. Distribution of these funds is subject to a formal review process in accordance with the Inspector General, Legislative Auditor, Commissioner of Administration and State Treasurer, as has been done for all funds distributed by OSHEP since Hurricane Katrina.

The first action of the LRA related to hazard mitigation was to jump start mitigation projects in the State by the authorization of $256 million in funding for four purposes: 1) to mitigate repetitive flood damage properties (properties damaged 4 times or more or twice for more than half of the property’s value), 2) elevation or acquisition of other residences, 3) the retrofitting of critical facilities; and 4) mitigation planning. The first action was funded to address the fact that Louisiana has one of the highest numbers of repetitive flood properties in the nation, even prior to the 2005 hurricanes. By taking this action, the Board made its first priority to resolve existing high risk properties in the State. The second aspect of this initial allocation is expected to fund the highest priority flood and disaster mitigation projects.
The second action of the LRA Board was to approve the following as its mitigation hierarchy of priorities, which are consistent with the approved State Hazard Mitigation Plan, to represent a prioritized list of projects as a long term implementation strategy. Those priorities were in order as follows:

- Acquisition and Demolition
- Elevation
- Demolition/Rebuild
- Retrofit of Critical Facilities
- Retrofit of Public Facilities
- Retrofit of Non-Profit Facilities
- Retrofit of Residential Structures
- Drainage Projects
- Retrofit of Business
- Coastal Restoration
- Planning
- 5% Set Aside

Based on these actions $100 million of the initial allocation will be dedicated to elevate and acquire severely and repeatedly damaged homes, another $136 million is for mitigation projects in parishes declared disasters by FEMA, and the remaining $14 million is intended for disaster mitigation planning to be used by state, local, tribal and eligible private non-profit institutions.

In addition to addressing priorities as shown above, the LRA also recommended that projects also be considered and given greater priority when they provide a regional or systemic solution to natural hazards risk. Each application will also be considered in terms of whether the projects produce impacts that are consistent with LRA and State policy, guidelines and standards developed to guide the reconstruction and recovery efforts from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

The state hazard mitigation team has also passed a resolution to endorse the principle that HMGP funds should be leveraged where possible with other federal, state and local dollars, such as CDBG funds, to use all possible resources in a coordinated fashion to best prepare for and prevent future damage due to flooding and other disasters. Similar to the way that CDBG is proposed in this Action Plan to be used for local government match payments for FEMA public assistance projects, a similar need for match dollars will exist for local governments proposing mitigation efforts. The State’s most damaged communities have very little resources to pay the match, and programs such as CDBG will play a crucial role in assuring the successful mitigation by these communities during this budget-constrained, post-disaster period.
Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing

Policy makers and homeless providers alike are struggling to understand the significant changes in Louisiana’s homeless population. It will be months, if not years, before the full consequences for homeless persons can be documented adequately. In spite of that reality, we can with certainty make several observations, including:

* Substance abuse and chronic mental illness are the two most significant factors leading to homelessness. The post-traumatic stress associated with a major displacement will not only result in additional homeless persons; some successfully housed disabled clients will experience a de-compensation of their condition that will in all likelihood return them to homelessness.

* As unemployment and under-employment (additional significant contributors to homelessness) rise because of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita and as families experience the financial stress of re-locating or finding new housing, families that were housed but in precarious financial situations will also add to the homeless rolls.

* The serious lack of affordable housing has been made significantly worse due to the hurricanes. Existing affordable housing stock has been destroyed across Southern Louisiana. Communities in other parts of the State that struggled to find affordable housing for their clients now see competition for these units that drives up fair market rents and pushes additional individuals and families into homelessness.

Our current system and resources were already at or near capacity prior to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The increased demand on the system after these disasters greatly increases the challenge of significantly reducing and or eliminating homelessness. The most effective solution to homelessness is to provide affordable housing with the supports that make it sustainable. There must be an increase in the supply of affordable housing and funding for the supportive services that successfully re-houses individuals and families.

We are facing many challenges in addressing emergency and transitional housing needs of individuals and families. As we continue to document the full scope of the need, it does not prevent us from beginning the difficult work of increasing the supply of affordable housing and funding the supportive services that successfully re-houses individuals and families.
The State of Louisiana has as one of its highest priorities the commitment to prevent low-income individuals and families with children (especially those with incomes below 30 percent of median) from becoming homeless. To prevent homelessness, mainstream government agencies must assist the most vulnerable clients--those with severe disabilities or extreme poverty--in obtaining housing and keeping them housed. Investment in prevention holds the promise of saving money on expensive systems heavily utilized by homeless people such as hospitals and jails. Effective homelessness prevention programs include: (1) rental assistance programs for families living in extreme poverty who are facing eviction or foreclosure; and (2) discharge planning policies from public institutions such as mental health and substance abuse treatment facilities, correctional facilities, medical hospitals, foster care services and juvenile justice services.

As of August 15, 2005, two weeks before Hurricane Katrina, there were 93,783 renter households in Louisiana. Eighteen percent of the total number of renter households were paying more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs. This places them at risk of homelessness. This number has at least doubled because of the loss of affordable housing due to the severe damage in the areas impacted by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and the severe increase in rents being charged for habitable, rental housing stock.

We are seeking to develop or increase the capacity of rental assistance programs that will provide short-term subsidies to defray rent and utility arrearages for families that have received eviction or utility termination notices. The program will target those families with children living in extreme poverty to prevent eviction or foreclosure on a home. Innovative programs and activities will be designed to prevent the incidence of homelessness. Others in need of rental assistance are those with financial difficulties caused by loss of job, illness or disability, a family emergency or an inability to pay rent that has dramatically increased in the aftermath of the hurricanes. Additional programs include security deposits or first month’s rent to permit a homeless family to move into its own dwelling; mediation programs for landlord-tenant disputes; and legal services programs for the representation of indigent tenant in eviction proceedings.

The prevention of homelessness relies on the early identification of those individuals who are at risk of homelessness. To aid in their identification, Louisiana will design a homelessness profile/checklist to aid in alerting agencies to the need to intervene expeditiously. The State recognizes the need for state agencies and other service providers to have information about the housing resources available; including those for special needs groups such as the disabled. Louisiana plans to develop reliable databases of affordable housing for each region of the State.
From Transition to Permanent Housing

The State of Louisiana recognizes the importance of helping homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living. The continuum of care approach envisions comprehensive strategic planning at the community level to inventory existing resources and to identify gaps or deficiencies for development of the continuum of care, including the chronically homeless. Activities targeted to eliminate such gaps would be the primary objectives to which available resources to address homelessness and housing needs would be directed.

Homeless individuals and families often require numerous and varied support services to achieve independent living, including remedial education, job search and job training, alcohol and drug rehabilitation services, case management, transportation and day care services. Support programs available for homeless persons may be limited in scope, accessibility, and/or capability of programs to accommodate special needs. Throughout the state, the need to develop additional and expanded support services for shelter recipients is strongly indicated.

In order to end homelessness, people must have sufficient income to obtain and maintain housing. Many persons are capable of working part-time or at less taxing jobs. Finding employment for those capable of working is sometimes a challenging task. Many lack work experience and skills, but some are not able to read and write. Some do have sufficient skills, but have been incarcerated, making employers reluctant to hire them. With additional funding support, the State through homelessness coalitions and state agencies will continue to provide opportunities and supports needed for job acquisition and retention; provide educational opportunities that promote the unique skills of the individual; reduce the barriers that hinder the ability of homeless persons to obtain and maintain employment; and address public policy influencing the ability for homeless persons to pay for housing costs.

Priorities for development of transitional, permanent and single-room occupancy housing, and supplemental programs to assist homeless persons are preeminent for the major urban regions in the State. However, non-urban areas are also deficient in these resources and could benefit from programs that serve parish and/or multi-parish areas and involve strong supportive service components and elements of broad-based community participation in developing a continuum of care system.

Supportive housing has proven itself to be an overwhelmingly successful answer to homelessness because it is a cost effective, community-friendly alternative to shelters which enables individuals to remain housed and achieve increasingly greater levels of self sufficiency. Supportive housing, by definition, is permanent affordable rental housing linked to services (health, mental health, employment) required to help individuals rebuild their lives after homelessness, institutional care or other disruptions.
It has been combined very successfully within mixed income, mixed use development, with supportive housing making up 50-60 percent of a building’s tenancy, and the remaining apartments set aside for low wage earners. Typically, an on-site staff would see that tenants have the assistance and support needed to address health and employment issues and navigate the process of securing benefits and accessing work.

In national studies, supportive housing has proven to be far less costly than shelters, hospitals stays and other emergency responses to homelessness. Especially when targeted to very frail individuals who are frequent users of hospital and mental health services, supportive housing produces substantial reductions in public expenditures on emergency and institutional care.

Supportive housing is typically developed by nonprofit groups, but has occasionally been built by for-profit developers on a turn-key basis on behalf of nonprofit owners. Supportive services are provided or coordinated by the nonprofit groups, at times in partnership with other nonprofit groups. Properties are sometimes self-managed by the groups, sometimes by for-profit companies hired by the nonprofit owner.

Supportive housing has typically utilized the Low Income Tax Credit as a major financing tool. Where possible, the Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit has also been used to secure private equity investment. In many cities, federal HOME and HOPWA funds have provided capital to projects. (In Louisiana, securing capital and operating commitments for a 10,000 unit supportive housing development plan is the first step.) Securing sites and buildings to convert into supportive housing, or land for the construction of supportive housing is the other urgent task. Identifying and building the capacity of local nonprofit operators to develop and operate supportive housing can be undertaken simultaneously.

CDBG funding will be utilized to be used to complement and enhance HUD homeless assistance funding under all McKinney program sources (ESGP formula funding and Continuum of Care SuperNOFA awards). A proposal will be submitted to the LRA requesting funding under the Housing Program category. These funds will be used as a source of funding support for securing sites and services, and to allow facility expansion to help eliminate or lessen the gaps of unmet needs within local service delivery and homeless housing systems.

Special Needs Individuals

The most effective solution the State has in addressing the special needs of persons who are not homeless is to provide affordable housing with the supports that make it sustainable. This includes preventing homelessness whenever possible; rapidly re-housing people when homelessness cannot be prevented and providing wrap around
services that promote housing stability and self-sufficiency. Post Katrina, this has become more difficult.

The following populations are deemed to be at high risk of becoming homeless:

* The very low-income population, including recipients of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
* Elderly
* Low income individuals involved in substance abuse
* Recently released ex-prisoners
* Deinstitutionalized mentally disabled persons
* Victims of family violence

Access to adequate housing is a problem for many people living with special needs, including the chronically homeless. The cost of medical care and medications, a lack of transportation, rising rents, housing discrimination and a shortage of affordable housing can present major obstacles for these individuals. This has been especially true in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. A lack of stable and affordable housing can contribute to an increased number of missed medical appointments; sporadic access to care may diminish the impact of medicine and medical treatment. This, in turn, can lead to greater needs. Some special needs groups experience higher rates of many diseases, including HIV, than the general population. Homelessness often occurs in combination with chronic mental illness, substance abuse, and unsafe sexual behavior—all factors that heighten the risk of special needs.

The State’s strategy to address at-risk individuals takes into account the primary role of community-based charitable organizations and voluntary programs, alone or in partnership with local governments and public agencies, in establishing and supporting basic facilities and services for special needs individuals. Central to the strategy are the following elements:

1. The gathering of information on the at-risk population in the State and assessing the needs of these individuals;
2. Dissemination and sharing of this information to community based groups and agencies concerned or involved in servicing the at-risk;
3. The evaluation of the special needs of individuals (component of local continuum of care system);
4. Making appropriate referrals to available community resources;
5. The provision and coordination of all necessary services so that the homeless individual achieves maximum benefit from available facilities and services; and
6. Encouraging the development of all necessary and appropriate services, service networks, and public and private resources (including real property, in-kind contributions, etc.) to support activities to assist persons with special needs in
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Monitors

The Department of Social Services/Office of Community Services will develop, with oversight from the LRA board’s Audit Committee, comprehensive procedures to monitor compliance with program rules by recipient local governments and nonprofit sub recipients under the Community Development Block Grant Program when funds are allocated for these purposes. As part of the initial application review process, specific components of project proposals will be evaluated with respect to compliance with program rules. This assessment will influence the selection of project proposals to be funded and the amount of grant funds awarded to individual projects. As necessary and appropriate in the negotiation and development of grant agreements by the State, local governments and/or project sponsors will be instructed to revise proposals and budgets to eliminate ineligible activities and or to align proposed activities more strictly in conformance with HUD regulations. As prescribed by program rules, the State will adhere to HUD’s regulations with respect to oversight of compliance with environmental statutes and authorities.

State fiscal procedures require that payment requests be submitted on DSS supplied forms, which identify the costs claimed by eligible category and describe the sources and amounts of matching funds. A process for budget revisions requires that recipients submit requested revisions in writing for approval by the State when revisions involved new line items or transfer of funds between CDBG categories. Standard contractual provisions require that grantee local governments submit copies of their audit reports to DSS. Audit review staff of DSS reviews local governments’ audit reports for findings relative to programs administered by DSS and follow up is implemented on appropriate measures to resolve audit findings.

On-site monitoring of recipient local governments shall be performed by the Office of Community Services’ Contracts and Eligibility Section in accordance with CDBG regulations. Monitoring issues shall include all relevant statutory and regulatory provisions applicable to CDBG as set forward in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Major areas of program compliance which shall be covered during the on- site monitoring evaluations include: client eligibility, separation of church/state compliance, drug free workplace compliance, confidentiality issues, involvement of homeless persons in project, formal process for termination assistance, record keeping and performance reporting. Reports regarding such monitoring will be shared with the LRA board’s Audit Committee.
CDBG Programs

As discussed in the federal and state response section, an enormous amount of rebuilding activity is occurring to address the needs described in this plan. The main goal of investment of supplemental CDBG funds is to fill the gaps in funding for the most critical needs in the areas of housing, infrastructure and economic development. Another primary goal is to leverage the other private and public sector resources available for recovery.

Infrastructure Programs

The State has suffered severe infrastructure losses. As stated previously, there is an enormous gap to fill to bring back basic infrastructure at the state and local level in order to provide the necessary public services. In order to help meet some of the identified unmet needs, $1,187,500,000 will be programmed into infrastructure activities at the state and local level.

Local Government Emergency Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Activity</th>
<th>105(a)(2) and (9) Public Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Objective</td>
<td>Low to moderate income, elimination of blight, urgent need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Amount</td>
<td>$95 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the $1,187,500,000, an initial allocation of $95,000,000 will be programmed into the Local Government Emergency Infrastructure Program. This program will provide local governments with the required FEMA match for emergency infrastructure projects. The method of distribution will be on a first come, first serve basis. As public assistance projects are approved by FEMA, the State will allocate funding for the local match for these projects if the following guidelines are met:

1. That the funding to be provided is for cases of emergency need (to be determined by the State);
2. That the funding to be provided will be match for projects eligible for FEMA Public Assistance;
3. That the funding be provided to parishes which have adopted the latest available base flood elevations of the FEMA Flood Recovery Guidance;
4. That the funding be provided to parishes or communities which have adopted, implemented or are in the process of implementing the new statewide building code standards adopted in the 2005 1st Extraordinary Session of the Louisiana Legislature;
5. That the funding be provided to communities for projects recommended through a broad community planning process; and
6. That the projects receiving funding follow the best design for delivery of services in light of the population shifts and changed circumstances of many Louisiana communities.

Each project funded will meet one of three national objectives. Until applications are received and service areas and beneficiaries are known, the specific national objective cannot be determined.

This activity is considered a low risk activity. Monitoring will be performed in accordance with the attached monitoring plan. (Appendix 6)

**State Building Infrastructure Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Activity</th>
<th>105(a)(2) and (9) Public Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Objective</td>
<td>Low to moderate income, elimination of blight, urgent need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Amount</td>
<td>$142,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 1,500 state buildings were damaged by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Damage estimates for both buildings and contents are approximately $1.8 billion. Insurance will cover approximately $300 million of that loss leaving $1.5 billion not covered by insurance. FEMA funds under the Stafford Act provisions and presidential declarations will cover 90% of those uninsured losses, which leaves a gap of $150 million at a time when the State’s tax base has been severely impacted. $142.5 million of the CDBG funds will be utilized to provide the FEMA match for those facilities.

It is impossible to repair all 1,528 damaged facilities at the same time. There are not enough designers and contractors to repair all $1.8 billion in damages immediately. Because of this, the State developed a process to determine the priorities and timing of bringing state buildings back up to par. A decision tree was developed and from that a plan for the restoration of state facilities. In order to begin this process we had to first develop a data base, or list, of all damaged facilities, and estimates of cost for the repair of those damages. Understand that these are initial estimates, and actual costs of repairs may vary depending on the bid climate as well as hidden, unforeseen and unanticipated damages that will be revealed after repairs are begun.

After developing the list of damaged facilities, a system was developed to set priorities. The staff of Facility Planning and Control (FP&C) in the DOA developed a decision tree that was approved by the Joint Legislative Committee on the Budget. The decision tree was based on FP&C’s understanding of the facilities, agencies and programs housed in
those impacted buildings. The following is a summary of the decision making process and application of the decision tree:

The first thing considered was the degree to which those buildings are of great significance to and are symbols of our state, or are recognized cultural or historical artifacts. It was felt that the repair of those facilities would be important to send a message to the world and our citizens that Louisiana is coming back. So this was the first question asked and answered. Those facilities fitting these criteria became Priority 1 projects.

The second type facility considered was those facilities that house basic and necessary functions of state government. (Statutorily mandated function, public safety, health protection services, education and incarceration) The following questions were asked: “What is the business of government?” “Why does government exist?” These facilities fell into Priority 2 if they did not flood or Priority 3 if they did flood. It was considered important to determine whether or not we should restore those facilities that were at risk of flooding again before we restore those that were not. Those facilities that are not in a special flood hazard zone were placed in the higher Priority 2 category while those at risk of flooding were placed at a lower Priority 2 category. A question asking whether this facility houses a program essential of state government was answered. If the answer was no, it stayed on the left of the decision tree. If the answer was yes, it went to the right and ultimately ended up in either Priority 2 or Priority 3.

The next level of the decision tree was based on the question, “Does the facility promote economic development?” (Those facilities that encourage industry to relocate or encourage tourism.) If the answer was no the facility stayed on the left of the decision tree. If the answer was yes the facility/building went to the right and ultimately ended up in Priority 4 if it was not in the Special Flood Hazard Zone and Priority 5 if it was in the Special Flood Hazard Zone.

The next level of decision making related to self generated funded facilities. The question was asked, “Does the facility have historic significance?” (Over 45 years old, site of an historic event, significant and/or unique architectural style or educational in nature.) If the answer was no, then the facility stayed on the left of the decision tree. If the answer was yes, the facility/building went to the right and ultimately ended up in Priority 8 if it was not in the Special Flood Hazard Zone and Priority 9 if it was in the Special Flood Hazard Zone.

The next level of decision making related to historically significant facilities. The question was asked, “Does the facility generate revenues that fully support it?” (Collects fees for other forms of self generated revenues.) If the answer was no, then the facility stayed on the left of the decision tree. If the answer was yes, the facility/building went to
the right and ultimately ended up Priority 6 if it was not in the Special Flood Hazard Zone and Priority 7 if it was in the Special Flood Hazard Zone.

The first stage of the process yielded a prioritization of all facilities at the program level. It was then necessary to further apply the priorities on a building by building basis asking the questions for each building at the site level. The following questions were asked of us and the user agencies or management boards of the institutions, “Does that building house a function that is essential to the mission of the institution, program or activity?” The importance of each building as it relates to the mission of the agency, program or activity was then discussed. Also the potential for consolidation, alternate locations for programs and activities if restorations were delayed, was discussed in all the groups. This information enabled a better refinement of the priority list.

The priority list was then submitted in priority order to the Joint Legislative Committee on the Budget and subsequently approved by that committee. See Appendix 7 for the priority listing and Appendix 8 for further explanation of the decision tree.

Each project funded will meet one of three national objectives. Until applications are received and service areas and beneficiaries are known, the specific objective cannot be determined.

The State has developed comprehensive procedures to ensure compliance with HUD’s CDBG program regulations for each funded project. The State will verify each project’s ranking on the pre-determined priority list and ensure that the project meets one of the three national objectives. The State will also ensure that each project is eligible to receive the aforementioned FEMA funds. The State will verify that each project has been environmentally cleared by FEMA prior to any construction activity.

The State will review the procurement process utilized in the hiring of an architect and/or engineer for each project and will verify and document that the person/firm hired is not listed on the federal Excluded Parties List. The State will also ensure that the professional services contract will include all required supplemental clauses and conditions.

The State will review the project’s bid package and ensure inclusion of all required supplemental clauses and conditions, Federal Labor Standards Provisions, current wage decision(s), etc. The State will attend the pre-bid conference and the bid opening as necessary. The State will obtain a copy of the bid tabulation and verify and document the eligibility of the contractor selected via the federal Excluded Parties List system. The State will attend the pre-construction conference to ensure that all required Equal Opportunity forms and certifications are signed by the prime contractor and all subcontractors as well as to provide these contractors with a list of eligible workers obtained from the State’s Department of Labor. This list will help the contractor in meeting the
Section 3 hiring goals requirement. At this conference, the State will also explain the Labor Standards requirements of weekly payrolls and daily inspections reports.

The State will review submitted payrolls, new and existing employee forms, payroll deduction authorization forms, etc., as well as conduct employee interviews and make site visits to the project when necessary. During the review of the payrolls, the State will ensure that all Davis-Bacon and Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (CWHSSA) requirements are being met and will ensure payment of restitution where needed. The State will also review and process Request For Payment (RFP) forms and supporting documentation, and will review change orders for reasonableness of cost and consistency with the project’s scope of work.

The State will prepare a Final Wage Compliance Report, accept clear liens, make final payments and issue Acceptance of Work Certificates.

Economic Development

Louisiana Bridge Loan Program

Under the Special Economic Development category, $332.5 million will be utilized to stimulate short term and long term economic recovery of our State. Of the $332.5 million, $100 million will be utilized to fund the Louisiana Bridge Loan Program (LBLP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Activity</th>
<th>105(a)(17) Economic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Objective</td>
<td>Low to moderate income and urgent need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Amount</td>
<td>$95 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The State has already utilized $10 million of the Governor’s Rapid Response Fund to initially fund the LBLP. The response was enormous and the funding was gone within three weeks. This $10 million assisted 407 businesses in 13 parishes, mostly in Southwest Louisiana, due to the businesses there being able to react more quickly than those impacted by Katrina. These loans are interest free for 180 days. After these funds were exhausted, the State set aside $30 million of its CDBG funds which are already obligated in previous action plans but are as yet unneeded and undisbursed. The eligible area of coverage was expanded from 13 to 37 parishes. One hundred million dollars of the new disaster funds are being programmed for this same activity. A portion of the $100 million will be used to reimburse banks for any losses suffered, and the interest-free period given the businesses, from the initial $10 and $30 million float loan to borrowers that returned to the affected area. It is expected that the State will be able to leverage funds of approximately five to one based on Florida’s experience with a similar program.
The loans will be used to provide temporary working capital to businesses located in the above designated areas. It is estimated that 81,000 small businesses were impacted by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

Fifty percent of the funds will be allocated to the following 13 most affected parishes:
- Calcasieu, Cameron, Jefferson, Lafourche, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. John, St. Tammany, Tangipahoa, Vermilion, and Washington Parishes

Fifty percent of the funds will be allocated to 24 remaining parishes:
- Acadia, Ascension, Assumption, East Baton Rouge, East Feliciana, Iberia, Iberville, Jefferson Davis, Lafayette, Livingston, Pointe Coupee, St. Helena, St. James, St. Martin, St. Mary, Terrebonne, West Baton Rouge, West Feliciana, Allen, Beauregard, Evangeline, Vernon, St. Landry, Sabine

A guarantee will be provided by cooperative endeavors between the DOA, Louisiana Department of Economic Development (LED), Louisiana Public Facilities Authority and several participating banks. The participating banks will provide loans using guarantees through a loan committee process which will be established by each bank. The banks will administer the loans which are covered by the personal liability of the small business owner. The length of the loan is six months and is interest free if repaid by a borrower who returns his business to the affected area. These funds will pay the banks the interest during this six month period. In cases of a default by the small business owner, the bank will pursue payment through a collection process. If payments cannot be collected through the collection process, the guarantee will become effective.

To be eligible for funding, small Louisiana firms must have suffered losses, damages, displacement or business interruption as a direct result of either or both hurricanes. The minimum loan amount is $5,000 and the maximum loan amount is $100,000. Reports will be provided quarterly to the DOA, by the banks, on the number of jobs in each position, including job titles and salaries, created or retained by each of the businesses during the term of the loan.

**Eligibility Requirements:** Those eligible to apply for loans under the Program will include:

a. **Individual(s)** who own at least 51% of a small business with an existing Tax Identification Number, established in the above listed parishes of Louisiana (for not less than one year prior to the hurricane), that have sustained physical damage, displacement or business interruption due to either or both of the hurricanes, Katrina or Rita.

b. Minimum number of employees – two. The business owner and at least one other
employee are considered as two employees. (Self employed individuals are not eligible for this Program).

c. Maximum number of employees - 100 employees.

d. The need for the loan and use of proceeds must be directly related to the impact of or mandatory evacuation due to one or both of the storms.

e. Loan recipient: Loans will be made to individuals, or groups of individuals, who own at least 51% of the business. If the business is a Not-For-Profit entity, evidence of an IRS form 990 must be provided along with a resolution authorizing the Executive Director to borrow funds. Only one such loan will be permitted per individual, per group of individuals, and/or per business.

f. Use of Proceeds: A borrower will be required to sign a statement that proceeds of the loan will be used only for purposes of maintaining or restarting the business, in the designated area or in a temporary location within the business’ community in which it was operating prior to the hurricane (its community of origin), to one of its neighboring areas or parishes also adversely affected by the hurricane.

g. Dedicated Sources of Repayment: A borrower will be required to certify a source for the repayment of the loan (for example: the proceeds of anticipated insurance claims, SBA loan, other loans applied for or to be applied for, and/or financial assistance grants which will be used to repay the loan, or revenue from the re-opening of the business).

h. Application Period: Applications will be accepted under this Program through June 30, 2006, contingent on the availability of funds.

**Application Procedures:**

a. The Program guidelines and Application forms for the Program can be found at www.lpfa.com.

b. Applications will be distributed by regional economic development, financial institution partners, on the Internet, and by other means and organizations as appropriate. LED, the local Parish Economic Development Office (EDO) will work with local organizations to distribute informational materials and press releases as appropriate.

c. Applicants will submit their completed, signed application and related information
to a participating bank. Current participating banks are listed in Appendix 11 of this document or may be viewed at www.lpfa.com.

d. Participating banks will make one or more experienced loan officers available to review the application, verifying the applicant's identity at that time (e.g., copy of driver's license and current contact information), credit history, and assuring that the application form and accompanying information (if any) are sufficiently complete for consideration by a loan committee.

Additional information may be required - e.g. copies of business or personal tax returns.

If the application is complete, the bank will accept it, create a file with the applicant’s name and/or business name on it, and assign an application number as further described below.

If the application is not sufficiently complete, the bank will advise the applicant concerning additional information required or desirable.

e. If each applicant for a Loan has a credit score of 620 or above, the bank is authorized to approve the loan; if any applicant for a Loan has a credit score of 580 to 619, the bank is required to submit the entire Loan application for approval to a credit committee that the Department of Economic Development will convene or cause to be convened; if any applicant for a Loan has a credit score below 580, the bank will be required to decline the loan application.

Applications to be sent to the Department of Economic Development should be faxed to 225-342-0142 or mailed or delivered to 1051 North 3rd Street, Baton Rouge, LA 70802 and be sent to the attention of: Mike Williams.

**Loan Processing**: A participating bank that has received applications will be responsible for the further processing of completed applications before they are presented to a loan committee. **This generally will involve obtaining and reviewing credit reports as needed on the applicant or business partners, co-signers, et al.; contacting business or bank references, and other activities as appropriate.**

The LBLP will be funded under the urgent need objective. After the Office of Community Development (OCD) receives the quarterly reports on the number of jobs created or retained, job titles, and the salary information, the national objective will be reassessed and amended accordingly. It is expected that many of the jobs retained or created will be filled by persons of low and moderate income.
This activity is considered a high risk activity. Staff will receive and review quarterly reports and evaluate program objectives. Visits will be made randomly to the businesses served by the program to ensure correctness of the information sent to the State. Audits will be performed.

At this time, other economic development programs are being carefully thought out and designed to further enhance the State’s economic recovery in those areas most impacted by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

**Housing Programs**

The State intends to allocate $4,519,400,000 for housing programs. The State is in the process of designing several housing programs to assist in the State’s recovery efforts. Programs being considered at this time are: Homeowner Repair, Rebuild and Relocation Program, Small Rental Property Owner Rehabilitation Program, Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) “Piggy-back” Rental Property Development Program, Supportive Housing Programs and Pre-development Loan Program.

These programs will be further refined to include method of distribution, criteria for selection, monitoring, etc., and will be submitted to HUD as an amendment to the State’s Action Plan at a later date.

**Displacement Policy**

The state has a displacement policy which will be modified prior to implementation for any activities that may cause displacement. It is our intent to work with Phillip Fortenberry on these modifications in order to minimize displacement and to comply with all regulations relative to the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.

**Homeowner Repair, Rebuild, and Restore Program**

In order to prepare for the implementation of the Road Home Housing Program it will be necessary to request proposals for professional services to assist the State in program design, business processes, and work flows for implementing these proposed housing programs as well as provide assistance in the development of a Management Information System.

A call center will be established to begin registering and initiating case files for homeowners needing housing assistance. Funding is being requested at this time to pay
for these services and to begin the planning of the Road Home Assistance Centers. The centers will aid in removing barriers to reconstruction. Staff will be trained to assist the homeowners to get through the “red tape” in order to quickly get them back into their homes. Counselors will aid the homeowner in getting loans, learning how to manage debt, and explaining all options available to them as a homeowner. The State will be extremely cautious of designing housing programs that add barriers to reconstruction. Barriers to reconstruction will be identified and to the extent possible will be eliminated through program design and the processes developed to implement the housing programs.

It is expected that 18 parishes will need environmental clearance parish-wide. Centers shall be placed in the most impacted areas of the State and shall be staffed with qualified financial counselors to provide information relative to refinancing options and availability of loans and grants for repair, rebuilding or relocation. These centers shall assist displaced persons, who were homeowners or renters, and property owners with creating viable housing strategies. The contracting process for the operations of the implementation of the Road Home Housing Program must begin now in order to assist the thousands of renters and homeowners currently displaced. Existing non-profit housing entities determined by the State to have the capacity to provide these services may be contracted with to also provide these services.

It is also being requested in this Action Plan that funding be approved for costs associated with the environmental review that will be needed in order to begin any type of housing program. It is expected that 18 parishes will need environmental clearance parish-wide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Activity</th>
<th>105(a)(1), (4) and (20) Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Objective</td>
<td>Low to moderate income, urgent need and elimination of blight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Amount</td>
<td>$17,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administration**

These funds will be used to pay reasonable administration costs related to the planning and execution of disaster recovery community development activities. Program administration costs will include staff and related costs required for overall program management, coordination, monitoring, reporting and evaluation. This category includes both the State’s cost of administering the program, as well as units of general local governments’ (UGLG) costs of administering grants awarded by the State. For administration, $148,680,000 is being set aside for administration. Of that, $8,810,400 is being requested for the administration of the above activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Activity</th>
<th>105(a)(13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity Amount</td>
<td>$8,810,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning

The LRA will develop priorities for the utilization of CDBG Disaster Funds. LRA’s board is organized into task forces in the areas of Economic Development and Workforce Development, Health, Human Services, Infrastructure, Environmental, Housing and Education. The roles of these groups include the development of best practices based on strategic plans to guide the recovery and rebuilding process and the efficient use of funds as well as to make recommendations to the LRA Board on programs funded through the CDBG program.

Data gathering and research of best practices will be an important role of the LRA. The results of these efforts will be used to develop priorities and programs. The LRA through its various task forces will work with OCD in design of programs and activities to meet the goals and objectives identified in the State’s plan. In addition, LRA will evaluate the progress of such programs in accomplishing these goals and objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Activity</th>
<th>Activity Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105(a)(12)</td>
<td>$9,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical Assistance

The LRA will provide assistance to UGLGs to help plan and implement long term recovery strategies. OCD will provide pre-application workshops for local government as well as implementation workshops. Technical assistant programs will be developed to assist in areas where it has been determined that a need exists. Training and materials will be provided to homeowners, inspectors, contractors, etc., to assist them on various topics. One on one technical assistance will be provided to those UGLGs experiencing performance problems. $12,420,000 is being set aside for technical assistance activities. Of that $500,000 is being requested to provide technical assistance on the requested activities in this Action Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Activity</th>
<th>Activity Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105(a)(19)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grant Administration

The DOA/OCD and the LRA plan to hire additional employees to carry out the administrative functions associated with the supplemental appropriations. The roles and responsibilities of the LRA and OCD are spelled out in a memorandum of understanding. (See Appendix 9) The OCD has the staff expertise to train additional employees on the federal and state regulations governing the CDBG program. The LRA has a mandate
from the Governor and Louisiana Legislature to assure the coordinated use of resources toward the recovery and to support the most efficient and effective use of such resources. The OCD and the LRA will work together to achieve this goal.

The State has a monitoring plan for the regular CDBG program and it is attached as an Appendix. The plan will be revised somewhat to accommodate the waivers given to the State and other provisions cited in the legislation. Particular attention will be paid to ensuring that the use of funds are disaster related and that funding allocated will not duplicate other benefits. The State will ensure through its application process, monitoring of recipients, and oversight by the LRA Board’s Audit Committee, that recipients are not receiving duplication of benefits and that funds are not used for projects or activities that are reimbursable by or for which funds have been made available by FEMA or by the Army Corps of Engineers. The State, drawing upon the resources of the LRA and under its guidance, will coordinate with FEMA, Small Business Administration (SBA), Corps of Engineers, insurance companies, and other entities during the application process to ensure there is no duplication of benefits. Recipients will be asked to sign a waiver of their privacy rights so that the State can obtain the appropriate information from FEMA and SBA.

**Processes in Place to Avoid Fraud, Abuse and Mismanagement**

The Legislative Auditor serves as the watchdog of public spending, overseeing more than 3,500 audits of state and local governments and their related quasi-public enterprises. Conducting independent financial and performance audits of the State’s agencies, colleges, and universities, these auditors find ways to improve government and identify critical issues to protect public resources and tighten government control systems. When necessary, they follow up on allegations of fraud, waste, or abuse. The Legislative Auditor will perform an annual audit of the DOA in accordance with A-133.

In addition, the State has an established Office of Inspector General. The office’s mission is to help prevent waste, mismanagement, abuse, fraud and corruption in the executive branch of state government without regard to partisan politics, allegiances, status, or influence. The Inspector General answers to the Governor.

The LRA Board has established an Audit Committee which, in conjunction with its LRA audit staff, is charged with ensuring that the work of the recovery is conducted in a manner consistent with the highest ethical standards. Throughout the recovery process, the LRA Audit Committee and staff will receive and review reports from all governmental entities working to detect, prevent, and eliminate instances of fraud and abuse.
The Office of Finance and Support Services (OFSS), a section of the DOA, has established clear designation of responsibilities in order to ensure separation of duties. This separation of duties, along with other established operational policies and procedures, provides assurance that fraud cannot be accomplished without collusion among employees in separate areas.

The OFSS is responsible for payments, federal draw down requests, and state and federal financial reporting. The OCD is responsible for the day to day administration of the CDBG program. Their staff reviews all requests for payment and accompanying invoices to ensure costs are reasonable and within the scope of the activity funded. Two signatures are required on a request for payment prior to being sent to OFSS for payment. All payment requests are reviewed for proper authorized signatures prior to input into the financial system for payment. One employee actually inputs the properly authorized payment request into the financial system and the request must be approved in the system by the payment unit supervisor. Through financial system security, no one person can both input and approve a payment request.

The payment management unit of OFSS provides information to the appropriation accounting unit so that federal funds can be drawn. The federal draw down request is reviewed and approved by a supervisor prior to the draw down request being processed. All funds are electronically transferred to the State Treasurer’s central depository account to be used to liquidate the payables. The financial reporting of the expenditure and revenue activities is prepared by the appropriation accounting unit. All reports are prepared by one employee and reviewed by the appropriate manager prior to release of the report/statement.

In addition, the State will hire an internal auditor who will be placed within the OCD to oversee the internal functions of this office. The auditor will report to the Commissioner of Administration.

The State follows the State Procurement Code and all other sub recipients are required to follow Title 24 Part 84 and Part 85. The monitoring plan outlines the requirements that must be followed.

Training and technical assistance will be provided to local governments, contractors, and any other entity responsible for administering activities under this grant.

*Citizen Participation*

The State is employing several innovative ways to obtain the input of Louisiana citizens on the recovery and rebuilding process. One way citizen input and views are used to formulate CDBG programs is through the community planning process described above.
In several planning meetings held in partnership with FEMA, the need for housing, government infrastructure and levees protection was paramount. These comments and views formed the basis of the policy making decisions that resulted in the programs proposed in this proposed action plan. The full report can be accessed at www.lra.louisiana.gov.

Direct citizen input is also solicited in LRA task force meetings as they deliberate on proposed programs for CDBG funding. Task force resolutions have been passed in the Housing, Infrastructure and Transportation, and Economic Development and Workforce Training committees that incorporate this input before the programs are developed and submitted in the proposed action plans.

Citizens who have participated in community planning events are part of a database that will be used to solicit their input on subsequent plans. Another mechanism, the LouisianaRebuilds.info internet portal, is being developed to disseminate information on all rebuilding efforts that the OCD can harness to garner more input.

States were given several waivers relative to the Citizen Participation regulations such as the requirement for public hearings at the state and local level, consulting with all units of local governments, etc. The State will employ innovative methods to communicate with our citizens and to solicit their views on the proposed uses of disaster recovery funds. These comments and the State’s response to the comments will be made a part of the Action Plan and amendments to the plan.

The proposed Action Plan was published on March 10, 2006 in five MSA newspapers. A ten day comment period was provided for public comment. In addition, the plan was presented and approved by the LRA Board on February 20, 2006. All board meetings are open to the public for comment. A summary of comments received and the State’s response to these comments is found in Appendix 12.

Based on comments received, the State has revised its Citizen Participation Plan. A separate Citizen Participation Plan was written for Disaster Recovery funds. This Plan details the processes to be used to obtain citizen input on the proposed uses of disaster recovery funds. The Plan is included as a part of this Action Plan as Appendix 10. There is now a written Citizen Participation Plan which covers the regular CDBG program and a separate one which covers the Disaster Recovery CDBG Program.
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## Appendix 1
Population Estimates Based on FEMA Applicants as Compared to Department of Health and Hospitals Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>July 05 (LaTech)</th>
<th>Jan 06 Est (DHH)</th>
<th>Estimated JHSCPop for Jan 06</th>
<th>% different from DHH estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acadia</td>
<td>59515</td>
<td>60146</td>
<td>62037</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>25255</td>
<td>26072</td>
<td>26828</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td>88142</td>
<td>97463</td>
<td>96521</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption</td>
<td>23095</td>
<td>23475</td>
<td>24733</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoyelles</td>
<td>42358</td>
<td>42655</td>
<td>45344</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauregard</td>
<td>33417</td>
<td>34137</td>
<td>32778</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bienville</td>
<td>15706</td>
<td>15396</td>
<td>15958</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossier</td>
<td>104673</td>
<td>107238</td>
<td>107657</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caddo</td>
<td>255383</td>
<td>254125</td>
<td>262077</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcasieu</td>
<td>185862</td>
<td>182352</td>
<td>139506</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>10556</td>
<td>10787</td>
<td>10740</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>9552</td>
<td>7851</td>
<td>6764</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catahoula</td>
<td>10534</td>
<td>11143</td>
<td>10963</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claiborne</td>
<td>16291</td>
<td>16067</td>
<td>16574</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>19262</td>
<td>21322</td>
<td>20351</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Soto</td>
<td>25737</td>
<td>26358</td>
<td>26227</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Baton Rouge</td>
<td>417218</td>
<td>448500</td>
<td>474920</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carroll</td>
<td>8751</td>
<td>8736</td>
<td>8986</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Feliciana</td>
<td>20811</td>
<td>22279</td>
<td>21540</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangeline</td>
<td>35518</td>
<td>35758</td>
<td>37897</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>20367</td>
<td>19553</td>
<td>20876</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>18614</td>
<td>18921</td>
<td>19116</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberia</td>
<td>73897</td>
<td>75738</td>
<td>76940</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberville</td>
<td>32503</td>
<td>34859</td>
<td>34801</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>15609</td>
<td>15033</td>
<td>15937</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>458029</td>
<td>363309</td>
<td>328107</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Davis</td>
<td>31252</td>
<td>31488</td>
<td>31061</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Salle</td>
<td>14032</td>
<td>14316</td>
<td>14424</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>197268</td>
<td>200933</td>
<td>215453</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafourche</td>
<td>92169</td>
<td>92061</td>
<td>96864</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>43471</td>
<td>43600</td>
<td>45304</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>103507</td>
<td>112520</td>
<td>108939</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>12449</td>
<td>13144</td>
<td>12680</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehouse</td>
<td>29970</td>
<td>30466</td>
<td>30522</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natchitoches</td>
<td>39252</td>
<td>39346</td>
<td>41391</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleans*</td>
<td>458393</td>
<td>156140</td>
<td>137889</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouachita</td>
<td>148863</td>
<td>149081</td>
<td>153371</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaquemines*</td>
<td>29432</td>
<td>17309</td>
<td>18014</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointe Coupee</td>
<td>22363</td>
<td>22852</td>
<td>24490</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapides</td>
<td>128338</td>
<td>136217</td>
<td>135919</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red River</td>
<td>9822</td>
<td>9981</td>
<td>9976</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>20513</td>
<td>20696</td>
<td>20877</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>23772</td>
<td>24315</td>
<td>24879</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard*</td>
<td>57418</td>
<td>68993</td>
<td>22403</td>
<td>225%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>48359</td>
<td>51830</td>
<td>52761</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>10128</td>
<td>11609</td>
<td>12602</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1
Population Estimates Based on FEMA Applicants as Compared to Department of Health and Hospitals Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>July 05 (LaTech)</th>
<th>Jan 06 Est (DHH)</th>
<th>Estimated JHSCPop for Jan 06</th>
<th>% different from DHH estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. James</td>
<td>20842</td>
<td>21747</td>
<td>22490</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John the Baptist</td>
<td>44590</td>
<td>49286</td>
<td>50890</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Landry</td>
<td>89709</td>
<td>92921</td>
<td>95799</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martin</td>
<td>49746</td>
<td>51647</td>
<td>52132</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary</td>
<td>51698</td>
<td>53366</td>
<td>54709</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Tammany</td>
<td>213633</td>
<td>205461</td>
<td>198974</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangipahoa</td>
<td>103232</td>
<td>109423</td>
<td>109228</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensas</td>
<td>6121</td>
<td>6496</td>
<td>6807</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrebonne</td>
<td>107146</td>
<td>107501</td>
<td>111385</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>22159</td>
<td>22042</td>
<td>22614</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermillion</td>
<td>54502</td>
<td>54325</td>
<td>54855</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>51591</td>
<td>49119</td>
<td>53077</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>44595</td>
<td>42449</td>
<td>42425</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>41331</td>
<td>40510</td>
<td>42005</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Baton Rouge</td>
<td>21621</td>
<td>24004</td>
<td>23386</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Carroll</td>
<td>11929</td>
<td>11921</td>
<td>12106</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Feliciana</td>
<td>15370</td>
<td>15397</td>
<td>16229</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winn</td>
<td>16341</td>
<td>16219</td>
<td>16810</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4523628</td>
<td>4137915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: JHSC is the FEMA Joint Housing Solutions Center
# Infrastructure Needs

## Infrastructure Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost to Repair</th>
<th>FEMA Covered</th>
<th>Insurance Covered</th>
<th>Local/State Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sewer</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 State buildings</td>
<td>3,500*</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1,270*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Drinking water</td>
<td>2,995</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Electricity, gas, telecom</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Roads: hurricane recovery</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>4,855-5,350**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150-645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recovery subtotal**: 15,870 10,750-11,245 660 3,965-4,460

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost to Repair</th>
<th>FEMA Covered</th>
<th>Insurance Covered</th>
<th>Local/State Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Roads: hazard mitigation/preparedness</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;5,100?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Local schools*** &amp; other buildings</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes rough placeholder of $300M for full cost or rebuild/restart of Charity Hospital

** Range is 90% of $550M estimate for pavement failures in affected areas

*** Excluding all but 16 New Orleans schools that are included in state buildings at total cost/gap of $865M/$285M

Source: State agencies, Investor owned utilities, Public Service Commission, FEMA

Excludes private non-utility assets (higher ed), and fire, police, other services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owners</th>
<th>Homes in FEMA 100 yr. fl plan</th>
<th>Homes outside 100 yr. fl plan</th>
<th>Homes with no flood damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazard and flood</td>
<td>Hazard only</td>
<td>No insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor damage</td>
<td>4,945</td>
<td>1,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Major damage</td>
<td>21,883</td>
<td>5,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe/destroyed</td>
<td>36,619</td>
<td>8,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>63,447</td>
<td>14,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Parish, LA</td>
<td>Minor damage</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major damage</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe/destroyed</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>424</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Parish, LA</td>
<td>Minor damage</td>
<td>2,732</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major damage</td>
<td>10,419</td>
<td>1,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe/destroyed</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,884</td>
<td>2,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleans Parish, LA</td>
<td>Minor damage</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major damage</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe/destroyed</td>
<td>30,334</td>
<td>6,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,114</td>
<td>8,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaquemines Parish, LA</td>
<td>Minor damage</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major damage</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe/destroyed</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>537</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard Parish, LA</td>
<td>Minor damage</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major damage</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe/destroyed</td>
<td>3,401</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,256</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Tammany Parish, LA</td>
<td>Minor damage</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major damage</td>
<td>5,129</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe/destroyed</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,083</td>
<td>1,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermilion Parish, LA</td>
<td>Minor damage</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major damage</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe/destroyed</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>957</td>
<td>1,004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Renters

### Rental units in FEMA 100 yr. fl plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard and flood</th>
<th>Hazard only</th>
<th>No insurance</th>
<th>Total Housing Units (Major/ Severe)</th>
<th>% of total major/severe damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor damage</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>8,848</td>
<td>124,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major damage</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>22,959</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severed/destroyed</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>65,538</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2,721</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>97,345</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rental units outside 100 yr. fl plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard and flood</th>
<th>Hazard only</th>
<th>No insurance</th>
<th>Total Housing Units (Major/ Severe)</th>
<th>% of total major/severe damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor damage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major damage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severed/destroyed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rental units with no flood daamge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard and flood</th>
<th>Hazard only</th>
<th>No insurance</th>
<th>Total Housing Units (Major/ Severe)</th>
<th>% of total major/severe damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor damage</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>3,733</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major damage</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>6,949</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severed/destroyed</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>11,497</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard and flood</th>
<th>Hazard only</th>
<th>No insurance</th>
<th>Total Housing Units (Major/ Severe)</th>
<th>% of total major/severe damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor damage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major damage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severed/destroyed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Parishes, LA

| Minor damage     | 30          | 31           | 727                                 | 133,367                         |
| Major damage     | 194         | 175          | 3,768                               | 133,367                         |
| Severed/destroyed| 126         | 73           | 2,557                               | 133,367                         |
| Subtotal         | 197         | 105          | 3,526                               | 133,367                         |

### Other Parishes, LA

| Minor damage     | 4           | 21           | 224                                 | 133,367                         |
| Major damage     | 15          | 44           | 618                                 | 133,367                         |
| Severed/destroyed| 0           | 2            | 45                                  | 133,367                         |
| Subtotal         | 19          | 67           | 887                                 | 133,367                         |
Appendix 4

Affected area definitions

The areas affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita referred to in this report are those parishes designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency through September 30, 2005. An area was considered “affected” if it was designated by FEMA for any type of assistance. An area was defined as "most affected" if it was designated for both individual and public assistance.

The following parishes are receiving technical assistance to draft plans: St. Tammany, Orleans, Jefferson, Plaquemines, Lafourche, Vermilion, Calcasieu, Cameron, Vernon, Beauregard, Allen, Jefferson Davis, Iberia, St. Mary, St. Charles, Tangipahoa, Washington, and Sabine.

Acadia Parish, LA
Allen Parish, LA
Ascension Parish, LA
Assumption Parish, LA
Avoyelles Parish, LA
Beauregard Parish, LA
Bienville Parish, LA
Bossier Parish, LA
Caddo Parish, LA
Calcasieu Parish, LA
Caldwell Parish, LA
Cameron Parish, LA
Catahoula Parish, LA
Claiborne Parish, LA
Concordia Parish, LA
De Soto Parish, LA
East Baton Rouge Parish, LA
East Carroll Parish, LA
East Feliciana Parish, LA
Evangeline Parish, LA
Franklin Parish, LA
Grant Parish, LA
Iberia Parish, LA
 Iberville Parish, LA
Jackson Parish, LA
Jefferson Davis Parish, LA
Jefferson Parish, LA
 La Salle Parish, LA
 Lafayette Parish, LA
 Lafourche Parish, LA
 Lincoln Parish, LA
 Livingston Parish, LA
 Madison Parish, LA
 Morehouse Parish, LA
 Natchitoches Parish, LA
 Orleans Parish, LA
 Ouachita Parish, LA
 Plaquemines Parish, LA
 Pointe Coupee Parish, LA
 Rapides Parish, LA
 Red River Parish, LA
 Richland Parish, LA
 Sabine Parish, LA
 St. Bernard Parish, LA
 St. Charles Parish, LA
 St. Helena Parish, LA
 St. James Parish, LA
 St. John the Baptist Parish, LA
 St. Landry Parish, LA
 St. Martin Parish, LA
 St. Mary Parish, LA
 St. Tammany Parish, LA
 Tangipahoa Parish, LA
 Tensas Parish, LA
 Terrebonne Parish, LA
 Union Parish, LA
 Vermilion Parish, LA
 Vernon Parish, LA
 Washington Parish, LA
 Webster Parish, LA
 West Baton Rouge Parish, LA
 West Carroll Parish, LA
 West Feliciana Parish, LA
 Winn Parish, LA
## Hurricane Impacted Areas of Parishes

### Hurricane Impacted Areas of Parishes / In Flood Plain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>Total Pop</th>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Renter Occuped</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Adjusted Median Housing Value, 2005</th>
<th>2005 Value of Impacted Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascension Parish</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$87,132.35</td>
<td>$11,380,547.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcasieu Parish</td>
<td>3,175</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>$102,567.30</td>
<td>$122,976,622.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Parish</td>
<td>8,572</td>
<td>4,651</td>
<td>2,642</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>$67,743.24</td>
<td>$293,880,981.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberville Parish</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$58,601.12</td>
<td>$14,367,444.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Parish</td>
<td>78,448</td>
<td>33,728</td>
<td>20,043</td>
<td>10,830</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>$194,545.76</td>
<td>$5,235,244,247.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafourche Parish</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>$72,774.88</td>
<td>$82,497,071.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston Parish</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>$91,232.08</td>
<td>$186,889,115.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleans Parish</td>
<td>315,211</td>
<td>134,923</td>
<td>56,793</td>
<td>62,090</td>
<td>15,215</td>
<td>$136,793.51</td>
<td>$13,044,344,390.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaquemines Parish</td>
<td>9,956</td>
<td>4,106</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>$47,921.13</td>
<td>$174,076,553.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard Parish</td>
<td>25,516</td>
<td>9,850</td>
<td>7,163</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>$104,748.14</td>
<td>$902,574,629.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles Parish</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$81,716.29</td>
<td>$24,966,744.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James Parish</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$72,993.88</td>
<td>$943,110.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John the Baptist Parish</td>
<td>4,701</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>$53,592.82</td>
<td>$85,331,047.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martin Parish</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,204.17</td>
<td>$10,568,164.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary Parish</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$105,645.28</td>
<td>$2,390,027.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Tammany Parish</td>
<td>33,445</td>
<td>14,894</td>
<td>10,384</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>$147,516.98</td>
<td>$1,911,001,074.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangipahoa Parish</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>$123,637.18</td>
<td>$124,312,308.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrebonne Parish</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$72,804.12</td>
<td>$5,580,579.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermilion Parish</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>$85,669.54</td>
<td>$88,720,889.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>494,457</strong></td>
<td><strong>212,957</strong></td>
<td><strong>107,072</strong></td>
<td><strong>80,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,543</strong></td>
<td><strong>$93,022.03</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,382,425,551.26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hurricane Impacted Areas of Parishes / Out Flood Plain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>Total Pop</th>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Renter Occuped</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Adjusted Median Housing Value, 2005</th>
<th>2005 Value of Impacted Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascension Parish</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$89,951.53</td>
<td>$4,078,238.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcasieu Parish</td>
<td>3,187</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$121,057.15</td>
<td>$139,867,844.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Parish</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$71,276.53</td>
<td>$6,630,315.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberville Parish</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$97,991.52</td>
<td>$747,589.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Parish</td>
<td>18,302</td>
<td>8,761</td>
<td>4,516</td>
<td>3503</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>$259,722.11</td>
<td>$1,682,831,190.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafourche Parish</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>$87,255.87</td>
<td>$103,867,748.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston Parish</td>
<td>85,372</td>
<td>40,631</td>
<td>15,063</td>
<td>19494</td>
<td>6074</td>
<td>$150,004.24</td>
<td>$4,088,053,024.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaquemines Parish</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$54,166.05</td>
<td>$12,793,546.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard Parish</td>
<td>41,223</td>
<td>16,665</td>
<td>11,661</td>
<td>4410</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>$99,273.07</td>
<td>$1,404,203,293.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles Parish</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$96,688.28</td>
<td>$28,154,852.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James Parish</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$81,508.61</td>
<td>$25,495,111.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John the Baptist Parish</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$89,919.36</td>
<td>$90,763,974.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martin Parish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$57,409.89</td>
<td>$752,263.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary Parish</td>
<td>3812</td>
<td>14,562</td>
<td>11,207</td>
<td>2423</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>$148,297.36</td>
<td>$1,906,387,928.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangipahoa Parish</td>
<td>11,274</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>$109,963.28</td>
<td>$425,174,369.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrebonne Parish</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$93,772.27</td>
<td>$3,777,055.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>206,789</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,889</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,611</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,581</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,697</strong></td>
<td><strong>$106,766.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,959,978,746.72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GCR Inc. for the LA Housing Finance Authority
## Hurricane Impacted Areas of Parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>Total Pop</th>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Renter Occupied</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Adjusted Median Housing Value, 2005</th>
<th>2005 Value of Impacted Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascension Parish</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>$88,851</td>
<td>$52,338,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcasieu Parish</td>
<td>6,362</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>$109,423</td>
<td>$262,844,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Parish</td>
<td>8,805</td>
<td>4,748</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>$67,882</td>
<td>$300,511,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberia Parish</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>$60,392</td>
<td>$15,115,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Parish</td>
<td>96,750</td>
<td>42,489</td>
<td>24,559</td>
<td>14,333</td>
<td>3,597</td>
<td>$207,141</td>
<td>$6,918,075,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafourche Parish</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>$72,639</td>
<td>$82,497,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston Parish</td>
<td>8,103</td>
<td>3,585</td>
<td>2,598</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>$89,976</td>
<td>$290,756,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleans Parish</td>
<td>400,583</td>
<td>175,559</td>
<td>71,867</td>
<td>82,403</td>
<td>21,289</td>
<td>$140,025</td>
<td>$17,132,297,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaquemines Parish</td>
<td>10,654</td>
<td>4,361</td>
<td>2,991</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>$48,517</td>
<td>$186,870,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard Parish</td>
<td>67,138</td>
<td>26,735</td>
<td>18,724</td>
<td>6,366</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>$101,448</td>
<td>$2,306,777,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles Parish</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$83,855</td>
<td>$53,121,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James Parish</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$77,551</td>
<td>$26,438,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John the Baptist Parish</td>
<td>8,098</td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>$63,583</td>
<td>$176,095,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martin Parish</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$58,948</td>
<td>$11,320,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary Parish</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$105,770</td>
<td>$2,390,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Tammany Parish</td>
<td>71,570</td>
<td>29,456</td>
<td>21,591</td>
<td>5,024</td>
<td>2,841</td>
<td>$147,743</td>
<td>$3,817,389,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangipahoa Parish</td>
<td>13,749</td>
<td>5,728</td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>$117,381</td>
<td>$549,486,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrebonne Parish</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$72,960</td>
<td>$5,580,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermilion Parish</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>$85,742</td>
<td>$152,497,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>703,246</td>
<td>303,856</td>
<td>156,694</td>
<td>111,922</td>
<td>35,240</td>
<td>$94,728</td>
<td>$32,342,404,298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION

Program evaluation and monitoring is the mechanism by which the Office of Community Development provides administrative oversight to LCDBG recipients. It is the keystone to the success of the State’s program.

The LCDBG staff has the responsibility to ensure that recipients carry out their programs in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations. In carrying out this responsibility, the LCDBG staff should help recipients identify problems early in program implementation, identify the causes and assist in correcting these problems. Staff should conduct all monitoring activities in a positive, assistance-oriented manner and when feasible, deficiencies should be corrected on-site through technical assistance. However, in cases where major performance and compliance problems are identified, staff should seriously analyze those problems and their causes prior to making recommendations to the recipients. It is the responsibility of the LCDBG staff to ensure that proper procedures are followed both at the recipient level and at the state level in resolving serious findings.

I. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the LCDBG staff in monitoring are to determine if recipients are:

a. Carrying out their LCDBG programs as approved in their application;
b. Complying with applicable federal and state regulations;
c. Carrying out their programs in accordance with the most current implementation schedule;
d. Demonstrating a continuing capacity to carry out the approved programs; and,
e. Requesting reimbursement only for approved project costs.

II. THE ROLE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES

Since Local Government Representatives (LGRs) will be the primary contact with recipients, the LGR’s role in fostering a cooperative relationship is critical. Unlike HUD, which has specialists as well as reps, the State has mostly generalist LGRs, with a few who serve as technical specialists. Each LGR is assigned specific grantees for whom
she/he will be responsible. The LGRs will be responsible for oversight, problem identification, problem resolution, and grantee relations.

In order to fulfill this responsibility, the LGR must develop a working knowledge of the overall state and federal program regulations, a detailed knowledge of each grantee’s program and its major participants, and knowledge of the data resources and human resources available from support staff and other LGRs. It will require cooperation with other staff and a willingness to learn from those more experienced and knowledgeable.

III. GENERAL APPROACH TO PROGRAM MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Program monitoring and evaluation consists of three major functions:
~ Education
~ Ongoing evaluation and assistance
~ On-site assistance

Education is the provision of the workshops, manuals, and handouts that tell recipients how to do something and explain why it must be done. Our primary educational efforts are the mandatory post-award workshops and the Grantee Handbook.

On going evaluation and assistance is the systematic process used to maintain contact with all recipients in order to track their progress, make comparisons between and among grantees, and identify “slow performing” grantees for early contact and assistance.

On-site assistance is that which is actually provided in the communities. It includes, among other things, monitoring and the provision of technical assistance. This function is the one most critical to effective program implementation since it is during those visits that most major problems are discovered. Education and ongoing assistance essentially support this effort and often prevent the major problem just discussed from developing.

A. Education

The Grantee Handbook is revised and distributed annually to all grant recipients for that particular program year. An official from each recipient’s governing body is required to attend the two-day Grantee Workshop held for that funding year’s recipients. In the course of this annual workshop all
facets of the LCDBG Program are explained and discussed. In addition, recipients are provided with copies of revised or updated state and/or federal regulations.

Finally, the Office of Community Development conducts additional workshops, as training needs are identified.

B. Ongoing Evaluation and Assistance

Ongoing evaluation and assistance is the primary means of tracking grantee performance/compliance on a day to day basis, determining the need for technical assistance, obtaining data to plan for the routine site visits, and determining the need for exception site visits. In keeping with the objective of minimizing monitoring burdens for the recipients, the system utilizes, to the extent possible, existing data that is routinely submitted for other purposes. The following are examples of data sources which are utilized:

~ Recipient’s application
~ Implementation schedule
~ Recipient’s contract
~ Request for payment
~ Request for release of funds
~ Ten day call and request for a wage rate decision
~ Verification of contractor eligibility
~ Notice of contract award
~ Final wage compliance report
~ Citizen complaints
~ Audits
~ Tickler reports
~ Exception reports

The first ongoing evaluation activity is to examine the recipient’s implementation schedule, approved application, and contract. All activities included on the schedule should be consistent with the approved application and the time period indicated should be reasonable. Any discrepancies must be resolved with the recipient. You must also note any contract conditions established in the recipient’s contract.

Each request for payment submitted by the recipient indicates the budget line item for which the draw is being made. This data is entered in the recipient’s drawdown file and on the computer and can be used to chart each recipient’s
performance in completing its program activities. Other sources for charting the recipient’s performance include:

~ Change in activities due to program amendments and budget revisions;
~ Changes in funds budgeted due to program amendments;
~ Budget revisions;
~ Changes in completion dates due to revised schedules and contract extensions.

Exhibits 1, 2, and 3 identify the data that is tracked in the drawdown file for each grant recipient.

The requests for payment provide the most current information on the overall status of the recipient’s program. The drawdown file can be used as a tool to determine the following:

~ Cumulative drawdowns should be compared with funds budgeted to make sure the amount drawn does not exceed the budgeted amount without appropriate changes. Periodically the program schedule contained in the contract should be checked. Discrepancies between the schedule and the amount drawn should be resolved with the recipient;

~ Activities on the schedule for which no funds have been drawn after the proposed scheduled initiation date should also be discussed with the recipient;

~ Whenever appropriate, a revised implementation schedule should be requested. The recipient must submit a detailed description indicating the activities which will be undertaken to complete the project within the time frame of the contract. A revised schedule must also be obtained from the recipient when a contract extension is approved.

Each LGR can compare the performance of one recipient to other recipients which have similar activities by assessing their relative performance in a particular activity area. For example, if the drawdown rate for a particular community’s rehab program is significantly lower than the drawdown rates of other communities implementing similar programs, the need for assistance is suggested.

A Budget Reconciliation Report (Exhibit 4) will need to be sent only when there is a change in the category of expenditure as requested in the Request for
Payment (RFP). In this report actual expenditures must be compared with budgeted amounts and amounts requested (24 CFR 85.2(b)(4)). This report needs to be sent if there are errors or changes in invoices after submittal for reimbursement. If amounts on the Certificate of Completion differ from the LCDBG records, budget reconciliation will be required prior to closeout.

Any complaints made to the Office of Community Development about a recipient’s program are also sources of valuable compliance information. A record of the complaints received, identifying the actions taken and the results of the actions are maintained. The validity of all complaints suggesting problems in performance or compliance should be in the assessment of the recipient’s need for regular or exception monitoring assistance. The handling of complaints must be documented on the Citizen and/or Administrative Complaint Logs in the permanent files.

In order to assist LGRs in managing the on-going evaluation of recipients, monthly tickler reports (Exhibit 5) are produced by the Office of Community Development’s electronic grants management tracking system. These reports remind the LGR of certain steps which are supposed to be taken at a particular time. Such reminders include, but are not limited to: monitoring due, close-out due, audit due, et cetera. These reports should be used as a tool to manage the assigned programs.

In addition to the tickler report, an exception report (Exhibit 6) is also produced each month. The exception report is provided to the Assistant Director of the Office of Community Development. The exception report lists those items previously reported to the LGR on the tickler report, but which were not accomplished. This provides the Assistant Director with a tool to assess the performance of the LGRs in managing their ongoing grantees. It is each LGR’s responsibility to inform the Assistant Director and to document the file as to why the actions were not accomplished.

These procedures will be used to evaluate a recipient’s on-going performance and will be used to determine whether an exception site visit is warranted.
C. **On Site Monitoring**

The Office of Community Development is committed to substantial on-site compliance assistance. This includes reviews of grantee performance and compliance as well as the provision of technical assistance to facilitate the correction of any problems identified during on-site reviews. LCDBG staff monitors the following areas which include but are not limited to:

- Program progress;
- General organization of files;
- Financial and general contract management;
- Labor standards;
- Fair housing/equal employment opportunity requirements;
- Environmental review;
- Real property acquisition and relocation, including demolition/clearance activities and replacement housing;
- Public facilities;
- Procurement;
- Housing rehabilitation;
- Economic development;
- Local complaint procedures;
- Program benefit – compliance with national objectives;
- Citizen participation.

1. **Criteria for Site Visits**

There are two types of on-site compliance assistance visits: exception and regularly scheduled. Exception visits are those visits triggered by apparent problems indicated by on-going monitoring data and telephone conversations. Each LGR is responsible for contacting “slow-performing” recipients. Responses which indicate there may be a serious problem in performance should trigger an exception visit.

The first step is to notify the Community Development Director of the potential problems. The Community Development Director will review and discuss your findings with other appropriate staff. If there is
concur rence that the available evidence suggests there may be a problem, the Community Development Director will instruct the LGR or a specialist (depending on the nature of the anticipated problem) to initiate a site visit.

Regularly scheduled visits are those scheduled during the course of the year for normal oversight and compliance assistance. It is understood that each recipient will be visited at least once during the life of the grant. The LGR must ensure that expenditures on all activities of a recipient’s program are being undertaken in accordance with the implementation schedule. The LGR must identify early in the program if there are activities which are behind schedule. When this occurs the LGR must determine the reasons why the program is not on schedule and take the appropriate action necessary to insure that this project is completed in a timely manner. When the overall expenditures on a given program reach or exceed fifty percent, the recipient will be scheduled for and notified of a monitoring visit. Regularly scheduled visits will be made by the LGR assigned to each recipient. Sometimes there are legitimate reasons why a recipient should not be monitored when expenditures reach or exceed fifty percent. However, it is the LGR’s responsibility to notify the Community Development Director of the reason and to document the reasons for this exception in the files.

The following criteria may be taken into consideration when scheduling a monitoring visit:

~ Size of grant;

~ Program complexity;

~ Type of project;

~ Programs which receive program income;

~ Ongoing problems relative to other grantees (a grantee with a low drawdown rate or without a request for a wage decision after the expected date). These “slow performing” recipients may have a higher probability of difficulty than others.
2. **Scheduling the Site Visit**

When a recipient has been targeted for a site visit, exception or regular, the LGR handling that community will contact the locality to schedule the visit.

The call to schedule the site visit is important in setting the tone of the subsequent visit. You should contact the person identified in the application as the contact person. Identify yourself and indicate that you wish to visit the grantee to review the program. If it is an exception visit, indicate the areas you are particularly interested in reviewing.

If it is a regularly scheduled visit, ask the recipient if he/she has or if he/she foresees any problems you might help him/her with while you are on-site. Tell him/her the visit will require approximately one day and you will want to talk to the people carrying out the program as well as review program files and visit the construction site. Also tell him/her that you will have an exit conference with him/her to go over the results of your visit. Inform him/her that an elected official or staff person, if possible, should also attend the exit conference.

Indicate the records you will review and request that all files be available in the recipient’s office during your scheduled visit.

Avoid the use of the words investigation, deficiencies, findings, audit, and payback. Use words like review, assistance, early identification of any problems, and visit.

Once the monitoring visit has been scheduled, a letter confirming the date should be prepared and sent to the grantee. A sample letter is shown in Exhibit 7.

3. **Previsit Actions**

After the letter confirming the site visit has been sent, the LGR must prepare the materials for the visit. All applicable checklists in Exhibit 8 should be used during the monitoring visit. The LGR should complete all data items that can be completed prior to the visit; this will save valuable time on-site.
4. **Conducting the Site Visit**

The LGR is a representative of the State during these visits to the communities. The purpose of the visit is to determine how the recipient is progressing, to identify any problem areas, and to HELP the recipient correct the identified problems.

**Entrance Interview**

The LGR should introduce himself/herself and explain the purpose of the visit. At this point it is often useful to let the recipient talk a little about the program, identify any problems he/she is having, and grumble about the program requirements. A ten or fifteen minute casual conversation at the very beginning helps break the ice. On the other hand, hour dialogues are often a technique a recipient uses to avoid getting down to the real interview. Discussions of this length can also make it difficult to complete a comprehensive program review in the time available.

**Review Relevant Recipient Files**

The monitoring checklists will require participation on behalf of the local government, the administrative consultant, and possibly an engineer to secure files, answer questions and arrange on-site project inspections.

If problems are identified during the review, an attempt should be made to correct them on-site. For example, if the review of the financial management system indicates the absence of the required cash control register, a copy of the register from the Grantee Handbook should be provided and its use explained.

Many problems encountered will be relatively minor and can be corrected while on-site. This should be done whenever possible. When the problem cannot be remedied completely on-site, the steps that should be taken to correct the problem should be explained to the recipient.

**Visit the Construction Site**

The actual construction site must be visited to ascertain that it corresponds to the site approved by the Office of Community
Development. It also enables the LCDBG staff to complete certain questions on the checklists.

Exit Conference

You should review the results of the visit and prepare for the exit conference by completing the Exit Conference Report. The exit conference should be held with the contact person, an elected official, and anyone else the recipient wishes to attend.

You should begin the exit conference by stating what was right with the program. Do not hesitate to praise good performance.

If problems were uncovered, identify them clearly and specify the actions taken, or to be taken, to correct the problems. The discussion should follow the format contained in the Exit Conference Report to ensure that you cover all of the identified problems. You should encourage recipient participation - explanations and provisions of additional data. A recipient will often “remember” where missing items are during the exit conference. Give them every opportunity to address your findings. Identified problems with fiscal implications should be particularly stressed in your discussion.

5. Monitoring Follow-Up Procedures

A letter of findings (merits and/or deficiencies) will then be sent to the recipient, reporting the results of the monitoring visit. A sample monitoring letter is included in Exhibit 9.

The monitoring letter to the recipient must include the following information:

~ Contract number;
~ Date of the visit;
~ Scope of the monitoring visit;
~ Monitoring findings and concerns (both positive and negative) supported by the facts considered in researching the conclusions;
~ Specific corrective actions/recommendations if necessary (i.e., means by which any finding can be resolved);
Due date of any necessary corrective action (generally 30-45 days, depending upon the nature of the findings);
~ If appropriate, the offer of technical assistance.

The recipient should receive the written results of the monitoring visit as soon as possible. Generally all monitoring letters should be mailed within 30 days after the visit.

All findings included in the follow-up letter will be entered on the computer, (Exhibit 10).

Upon receipt of the monitoring response from the recipient, the LGR must decide as to whether or not the information is sufficient to resolve/clear the finding. This is done by preparing a new status letter to the recipient addressing each finding. Findings which are not properly addressed or resolved remain open and a new target date for clearance is given to the recipient in this letter.

Each LGR shall continue to work closely with the recipient until the finding(s) of deficiency are resolved.

As each finding is cleared, the clearance date is entered on the computer and a new status letter is prepared to be sent to the recipient and the computer screen is updated. All findings must be satisfactorily cleared before close-out procedures can be initiated. In the event that a recipient is unwilling or unable to clear the finding(s), the State may impose one or more sanctions outlined in the section herein entitled “Sanctions” and further addressed in the State’s Policy on Corrective and Remedial Action.

D. Sanctions

The LCDBG staff will work with recipients to assist them in clearing findings. Our objective is not to impose sanctions, but to resolve problems. But when every effort has been made to clear findings within the prescribed time period (and any granted extensions) and progress has not been made towards resolving problems, sanctions will be imposed.
The LGRs should familiarize themselves with the State’s policy on Corrective and Remedial Actions. A copy of this document is provided in Exhibit 11. Sanctions can include:

~ Termination of the grant;
~ Reduction of the grant amount;
~ Debarment from future program participation;
~ Imposition of additional contract conditions;
~ Recapture of funds;
~ Litigation/suit.

The internal procedures for issuing/clearing sanctions will be handled in accordance with the policy then in effect.

IV. GENERAL APPROACH TO CLOSEOUT AND AUDIT REVIEW PROCEDURES

To assist the LGRs in ensuring that all tasks for closeout have been completed, a closeout screen has been developed on the computer for each contract (Exhibit 12).

The tickler report reminds the LGR to request closeout documents when a recipient has requested ninety percent of the LCDBG funds. That report also reminds the LGR if the closeout documents have not been received thirty days prior to the contract termination date.

Exhibit 13 provides a sample letter for requesting closeout documents.

When closeout documents are received, they must be reviewed by the LGR for accuracy. The Certificate of Completion form must be approved by the Office of Finance and Support Services prior to closeout.

All findings, audit and/or monitoring, must be resolved prior to closeout.

A copy of the Final Wage Compliance Report must be given to the Labor Compliance Officer.

The closeout letter and three Certificates of Completion (all of which have original signatures) are distributed as follows: one to the recipient, one to the Office of Finance and Support Services, and one to the permanent files. Generally, a conditional close-out is issued if all LCDBG expenditures have not been covered in financial reports.

The tickler report will remind each LGR of the financial report due dates. A letter requesting the financial report must be sent to each recipient thirty days prior to the
financial report due date shown on the computer screen; a sample letter is shown in Exhibit 14. If a financial report becomes delinquent, an appropriate letter must again be sent requesting the financial report; refer to Exhibit 15.

The LGR financial report reviewer will review the information in the financial report to determine if the information agrees with the LCDBG program records. The Louisiana Department of Social Services (DSS) will send a letter for parish financial reports to CDBG stating if the report conformed to financial requirements. The LGR financial report reviewer will review all other financial reports to determine financial compliance and agreement with LCDBG program records.

A determination letter indicating acceptance or disapproval of each financial report must be sent to the recipient after the review, identifying whether the report is interim or final. Exhibit 16 is a sample of a letter accepting a financial report which was acceptable. Letters for unacceptable financial reports, questioned costs, et cetera will be developed individually for each specific situation. Any corrections requested must be resolved prior to final close-out.

Financial report data for each program funded is entered on the computer; refer to Exhibit 17.

All audit findings identified in the audit must be referenced in the letter of determination. All findings must be entered into the computer and tracked following the same procedures as previously outlined for monitoring findings.

A recipient cannot receive a final close-out until a financial report(s) covering all expended funds has/have been received and approved.

If a recipient has received program income prior to closeout, then these funds must be tracked and monitored. Any program income received after close-out must follow the rules set forth in the Grantee Handbook.

A conditional closeout letter is included in Exhibit 18 and final closeout letters appear in Exhibits 19 and 20. The closeout letter in Exhibit 19 is based on a final closeout without a conditional closeout whereas Exhibit 20 involves a final closeout after first receiving a conditional closeout.
**EXHIBIT 1**

**LCDBG DRAWDOWN RECORD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFP#</th>
<th>RPF Rec’d Date</th>
<th>Amount of RFP</th>
<th>Total Drawn to Date</th>
<th>% Drawn</th>
<th>Balance Remaining</th>
<th>On Sch?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FYE:** __________  **Audit Due:** __________  __________  __________  __________  __________

**Audit Rec:** __________  __________  __________  __________  __________
## Exhibit 2

**Grantee**

### LCDBG Activity Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity Amount</th>
<th>Revised Amount (1)</th>
<th>Revised Amount (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.e., Sewer / Water / Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFP#</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Total Drawn to Date</th>
<th>On Sch?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFP#</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Total Drawn to Date</th>
<th>On Sch?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXHIBIT 3
### INVOICE TRACKING WORKSHEET

**Bienville Parish**

**President Tommy Thompson**

**Contract #629235**

**Contract expires: July 20, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Amount: $211,640.00</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Rehab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pre-agree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Admin Con</strong></td>
<td><strong>Admin Govt</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>AMOUNT</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,200.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,500.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,500.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP 1 17-Jan-06</td>
<td>29,985.00</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>13,225.00</td>
<td>2,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP 2 OK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP 3 OK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP 4 OK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP 5 OK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP 6 OK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP 7 OK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP 8 OK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP 9 OK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP 10 OK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP 11 OK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,985.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,225.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,200.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,025.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$181,655.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,075.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,475.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Contractor**

Name: LCDBG Admin

**Consultant**

Name: Steve Fontana

**Engineer**

Name: Chris Patrick

---

*Project:* A 3" PVC water line and all appurtenances will be installed from the Edwards Mill Creek and Alberta Water Systems to the residences who are not connected to a water system. Install 1,400 L.F. of 3/4" PE service line and 4,300 L.F. of 3/4" PVC service line to connect low and moderate income residents to a water system in two target areas.
# BUDGET RECONCILIATION REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>FUNDS BUDGETED</th>
<th>BUDGET BALANCES</th>
<th>DRAWDOWNS RECEIVED</th>
<th>ACTUAL EXPENDED</th>
<th>DIFFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Number</td>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Recipient Name</td>
<td>Financial Report Number</td>
<td>Date Due</td>
<td>PCT Drawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600813</td>
<td>PP-2002-058</td>
<td>Avoyelles Parish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6/30/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571778</td>
<td>TE-2000-005</td>
<td>Rapides Parish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/2/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593823</td>
<td>PP-2002-027</td>
<td>Tangipahoa Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/9/2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589804</td>
<td>TE-2002-001</td>
<td>St. James Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609764</td>
<td>PP-2002-049</td>
<td>Acadia Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571778</td>
<td>TE-2000-005</td>
<td>Rapides Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Number</td>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Recipient Name</td>
<td>Report Number</td>
<td>Date Due</td>
<td>PCT Drawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593823</td>
<td>PF-2002-027</td>
<td>Tangipahoa Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/11/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600813</td>
<td>PF-2002-058</td>
<td>Avoyelles Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593823</td>
<td>PF-2002-027</td>
<td>Tangipahoa Parish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/1/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571778</td>
<td>TE-2000-005</td>
<td>Rapides Parish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/2/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7900481</td>
<td>PF-1998-265</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12/13/2005</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589804</td>
<td>TE-2002-001</td>
<td>St. James Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT 7

Honorable John Smith
Mayor, Village of Someplace
Post Office Box 123456
Someplace, Louisiana 99999

RE: Monitoring Visit
FY 20xx LCDBG Public Facilities Program
Contract Number 777777

Dear Mayor Smith:
This letter is to confirm that John Doe, Jane Public, and Fred Jones will conduct a comprehensive review of your FY 20xx Louisiana Community Development Block Grant (LCDBG) Program on March 13, 20xx. They should arrive at the Village Hall between 1:30 p.m. and 2:30 p.m. They will want to talk to the people carrying out the program as well as review program files and visit the project site(s). Please have all files available for their review.

Please ensure that the following specific items are available for their review: (1) inspection reports for the street project which may be obtained from your engineer and (2) current proof of bonding covering those who handle LCDBG financial transactions which, if not on file, may be obtained from your insurer.

It is required that you or your representative attend the exit conference that will be held at the conclusion of the review.

If you have any questions, please contact Fred Jones at (000) 000-0000.

Sincerely,

Susan Elkins
Director

SE/FJ

c: Ms. Debbie Howe, Grants Consultant
   Uptown & Associates, Engineer
   Mr. John Doe, Office of Community Development
   Ms. Jane Public, Office of Community Development
   Mr. Fred Jones, Local Government Representative
   File: Public Facilities, FY 20xx, Monitoring
The monitoring checklists are revised whenever necessary to reflect changes made in program guidelines and regulations.
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

The monitoring checklists are the primary tool used to monitor recipient performance in the LCDBG program. They have been designed to be as self-explanatory as possible. Local Government Representatives (LGRs) should be familiar with the program requirements. The more knowledgeable the LGR using each checklist, the better the final results will be. The Grantee Handbook and regulation updates are the primary tools for gaining knowledge of the federal and state regulations. State staff with “specialist” assignments can provide additional support in their areas.

A checklist has been prepared for each program area, such as housing, public facilities, economic development, clearance/demolition, etc., as well as each compliance area. Monitoring codes as well as the exit conference report are included. The exit conference report is a summary of the review conducted. A concise review of program implementation must be performed using the checklists which follow. The specific items to be reviewed will depend on the stage of progress when visited, the type of project, and whether or not it is the first or a subsequent visit. The following provides a brief description and explanation of the various checklists:

1. **Pre-Monitoring Visit Data Entry**

   Most data items on this checklist can be filled out prior to the monitoring visit. Data entered on this checklist will transfer to the appropriate monitoring checklist. The entry of that data prior to the on-site monitoring visit will allow for more time to monitor the project on-site and will alert the LGR to potential problem areas, if any.

2. **Program Performance**

   The implementation schedule included in the application is the basic tool for assessing program performance. It shows, by quarter, expected milestones and expenditures by activity. The implementation schedule and any subsequent revisions or amendments must be placed in the grantee’s financial management and drawdown files.

   When an activity falls behind the initial approval implementation schedule, a new schedule must be requested as well as an explanation as to why the program/activity is behind schedule. A new implementation schedule, however, should not be requested from the recipient simply to reflect that more time is needed to complete the activity. Instead, the new or revised implementation schedule must reflect with accuracy the proposed time of completion of the activities.
The time period reflected in the new schedule should be basically the same time indicated in the original application, unless the recipient has received a contract extension. The recipient must also submit a written explanation signed by the chief elected official outlining the types of actions that will be adopted and implemented by the recipient which will ensure that the program is completed within the time frame allowed by the contract.

Prior to the visit you should review the drawdown report for the grantee and note the amount of drawdown by activity to date. The first order of business on-site should be to compare planned vs. actual progress. You should remember that it is infinitely harder to actually run a program than it is to write applications. Many things can happen which result in program delays. Therefore, this discussion on-site should not be inquisitional in nature. It should be conversational. Reasons for delays should be noted on the schedule itself and the need for a revised schedule discussed with the recipient.

Sometimes delays are attributable to a recipient’s actions or inaction. When you discussion indicated that action by the recipient could reasonably expedite performance, you should clearly outline the steps you believe should be taken to move the project along. Note your recommendation accurately on the performance checklist.

In discussing major problems which may affect the feasibility of the entire program, you should indicate an appropriate level of concern and note the problems and possible results on the performance checklist. Examples of such problems include litigation, inability of developer to obtain financing, loss of local funding commitments, etc. Early notification of major problems will permit the State to provide technical assistance and prepare contingency plans. Always note such problems as soon as they appear. Common causes of program delay are:

~ Lack of staff;
~ Staff with limited experience of capacity;
~ Original schedule developed without consideration of construction seasons, acquisition requirements, Davis-Bacon requirements, environmental review, etc.;
~ Delays in acquisition due to unwilling seller;
~ Difficulties in locating replacement housing for displaced persons;
~ Local or other funds no longer available;
~ Bids received exceed funds available;
Incorrect or inadequate advice from consultant; and

Litigation.

3. Citizen Participation

In your review of citizen participation, check to see that the local community has made every effort to involve the citizens of the community in the application stage and later in the on-going grant activities.

Throughout the years, the citizen participation requirements for local governments have changed somewhat. The specific requirements by program year are presented in the application packages, grantee handbooks, and the State’s Citizen Participation Plan.

4. Environmental Review

Since each grant recipient receives environmental clearance prior to contract release, the task of the on-site monitor is to see that the approved Environmental Review Record (ERR) is still relevant.

The first step is the compare the as-built plans and specifications to the map which is included in the approved ERR to endure that no project sites have changed. It is important to determine whether or not the original ERR was site-specific. If so, and a project site has changed, the ERR would require an amendment. I the ERR was not site-specific, the monitor must check to see that the actual construction site was within the area cleared in the ERR.

Secondly, the monitor must review the letters in the ERR from other agencies for any additional requirements, such as permits, etc. Particular attention should be given to the letter from the State Historic Preservation Office in case they require photographs of certain houses before rehabilitation.

Finally, if the project involves housing rehabilitation or emergency repairs outside of the target area, the monitor must check to determine that all homes rehabilitated outside the target area received environmental clearance prior to construction. Although we advise the grant recipient to clear all anticipated areas, there are times when the location of some homes have not been determined when the original ERR is approved. In this case, the ERR must be amended.
5. **Financial Management**

The review of the recipient’s financial management system is not an audit. Its purpose, rather, is to thoroughly check the system in terms of OMB Circulars A-102 (24 CFR 85.20) and A-87. The financial management checklist is self-explanatory. The checklist is used to assist in determining if the following criteria have been met: the grantee’s financial management system provides for current, accurate and complete disclosure of financial results; there exists adequate and clear identification of the sources and uses of funds; there exists effective property management and control; the grantee’s records allow for comparison of actual and budgeted amounts activity; there exists procedures for minimizing the time elapsing between the receipt and expenditure of grant funds; there are procedures in place for determining reasonableness, allowability and allocability of costs in accordance with State and federal regulations.

In addition, it is highly recommended that OMB Circular A-87, “Cost Principles for State and Local Government,” be reviewed before monitoring and used as a reference item during the monitoring itself.

6. **Procurement Procedures**

The procurement procedures checklist is used to verify that the solicitation and subsequent award of professional services contracts was in accordance with the procedures established by 24 CFR 85.36 and LCDBG program directives.

For those grant recipients which have hired a consultant and/or engineer, the contract for each must be reviewed. A sample of other professional services contracts (appraisers, review appraisers, auditing firms, legal services, etc.) should also be reviewed. All sole source contracts must also be reviewed.

In general, documentation should be reviewed to ensure that: (1) recipients have documentation to justify the method of procurement used to select the provider; (2) cost analysis were performed to determine the reasonableness of the contract price; (3) contracts contain clear description of the provider’s duties and responsibilities and; (4) payments are adequately justified and documented.

7. **Fair Housing/Equal Opportunity**

Your review of Fair Housing/Equal Opportunity is primarily concerned with the locality’s actions undertaken on its own behalf. There are four specific areas to be reviewed: actions taken to further fair housing, the local government’s equal
employment opportunity practices, Section 3 requirements, and Section 504 Compliance.

In reviewing the personnel practices, determine whether the locality gives fair and equitable treatment with respect to hiring, salary and promotional opportunities to all applicants and employees. In reviewing Section 3, ascertain if the locality has adopted a written Section 3 plan containing certain criteria and if they are abiding by their plan.

In the area of fair housing, the local government agreed to implement measures to affirmatively further fair housing in their community. Determine whether or not they have implemented a program which addresses this need.

Compliance with the accessibility requirements of Section 504 must also be reviewed.

8. Public Improvements

The review involves: a) a comparison of work undertaken to the work approved in the application, b) a check for compliance with the State’s Bid Law, c) a detailed review of the bid and contract documents, d) a visit to the construction site, and e) a determination of the progress of construction.

9. Labor Standards

At this stage of monitoring labor standards (on-site), your objective is to ensure that the required procedures were implemented in accordance with the statutory regulatory provisions (Davis-Bacon Act, Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act, Copeland Anti-Kickback Act and 29 CFR Parts 1,3,5 and 7). Additionally, you should promptly advise the grantee to remedy any violations that are disclosed by the monitoring review.

When monitoring, you must check the bid and contract documents for the inclusion of the federal labor standards provisions, the federal wage determination, and the clearance of the contractor/subcontractor. You must ensure that the federal wage decision was current at the time of contract execution.

You must make sure that documentation showing compliance with all federal labor standards requirements has been maintained by the grantee during the course of construction. Such documentation should include the contractor/subcontractor signed certifications regarding labor standards/prevailing wages, notices of contract award and preconstruction conference (if applicable), notices to proceed, and preconstruction conference minutes if a pre-construction conference was conducted. You must ascertain
that the federal wage decision, any additional classifications, and the Davis-Bacon poster have been posted at the construction site.

The area of most importance is the review of weekly contractor payrolls. Each contractor and subcontractor must submit weekly payrolls from the time work is started until it is completed for each week in which work occurred. Each payroll submitted must be accompanied by a “Statement of Compliance” signed by an officer of the company.

In examining the payrolls, verify that only classifications appearing on the wage determination are used and check for a disproportionate employment of laborers (apprentices or trainees) to mechanics. Wage rates reported on the payroll must be at least equal to the wage decision. If a lesser rate was paid, the grantee’s files should include records of restitution made. Payroll computations must be spot-checked; deductions must be reviewed for any non-permissible deductions. The information on the employee interview form should be checked against the wage determination and applicable payroll sheet. You should also check for overtime pay for work in excess of 40 hours in one week.

The enforcement of labor standards provisions is as important as other requirements of the contract specifications and failure to comply with such labor standards must be corrected by contractors and subcontractors. In addition, failure to comply may result in the imposition of sanctions and penalties.

10. Housing Rehabilitation

Part I of the housing rehabilitation checklist covers the overall program while Parts II and III cover the inspection of a representative sample of individual properties.

Part I is self-explanatory.

To complete Parts II and III, you must select properties for an on-site inspection. The number and types of individual property files selected should constitute a representative sample of the entire rehabilitation and reconstruction case inventory, generally 10 percent but at least one of each type of unit if there are both rehabilitated and reconstructed homes in the project. In addition, any jobs on which the local jurisdiction has received a complaint should be reviewed.

The purpose of making property inspection is primarily to determine if rehabilitation funds were expended for the successful accomplishment of the identified
work. If funds being expended are not clearly reflected in the work accomplished, then the LGR must further investigate to determine the possible cause of the discrepancy.

Once the individual cases have been selected and the LGR familiarizes himself/herself with the information and documents contained therein, a property inspection should be scheduled with adequate notice to the property owner. The owner, or a representative or the owner, should be present at the inspection, particularly the inspection of property interiors.

When LCDBG funds are used for housing rehabilitation, the units must, at a minimum, be brought up to the Section 8 Housing Quality Standards and Cost Effective Energy Conservation Standards. A locality may wish to set higher standards. In monitoring the rehabilitated properties, the LGR should first review the applicable Housing Quality Standards and Cost Effective Energy Conservation Standards. Upon site inspection, he/she must determine whether or not these standards have been attained. In addition, the work write-up and change orders must be reviewed to ensure that all work completed was in accordance with the work write-up.

The bidding process for rehab provides an opportunity to promote the participation of small contractors as well as minority and female owned businesses. The rehab contract itself must include the language and requirements specified in applicable federal, state and local laws governing the program. Unless rehab is undertaken in a structure with eight or more units, the Davis-Bacon and other labor standards provisions do not apply.

11. **Clearance/Demolition**

The review of clearance/demolition will cover the locally adopted clearance/demolition policy and its compliance with the LCDBG regulations and state laws and will determine if the activities conformed to those in the approved application.

12. **Acquisition**

Your review of real property acquisition basically covers compliance with the Uniform Act. The Act is very specific about which acquisitions are subject to its requirements and the procedures which must be followed to acquire that property. Therefore, there are three separate components of your review.

The first, and probably the more difficult component, requires you to determine if acquisition occurred in the project or if exempt acquisition occurred.
On site you will verify this information with the grantee. Be sure to identify the date on which acquisition activities were initiated. Any non-exempt acquisition initiated after submission of the application must comply with the Uniform Act regardless of the source of funds. Serious acquisition problems arise from the grantee acquiring property without meeting the Uniform Act requirements.

Part II of the acquisition checklist specific acquisitions for parcels under the project. This checklist ensures that proper Uniform Act procedures were followed during the acquisition of each parcel of property.

13. **Residential Relocation/Displacement Checklist**

Your review of relocation will cover compliance with the relocation provisions of the Uniform Act. The requirements of the Act are very specific. The first step in completing the checklist is to identify whether or not displacement has occurred. Prior to the site visit, review the grantee’s application and complete the questions in Part I. Verify this data with the grantee on-site. It is also important to trace non-Uniform Act relocations to ensure compliance with the locally adopted relocation policy.

For those grantees with relocation covered by the Uniform Act, complete Part II for each displacement. For those relocations not subject to the Uniform Act, review the locally adopted displacement policy and determine whether or not the grantee followed their policy in completing their non-Uniform Act relocation activities.

14. **Economic Development**

The review of the economic development portion of the grantee’s files is to insure that the contractual provisions contained in Exhibits A, B, C, and D of the grantee’s contract with the State have been carried out.

The checklist is used to assist in determining if the following criteria have been met: the number and percent of low/moderate income jobs have been achieved; the developer has submitted the required financial reports; the projected sources and uses of funds have been realized; the LCDBG load has been properly secured and repayments are being made according to schedule, and; program income is being accounted for and properly used.

It is important that the company’s financial statements are current and sufficient to verify the stipulations of the contract.
When LCDBG funds are used for inventory acquisition, the inventory amount on the last balance sheet should approximate the amount of funds drawn to date. The amount of LCDBG funds are used for inventory acquisition, the inventory amount on the last balance sheet should approximate the increase in new assets (except cash); otherwise funds could have been diverted to refinance debt. Employment should be verified by looking at the most recent payroll records rather than a compilation of job applications to insure that job replacements are not being counted in the employment total.

When assessing the company’s financial condition, two quick and easy indicators are: comparing the actual gross profit margin (gpm) with the projected gpm, and the trend in short term liabilities (especially accrued payroll and tax expenses).

15. **Record Keeping**
   
   The record keeping requirements included in the Grantee Handbook are quite specific. Briefly review the grantee’s overall filing system and complete the record keeping checklist.

16. **Compliance with National Objectives**
   
   The purpose of this review is to ascertain that the grantee has documentation on file which supports that one of the national objectives is being addressed by the program.

17. **Disclosure**
   
   The purpose of this review will be to ascertain that the grantee has submitted the updated disclosure reports as required.

18. **Anti-Displacement**
   
   As part of this review, the Residential Anti-Displacement and Relocation Plan must be reviewed. If a person or business has been displaced as a result of the LCDBG Program, Part 2 of the checklist must be also completed.
19. **Exit Conference**

At the conclusion of the monitoring visit, an exit conference will be held with officials from the local governing body for the purpose of summarizing the results of the visit. The exit conference report can be used for the summarization and will be of assistance to you when writing the monitoring letter.
When issuing findings in the monitoring letter, the following codes must be used.

**Program Evaluation and Monitoring Report Codes**

1. **CONTRACT NUMBER**

2. **SOURCE OF FINDING** (1 Digit)

   0 = Ongoing Monitoring  
   1 = On site  
   2 = Complaints  
   3 = HUD Oversight  
   4 = Audit  
   5 = Other  
   6 = In-House

3. **SERIOUSNESS OF FINDING** (1 Digit)

   0 = Minor  
   1 = Serious  
   2 = Very Serious

4. **PROGRAM AREA** (2 Digits)

   01 = Financial Management  
   02 = Environmental Review  
   03 = Labor Standards  
   04 = FH/EO  
   05 = Acquisition  
   06 = Relocation  
   07 = Housing Rehabilitation  
   08 = Procurement  
   09 = Program Performance  
   10 = National Objectives  
   11 = Public Improvements  
   12 = Record Keeping  
   13 = Citizen Participation  
   14 = Other  
   15 = Other

5. **HOW TO NUMBER FINDINGS**

   Contract # - Source of Findings – Seriousness of Findings – Program Area*  
   101-3007 - 1 - 2 - 090

   *In numbering findings, the program area will be expanded to three digits to show the sequential number of the finding. For example, the first finding under program performance would be 090, then 091.
### Pre-Monitoring Visit Data Entry

*Updated: 1/3/05*

(Enter yellow cells. Other cells are password protected. Specify print pages or set the print area.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grantee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year of Grant:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Grant (PF, DN, HO, LS, ED):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Entity (Village, City, Town, Parish):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Elected Official:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGR:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Application:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorization to Incur Costs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmittal of Contract:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Cleared:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer Cleared:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Contract:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer Contract:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCDBG Contract Ends:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Visit:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts/Activities/Nat'l Obj.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Award:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Drawn to Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Activity One:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Objective:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL Budgeted Amount for Activity One:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most recent REVISED Budgeted Amount for Activity One:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures to Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Activity Two:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Objective:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL Budgeted Amount for Activity Two:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most recent REVISED Budgeted Amount for Activity Two:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures to Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Activity Three:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Objective:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL Budgeted Amount for Activity Three:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most recent REVISED Budgeted Amount for Activity Three:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures to Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Activity Four:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Objective:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL Budgeted Amount for Activity Four:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most recent REVISED Budgeted Amount for Activity Four:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures to Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Grant Award (ORIGINAL BUDGET): 0.00
- Grant Award (REVISED BUDGET): 0.00
- Total Expenditures to Date: 0.00
### Acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did application include acquisition by purchase or donation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Anti-Displacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the Plan identify a person who is responsible for displacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and relocation compliance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If Yes, note name of contact person:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was a person or business displaced as a result of this program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Citizen Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Was a program amendment requested and approved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did grantee's public notice for the public hearing state the following would be discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• amount of funds available for community development and housing needs,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• range of eligible activities and estimated amounts for activities that will benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low to moderate income persons,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• applicant's plans for minimizing displacement and the provision of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefits should displacement occur, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• information of the applicant's past LCDBG performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Did the notice encourage citizens, particularly those of low/mod income and residents of slum/blight areas to submit their views on community development and housing needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Did the notice state that accommodations would be provided for non-English speaking and disabled individuals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Were five calendar days allowed for notification of the public hearing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Was the second public notice published after the first public hearing was held and prior to application submittal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Was the second public notice published a minimum of 7 calendar days prior to application submittal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Was the following information included in the grantee's second public notice?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• proposed objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• proposed activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• location of proposed activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• activity amounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• application submittal date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the opportunity to comment on the application &amp; place and time to review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disclosure

If the grant amount exceeds $200,000 fill out the Disclosure items

2. According to regulations, 5 instances require the submittal of an updated disclosure report.
   *(Refer to the instructions for those 5 instances; i.e. contract execution)*

=> Have one of the five instances occurred?
   ~ If Yes, did grantee submit an updated report?
     a. Was it submitted to OCD 30 days following one of the five instances?

| Date 1st updated report received |     |    |
| Date 2nd updated report received |     |    |
| Date 3rd updated report received |     |    |

3. Is it necessary to advise grantee that no further RFP's will be processed until a report is received?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### Environmental

1. Were all activities exempt from the environmental review process?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

3. Did the Historic Preservation Officer request additional information before or during construction?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

4. Was a 'Statutory Checklist Completion Form' completed for each home selected for rehabilitation?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

   ~ If Yes, were copies sent to OCD?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

### Financial

4. Are there any delinquent financial reports?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

5. Does grantee have more than one open LCDBG grant?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

11. Date first construction invoice:  
    -  
    - Period covered:  
    -  

12. Were there internal control findings in the most recent audit?  
    - Yes  
    - No  
    - N/A

### Labor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime Contractor 1</th>
<th>Prime Contractor 2</th>
<th>Prime Contractor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Ad Dates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Day Call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Opening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;TDC&quot; Decision A*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod &amp; Date A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;TDC&quot; Decision B*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod &amp; Date B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Day Worked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Was the Ten Day Call(s) made?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

29. Was the Ten Day Call(s) made in a timely manner?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

30. Was the construction contract awarded more than 90 days after the bid opening?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

31. If more than 90 days elapsed, was a follow-up ten day call made?  
    - Yes  
    - No  
    - N/A

33. Was contractor clearance received prior to contract execution?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

34. Was the "Notice of Contract Award" sent to OCD?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

35. Was the Notice of Contract Award received by OCD within 30 days of the award date?  
    - Yes  
    - No  
    - N/A
### Consultant Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical location of the Town Hall or Courthouse:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was exempt acquisition involved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parcels acquired under the Uniform Act:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any site or activity change since original ERR?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If yes above, was the ERR amended?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many subcontractors?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How far do we have to travel to see the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there current proof of bonding?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who, in the vicinity, would be benefitted by a TA visit from this office?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments, etc.:

---

---
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did application include acquisition by purchase or donation or lease?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes, was the acquisition process started after grant award?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If No, should the application have included acquisition?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Was documentation of ownership or maintenance on file for grantee owned property or servitude acquired under R.S. 9:1253? (i.e., recorded plat map, title, attorney’s statement)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Exempt acquisition</strong> is land acquired from another public agency, temporary construction servitude or easement, voluntary acquisition, leases less than 15 years, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was exempt acquisition involved?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes, identify type of exempt acquisition under A., B., C., and/or D. below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Acquisition from another public agency?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Identify other public agency:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Identify documentation; i.e., title, map, transfer, deed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Temporary Construction Servitudes or Easements? (Recommendation)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Is there a signed agreement from all property owners?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Does it include provisions for the contractor to survey, layout and construct the service connections?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Leases?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If long-term lease, is it for a term of less than 15 years including options to extend? (Uniform Act applies if lease is 15 years or longer; 14.99 years with an option to renew.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(An executed lease must have had prior review from OCD.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. **Voluntary acquisition?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Is there an adopted Voluntary Acquisition Policy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Was a public solicitation notice published in the local newspaper prior to any voluntary acquisition activity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If Yes, did the notice explain or were the owners advised that unless the local governing body and the property owners agree on the terms and conditions of the sale, the property could not otherwise be acquired?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If No, how was notification achieved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Were there at least two properties in the community which met the criteria established for the property to be acquired?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If No, then the Voluntary Acquisition process cannot be completed. Did this occur?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If Yes, why wasn't the Uniform Act followed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) How many parcels were acquired using the Voluntary Acquisition process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) List owners involved:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Did an appraisal establish fair market value?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If No, was the fair market value of the property established by a person familiar with real estate values in the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments / Recommended Corrective Action:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Acquisition of Property (Part 2)

Appraiser: ___________________________  Contract #: ___________________________  FY: _________  Type: ________
Reviewing: ___________________________  LGR: ___________________________  Date: __________

1. Address of property acquired. ____________________________________________

2. Use of property prior to the beginning of the acquisition process.
   ___ single family residential  ___ industrial  ___ non-profit organization  ___ multi-family residential
   ___ commercial  ___ other (identify) _________________________________________

3. Owners (Indicate whether occupant). _______________________________________

4. Tenants. ________________________________________________________________

5. Current address and home and business telephone numbers of owners(s) to be interviewed.
   (Interviews should be conducted if review finds there may be some impropriety with the acquisition process.)
   ________________________________________________________________

6. Significant dates. (Reviewer must determine that event actually occurred and was in compliance with HUD regulations. Reviewer must review the timing of these events and the reasons for any delays in order to determine if the owner was caused an unnecessary hardship that would warrant negative findings.)
   a. Date of Determination to Acquire (Date of LCDBG Application).
   ______________
   b. Date of "Notice of Intent to Acquire".
   ______________
   c. When a Public Agency Acquired Your Property. Date grantee provided owner with the notice of land acquisition procedures? (usually the same date as b. above)
   ______________

   Appraisal Process...

7. Was an appraisal required?  Yes ___  No ___
   ~ If No, explain why an appraisal was not required. (i.e., if the value of property was less than $2,500; voluntary acquisition; etc.)
   ________________________________________________________________
   ~ If an appraisal was not conducted because the property was valued at less than $2,500, list the documentation used to determine the fair market value of the property.
   ________________________________________________________________
~ If Yes, explain. ________________________________________________________________

~ If Yes, explain. ________________________________________________________________

f. Were the owners invited to accompany the appraisers on their inspection of the property? Yes No

Act of Sale/Donation/Condemnation/Quick Take…

8. a. Purchase Offer. Prior to any bargaining, did grantee furnish owner a firm written offer stating all basic terms and conditions to purchase his property at the full amount determined to be just compensation?

Yes No Date

b. Date owner accepts offer to donate, or rejects offer. _________________

~ If donated, was the donation process carried out in a proper manner? Yes No

> If No, randomly pick 2 donations. Call and ask how the process was handled.

~ Did the owners indicate they felt pressured into waiving their right to just compensation? Yes No

> If Yes, explain. ________________________________________________________________

c. Date final contract entered into (all parties).

___________________________

d. Date condemnation proceedings initiated, if applicable.

___________________________

e. Date Quick Take proceedings initiated, if applicable.

___________________________
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f. Date estimated just compensation deposited with court. 

__________________________

g. Date title vested in agency. 

__________________________

h. Date 90-day notice to vacate property. 

__________________________

i. **Summary Statement.** Did the grantee provide the owner with a "Statement of the Basis for the Determination of Just Compensation" at the time the grantee furnished the owner with the written purchase offer? (Section 301 (3)) Yes ___ No ___

j. **Payment of Just Compensation.** Did the owner receive the amount determined to be just compensation for his property? (Section 301) Yes ___ No ___

k. **Settlement Costs.** Has grantee paid all settlement costs as required? (Sect. 303) Yes ___ No ___

9. **General Acquisition Process.** Based on the available evidence, did the grantee carry out the acquisition process in a manner that minimized hardships to the owners, and was the grantee consistent with its' treatment of other owners? (Section 301) Yes ___ No ___

Comments / Recommended Corrective Action: __________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
### Anti-displacement (Part 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee:</th>
<th>Contract #:</th>
<th>FY:</th>
<th>Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer:</td>
<td>LGR:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Is there a Residential Anti-displacement and Relocation file?
   - If **Yes**, does it contain the following information?
     - a. Residential Anti-displacement and Relocation Plan
     - b. resolution adopting the Plan
     - c. Residential Anti-displacement/Relocation Certification
     - d. if applicable, regulations, information booklets, relocation claim forms

2. Does the Plan identify a person who is responsible for displacement and relocation compliance?
   - If **Yes**, identify: ________________________________

3. Was a person or business displaced as a result of this program?
   - **If Yes**, complete the Anti-displacement Checklist (Part 2).

   Comments / Recommended Corrective Action: ________________________________

### Compliance with National Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee:</th>
<th>Contract #:</th>
<th>FY:</th>
<th>Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity(ies):</th>
<th>National Objective(s)*:</th>
<th>Verification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments / Recommended Corrective Action: ________________________________

* L/M = principal benefit to low-to-moderate income persons
  S/B = prevention/elimination of slum and blight
Identification of Occupants.

(Occupants include households: families, individuals and non-residential persons.)

1. Are there records identifying all households by name, number of members, gross income, rent, utility costs and apartment size, and identifying other persons occupying the property on the date of application submittal to grantee?  
   
   No.  
   
   Comments: 

2. Are there records identifying all households by name, number of members, gross income, rent, utility costs and apartment size, and identifying other persons who moved into the property after the owner’s application submittal but before completion of project?  
   
   No.  
   
   Comments: 

3. Are there records identifying all of the occupants, and ownership or rental status after completion of the project?  
   
   No.  
   
   Comments: 

4. Is there an acceptable explanation for the cause of the move of any person that was permanently relocated but was not displaced?  
   
   No.  
   
   Comments: 

Grantee: __________________________  Contract #:________________  FY: __________

Reviewed By: ______________________  LGR: ______________________  Date: __________
Records On Displacement.

(Persons forced to move permanently are considered “displaced”.)

5. If anyone was displaced as a result of this program, is there proper documentation of file?  
↳ If Yes, review a random sample of case files with the following.

Does the case file contain:
• copy of a timely general information notice?  
• copy of a timely notice of eligibility for relocation assistance?  
• a record of personal contacts & advisory services provided?  
• evidence of referrals to comparable or suitable (affordable) replacement housing?  
• copy of the 90-day advance notice of required date of move?  
• identification of actual replacement property/rent/utility costs of dwelling and date of relocation?  
• copy of replacement dwelling inspection report and date of inspection?  
• evidence eligible tenant/owner received a Section 8 certificate or cash replacement housing assistance?  
• approval form for, or evidence of payment of moving expenses?  
• Have copies of the displacement been sent to the State?  

Comments: ________________________________________________________________

Records On Persons Not Displaced.

Review a random sample of case files.

6. Does the case file contain the following:
↳ a time notice explaining persons would not be displaced, and information on after-rehabilitation rents?  
↳ evidence the person was reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses if temporary relocation or move within property was required?  

Comments: ________________________________________________________________

Monitoring Of Owner:

7. Was the displacement made public in the newspaper prior to the recognition of the contract?  

Comments: ________________________________________________________________
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Replacement Units.

8. a) Was the total number of units to be rehabilitated reduced?  
(i.e., changing a four-plex into a duplex)  
↳ If Yes, explain: ____________________________________________  

8. b) Were the applicable steps followed for “one for one” replacement under Section 104D to accomplish the reduction?  

8. c) Was it made public in newspaper prior to recognition of contract?  
↳ If No, explain: ____________________________________________  

8. d) Does the grantee have the following:  
‣ a description of the assisted activity?  
‣ a map with the location and number of dwelling units by size  
(# of bedrooms) that will be demolished or converted to a use other than for low/mod income units as a result of the activity?  
↳ If No, explain: ____________________________________________  

‣ a time schedule for the commencement and completion of the demolition or conversion?  
↳ If No, explain: ____________________________________________  

‣ a map with location & number of dwelling units by size  
(# of bedrooms) that will be provided as replacement dwelling units?  
↳ If No, explain: ____________________________________________  

‣ a source of funding and a time schedule for the provision of replacement dwelling units?  
↳ If No, explain: ____________________________________________  

‣ the basis for concluding that each rental replacement dwelling unit will remain a low/mod income unit for at least 10 years from the date of initial occupancy?  
↳ If No, explain: ____________________________________________  

‣ information demonstrating that any proposed replacement of units with smaller units (i.e., a two-bedroom unit with two one bedroom units) is consistent with the housing needs of low/mod income households in the jurisdiction?  
↳ If No, explain: ____________________________________________  

Appeals/Complaints/Need For A Follow-Up:  

9. Has there been appropriate responses to any appeals/complaints?  

10. Is additional technical assistance, monitoring, or training on tenant assistance requirements needed?  

Comments: ____________________________________________
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does grantee have an adopted Citizen Participation Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If Yes, was the plan adopted prior to the first public hearing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the plan...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• provide citizens with reasonable access to local meetings,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information concerning the State's method of distributing funds and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the use of funds under Title I?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• provide for LCDBG-related public hearings to obtain views on the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of needs, the review of proposed activities and the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review of program performance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• provide for and encourages participation, particularly persons of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low/mod income residing in blighted areas and/or in areas where</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG funds will be used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• provide TA to facilitate participation where requested?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• address accommodations at hearings for non-English speaking persons?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• address accommodations at public hearings for persons with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disabilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• provide for public hearings to obtain views concerning program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amendments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Was a program amendment requested and approved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If YES, was a public hearing conducted prior to the request?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• provide for a public hearing on performance at closeout?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the Citizen Participation Plan include a complaint procedure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If Yes, does the complaint procedure identify;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how a citizen should file a complaint?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the manner in which a complaint is processed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a response time to the complainant - maximum of 15 working days?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If any complaints were filed, was the procedure followed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did first public notice for the public hearing state the following</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be discussed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• amount of funds available for community development and housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the range of eligible activities and the estimated amounts for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities that will benefit low/mod income persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the applicant's plans for minimizing displacement and the provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of benefits should displacement occur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• information of the applicant's past LCDBG performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Did the notice encourage citizens, particularly those of low/mod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income &amp; residents of slum/blight areas to submit their views on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community development and housing needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Did the notice state accommodations would be provided for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-English speaking and disabled individuals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Were five calendar days allowed for notification of the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hearing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Is there a roster of those in attendance of the public hearing?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Are there minutes of the public hearing?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   ~ If Yes, do they state the items in #5 above were discussed? *(Reference isn't necessary if no one was in attendance.)*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Was the second public notice published after the first public hearing was held and prior to application submittal?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Was the second public notice published a minimum of 7 calendar days prior to application submittal?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Was the following information included in the grantee's second public notice?  
   
   - proposed objectives  
   - proposed activities  
   - location of proposed activities  
   - activity amounts  
   - application submittal date  
   - the opportunity to comment on the application and the place and time to review the application  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments / Recommended Corrective Action:  

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
1. a) Does the grantee have an adopted code enforcement policy or condemnation policy? 

   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

   ↩ If Yes, what code(s) is being used? (i.e., Section 8, Southern Building Code, local code, etc.)

   bool

b) Are condemnation procedures for demolition purposes following the requirements set forth in the LCDBG Handbook? 

   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

   ↩ If Yes, is the acquisition of property involved? 

   (If Yes, use the appropriate Acquisition Checklist(s))

   ↩ If No, did the grantee execute a clearance/demolition agreement or a similar document with the property owner prior to starting such activities? 

   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

   ↩ If Yes, does the agreement comply with R.S. 33:4761 as set forth in the LCDBG Grantee Handbook? 

   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

   Comments: ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

2. How many units were approved by the State for demolition? __________________________

3. Does demolition involve more than 8 housing units in one contract or 8 under one roof? (check Davis-Bacon applicability) 

   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

   Comments: ____________________________________________________________

4. How many units will not be replaced of the total units to be demolished? ________________

   Comments: ____________________________________________________________

5. Does the number of units scheduled for demolition correspond to the number approved for demolition? 

   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

   ↩ If No, explain: ____________________________________________________________
6. What criteria was used to determine the unit was suitable for demolition?
(The criteria can be in the form of photographs, a completed Section 8 checklist, a letter from the board of
health which condemns structures or from the chief elected official’s office.)

7. How many units were inhabited just prior to demolition? ________________
How many of those were scheduled for replacement? ________________
If they were inhabited and not scheduled for replacement, explain why: ________________

8. What problems, if any, has the grantee faced with demolition? ________________

9. Do you feel the grantee needs assistance with demolition? ___ ___ ___
   If Yes, explain: ____________________________________________________________________

10. Are there clear lien certificates on the units that have been demolished? ___ ___ ___
    Comments: ____________________________________________________________________
1. Is the grantee's initial Disclosure Report being maintained in the files?

   Complete remainder of checklist if grant amount exceeds $200,000.

2. According to the regulations, five (5) instances require the submittal of an updated disclosure report.
   (Refer to the instructions for the 5 instances; i.e. contract execution)

   ✔ Have one of the five instances occurred?

   - If Yes, did grantee submit an updated report?

   a. Was it received by OCD 30 days following one of the five instances?

   - date 1st updated report received: ________________
   - date 2nd updated report received: ________________
   - date 3rd updated report received: ________________

   b. Are copies being maintained in the grantee's files?

3. If any updated disclosure reports have not been submitted to OCD, advise grantee that no further RFP's will be processed until the applicable report has been received.

   ✔ Was it necessary to advise grantee of this measure?

   - If Yes, note the date the updated report will be submitted: ________________

Comments / Recommended Corrective Action: _____________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________
Grantee: ___________________________ Contract #:__________________ FY:________

Reviewed By:_______________________ LGR:______________________ Date:________

Company Name: ____________________________

Address: ____________________________

Responsible Official: ____________________________

Activity Description: ____________________________

__________________________

__________________________

(JTPA participants are acceptable as low/moderate beneficiaries except those participants on the dislocated workers program.)

Yes   No   N/A

1. Date of last financial review __________for the period ending ____________ .

   Number of reviews conducted to date: __________ .

   Date of last annual statement review __________ for period ending ____________ .

2. Has the grantee’s loan to the developer been secured (mortgage, etc.) in the manner described in Exhibit D of our contract with the contractor?  _____  _____  _____

   Comments: ____________________________

   ____________________________________

3. In general, have all currently applicable provisions of our contract with the grantee been carried out as described, especially Exhibits A - E?  _____  _____  _____

   Comments: ____________________________

   ____________________________________
VERIFICATION OF JOBS CREATED AND/OR RETAINED

4. Number of jobs to be created and/or retained as stated in contract: __________________________

5. Review payroll prior to grant award, if applicable. Mainly or expansions.
   Date of payroll: ______________ Number of existing jobs: __________________________

6. Review current payroll.
   Date of payroll: ______________ Number of existing jobs: __________________________

7. Review job certifications.
   a) Number of jobs to be created and/or retained: __________________________
   b) Number of jobs given to persons of low/moderate income households: __________________________
   c) Number of jobs given to low income households: __________________________
   d) Number of jobs given to high income households: __________________________

8. Does the current payroll match the job certifications? ____Yes ____ No ____ N/A

9. What is the low/moderate income limits for this locality? $________________________

10. What is the percent of low/moderate new hires? ____________%

11. Has this grant met its job creation goals? ____Yes ____ No ____ N/A

   ~ If No, explain: ________________________________________________________________

12. LCDBG funds less administration $________________________ divided by total number of jobs ______

   = cost per job $________________________.

13. Was the National Objective met? ____Yes ____ No ____ N/A

14. Is another monitoring visit required to verify job creation and compliance with the National
    Objective? ____Yes ____ No ____ N/A

* If Yes, plan a second monitoring visit & send a letter to the grantee informing them of their lack of
  compliance in this area.

All other applicable monitoring checklists must be completed. (i.e., Program Performance, FH/EO,
Financial Management, Labor Standards (if Davis-Bacon is applicable), etc.)
FINANCIAL STATEMENT ANALYSIS

1. Ending Date of Financial Statement: __________
   Date Financial Statement Received: __________
   Date Previous Financial Statement Received: __________

2. Type of Financial Statement:  ___ Internal  ___ Compilation  ___ Reviewed  ___ Audit


4. Does the Financial Statement have the following:

   a) Income Statement  Yes  No  N/A
   b) Beginning Balance Sheet  Yes  No  N/A
   c) Ending Balance Sheet  Yes  No  N/A
   d) Statement of Cash Flows  Yes  No  N/A
   e) CPA Statement  Yes  No  N/A
   f) Required Footnote Disclosures  Yes  No  N/A

5. Financial Statement Analysis:
   A. Profitability Indicators -
   B. Asset Management Indicators -
   C. Liquidity/Solvency Indicators -
   D. Other Indicators or Comments -
6. Based upon your review, are the following indicated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. LCDBG funds have been used as described in the application and in the contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The stipulated amount of private investment has been made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The ratio of private investment to LCDBG funds meets the minimum requirements as stipulated in the contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Other issues or comments:

..................................................................................................................

..................................................................................................................

..................................................................................................................

8. Date review completed: ___________________
Were all activities exempt from the environmental review process?

If No, complete remainder of checklist.

Has an activity or project site changed since review of original ERR?

~ If Yes, was the ERR amended and sent to OCD for review?

~ If No, note the date an amended ERR will be submitted:

Did the Historic Preservation Officer request additional information before or during construction?

~ If Yes, is there documentation to show compliance?

Was a 'Statutory Checklist Completion Form' completed for each home selected for rehabilitation?

~ If Yes, were copies sent to OCD?

Comments / Recommended Corrective Action:
**Fair Housing/Equal Opportunity**

Grantee: ___________________________  Contract #:  _____________  FY: _______  Type: _____

Reviewer: __________________________ LGR: _______________________  Date: _____________

---

**Fair Housing**

1. Identify actions taken by grantee to further fair housing during this project/contract period.

---

2. Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing choice (24 CFR 570.601 (a)(2)):
   a. Did the grantee conduct an analysis within its jurisdiction? [Yes] [No] [N/A]
   b. Did the analysis identify any impediments? [Yes] [No] [N/A]
   c. Has grantee taken steps to remedy impediments? [Yes] [No] [N/A]
   d. Are records being maintained reflecting the analysis and actions taken? [Yes] [No] [N/A]

---

3. Have any fair housing complaints been recorded? [Yes] [No] [N/A]
   ~ If Yes, explain.

---

a. Was complaint sent to HUD if discrimination was alleged? [Yes] [No] [N/A]
   b. Did grantee notify complainant of HUD's involvement? [Yes] [No] [N/A]
   c. What is the status of the complaint? _______________________________________

---

**Equal Employment Opportunity**

4. Are EEO guidelines followed or EEO language included in ads for vacancies? [Yes] [No] [N/A]

5. Are EEO posters posted or is an EEO slogan printed on grantee's stationary? [Yes] [No] [N/A]

6. Is employment data maintained? *EEO-4 form, Workforce Analysis in handbook* [Yes] [No] [N/A]

7. Has grantee been cited by a state or federal agency for EEO non-compliance or discrimination in hiring? [Yes] [No] [N/A]
Section 3

Section 3 goals:
- new hires for FY 1997 and later - 30%
- contracting with Section 3 professional services contractors - 3%
- contracting with Section 3 construction contractors - 10%

If grant is less than $200,000, Section 3 requirements do not apply.

9. Did grantee hire employees to work on this project?  
   ~ If Yes, what percentage were Section 3 residents?  
      %

10. Did grantee enter into construction contracts over $100,000?  
    ~ If Yes, did grantee meet the 10% contracting goal?  
        
11. Was the 3% contracting goal met for professional services?  

12. If contracting or hiring goals were not met, list impediments and/or efforts taken by grantee to comply.

For contracts in excess of $100,000... (answer: Yes, No or N/A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime Contractors/Subcontractors:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Did the prime contractor(s) have any new hires?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If Yes, did the contractor(s) meet the 30% goal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Did the subcontractor(s) have any new hires?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If Yes, did the subcontractor(s) meet the 30% goal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If hiring goals were not met, list impediments or efforts taken by contractors and subcontractors to comply.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Was a complaint made to HUD by a Section 3 resident or business that challenged non-compliance with Section 3 on the part of the grantee, prime or sub?  
   ~ If Yes, explain.  
   a. What is the status of the complaint?  
   b. Was there a finding of non-compliance?  

Comments:  
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"Summary of Previous Actions Taken"

17. Has the grantee prepared a "Summary of Previous Actions Taken"?
   a. Does it identify when the grantee conducted its Self-Evaluation? --- --- ---
   b. According to the "Summary", did the Self-Evaluation address:
      ⇒ Physical Accessibility --- --- ---
      ⇒ Communications --- --- ---
      ⇒ Employment --- --- ---

Physical Accessibility

18. According to the "Summary of Previous Actions Taken", …
   a. did the Self-Evaluation identify all non-housing facilities that provide services
      to the grantee? --- --- ---
   b. were facilities identified as "new" and "existing"? ("existing" means constructed,
      altered or designed before July 11, 1988; "new" means after this date.) --- --- ---
   c. did the Self-Evaluation identify any physical barriers that impede accessibility
      to any programs or activities? ～ If Yes, continue.
   d. did the grantee make physical alterations to provide for accessibility? --- --- ---
   e. were all physical barriers identified in the Self-Evaluation removed? ～ No, continue.

19. For "existing" facilities with continuing physical barriers, according to the "Summary of Previous Actions",
   a. have new policies or practices been adopted or existing ones modified or
      revised in order to achieve accessibility such as relocation, home visits, selectite alterations? (24 CFR 8.21(2)) --- --- ---
   b. has the community's adopted policies and/or practices been modified to
      achieve accessibility for all physical barriers identified? ～ If No, continue.
   c. has grantee determined that making facility accessible and usable by
      individuals with handicaps would impose either an undue financial and
      administrative burden, or demonstrated that it would result in a fundamental
      alteration in the nature of the program or activity? (24 CFR 8.21 (b)(1)(ii)) --- --- ---
   d. did the grantee identify any facilities as "new"? ～ If Yes, continue.
   e. did the grantee identify all "new" facilities as accessible? ～ If No, inaccessibility must be addressed in Transition Plan below.

Communications

20. According to the "Summary of Previous Actions Taken", …
   a. did the Self-Evaluation identify any impediments to communications
      accessibility? ～ If Yes, continue.
   b. did the grantee adopt policies to remedy impediments? --- --- ---
      Current Policies
   c. does the grantee use the LA Relay System, and if so, is it advertised? --- --- ---
   d. does the grantee operate a 24 hour emergency service? ～ If Yes, continue.
   e. does the grantee have a functioning TDD? --- --- ---
### Employment

21. According to the "Summary of Previous Actions Taken", …
   a. did the Self-Evaluation identify any practices discriminatory towards disabled persons? (i.e., advertising, tests, selection criteria, job assignment, etc.)
      ~ If Yes, continue.
   b. did the grantee adopt policies to remedy impediments?
   c. does the grantee have any disabled employees?
      ~ If Yes, continue.
   d. are reasonable accommodations made for a qualified applicant or employee with a disability? (restructuring or relocating a job, modifying a schedule, acquiring or modifying equipment, providing a reader or interpreter. This can be a policy statement).

### Other Section 504 Requirements As Applicable

If grantee has 15 employees or more, continue.

22. a. Has grantee designated a Section 504 coordinator?
   b. Adopted a grievance procedure for complaints alleging prohibited actions?
   c. Complied with notice in Section 504 handbook which states that grantee "does not discriminate against participants, beneficiaries, applicants, employees or unions or organizations with whom they have collective bargaining agreements, in admission or access to or treatment or employment treatment or employment in its federally assisted programs or activities"?
      i. If Yes, does notice list the Section 504 coordinator?
      ii. Note method grantee used to make notification.

### Grantee's Transition Plan

23. Has grantee acquired an "existing" facility that is not physically accessible and intends to renovate it before occupation?
   OR,
   Has the U.S. Justice Dept. required the grantee to make a facility physically accessible?
      ~ If Yes, continue.

24. Has a plan been developed listing all steps needed to complete the changes?
   ~ If Yes,
   a. Does the plan identify a compliance officer?
   b. Does it list handicap resources used in writing the plan?
   c. Does the plan identify all impediments?
   d. Does it describe how all facilities will be made accessible?
   e. Is there a time schedule for rectifying all impediments?
      Note time period -
      i. Are the renovations on schedule?
      ii. If No, should the time schedule be revised?

Comments / Recommended Corrective Action:
### Financial Reporting

Reference: 24 CFR 85.20 (b)

1. Does grantee have complete financial statements? *(Statement of Revenues, Expenditures & Changes in Fund Balance and Balance Sheet)*
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

2. Are the YTD statements current? *(at least the preceding month)*
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

3. Are the financial statements accurate? *(prepared on a monthly modified accrual basis)*
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

4. Are there any delinquent financial reports?
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

5. Does grantee have more than one open LCDBG grant?
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A
   - ~ If Yes, are they accounted for separately?
     - Yes  
     - No  
     - N/A

6. Is grantee reporting the program as a Capital Projects Fund?
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

7. Is 'program income' being received?
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A
   - ~ If Yes, is it accounted for separately?
     - Yes  
     - No  
     - N/A
     - Is it expended before LCDBG funds are expended?
       - Yes  
       - No  
       - N/A

### Accounting Records

8. Do the financial statements account for 'other funds' included in the application?
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

9. Does grantee maintain applicable accounting records? *(a chart of accounts for the program, journal entries, project ledger, fixed assets/property register)*
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

10. Does grantee properly maintain program records? *(contract, authorization to incur costs, program amendments, budget revisions)*
    - Yes  
    - No  
    - N/A

11. **Authorizations and Awards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorization</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorization to Incur Costs letter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First administrative invoice:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Period covered:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release of Funds letter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First construction invoice:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Period covered:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was there evidence costs were being incurred prior to award?
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A

Comments: 

---
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Internal Controls

12. Were there internal control findings in the most recent audit?  

13. Does the internal control structure support the representations made in the financial management questionnaire?
   - approval of invoices
   - recording of LCDBG financial transactions
   - signing of the checks

14. Are there two signatures on the checks?

15. Are the requests for payment forms pre-signed?

16. Are checks pre-signed?

17. Are all employees handling financial transactions bonded?

Comments:

Budget Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgeted Activities</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Current (REVISED) Budget</th>
<th>Expenditures to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FYE:</th>
<th>Amount Drawdown</th>
<th>RFP#</th>
<th>Revenue Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FYE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ledger Cash Balance  Date  Bank Statement Cash Balance  Date

18. Are there any discrepancies in the reporting of revenues and expenditures and the approved budget?

Comments:
Allowable Costs

19. Were purchases of supplies and leasing of equipment justified?  
   Yes  No  N/A

20. Was a lease vs. purchase analysis carried out and documented?  
   Yes  No  N/A

21. Are purchases documented with purchase orders and requisitions?  
   Yes  No  N/A

Comments:

Source Documentation

22. Are accounting records (journal entries) supported by adequate source documents (cancelled checks, invoices, contracts)?  
   Yes  No  N/A

23. Was employee time charged to the LCDBG Program adequately documented with time sheets and/or other source documents?  
   Yes  No  N/A

   ~ If Yes, are the transactions regarding employee time recorded properly in general and ledger?  
   Yes  No  N/A

Comments:

Cash Management

24. Are LCDBG funds deposited in a non-interest bearing account?  
   Yes  No  N/A

25. Are all checks pre-printed and pre-numbered?  
   Yes  No  N/A

26. Are 'other' funds deposited in the LCDBG account?  
   Yes  No  N/A

27. Are bank statements reconciled upon receipt?  
   Yes  No  N/A

28. Is there evidence of a violation of the '3-day rule'?  
   Yes  No  N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFP#:</th>
<th>Date Rec'd</th>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Dollar Amt.</th>
<th>Check Written</th>
<th>Check Cleared *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If more than 30 days has lapsed, a written explanation must be requested in writing.

29. Financial Institution: ___________________________  Account Number: ___________________________

30. Last cash disbursement: Check # ________ Date ________ Amount __________

Comments: ____________________________________________
31. Were the grantee's accounting records and financial practices sufficient to:
   a. permit the preparation of required financial reports? (24CFR 85.20(a)(1))
      ____________________  ____________________  ____________________
      Yes          No          N/A
   and/or
b. permit the tracing of LCDBG funds to establish that such funds have not been
   used in violation of the restrictions & prohibitions of applicable statues and
   regulations? (24CFR 85.20 (a)(2))
      ____________________  ____________________  ____________________
      Yes          No          N/A

What are the specific problems?
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

If No, inform grantee that no more money can be requested or disbursed until deficiencies are corrected.

Comments / Recommended Corrective Action:
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
1. Number of units approved for: 
   (Rehabilitation) Number of units: 
   (Replacement/Reconstruction) Number of units: 
   (Demolition) Number of units: 
   *(Demolition includes both vacant demolition and replacement/reconstruction units)*

2. Does it appear the proposed rehab/replacement/reconstruction/demolition will be completed?  
   Yes  No  N/A
   ~ If No, explain. ____________________________________

3. Are the program guidelines being followed and, is a deferred loan/payment program being used?  
   ~ If Yes, is the property being legally liened?  
   Yes  No  N/A

4. Are individual files being maintained for each rehabilitated unit?  
   Yes  No  N/A

5. What standards are being used to determine the extent of rehabilitation that is necessary?  
   ____________________________________

6. Did advertisement call bidders attention to:  
   • Section 3 and Section 109  
   • E. O. 11246  
   • Segregated Facility  
   Yes  No  N/A

7. Are site inspections used for assuring timely completion of work and payments?  
   Yes  No  N/A
   a) Who performs the inspections?  
   ____________________________________
   b) What is their prior experience?  
   ____________________________________

8. a) What is the average cost per,  
   (Rehabilitation)  
   (Replacement/Reconstruction)  
   (Demolition)  
   ~ If No, explain. ____________________________________
   b) Are these consistent with the application?  
   Yes  No  N/A
9. Did any individual grant/loan exceed the locally determined maximum average amount, if applicable? 
   
   ~ If Yes, explain. ________________________________________________________________

Comments / Recommended Corrective Action: _______________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

Housing Rehabilitation Plan

10. Have Rehabilitation guidelines (policies/procedures) been developed and approved by the local governing body? 
    
    ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

11. Do the guidelines…

   • state eligibility requirements for participation including household income, assets, 
     ownership, occupancy, need for Rehabilitation, geographical boundaries, 
     rehabilitation feasibility, etc.? 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • establish a maximum average grant and/or loan limitation considering the condition 
     of the targeted housing stock and the needs of the Program clientele? 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • identify a property rehabilitation standard? (Section 8 Housing Quality Standards, 
     Southern Standard Housing Code, local housing code, etc.) 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • require each Rehabilitated unit to comply at a minimum with the Section 8 Housing 
     Quality Standards and Cost Effective Energy Conservation Standards? 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • require each unit to comply with the Fire Administration Authorization Act of 1992? 
     (at a minimum, installed 2 hard-wired and/or battery operated smoke detectors) 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • establish procedures to ensure compliance with the Lead-Based Paint regulations? 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • clearly identify eligible Rehabilitation costs? 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • define the roles and responsibilities of program staff and the property owner and 
     contractor through all phases of program delivery? 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • include or reference all procedures and forms for application processing and 
     financial and construction management? 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • if applicable, establish a coordinated relationship with the local code enforcement 
     program? 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • include actions to recruit and assist contractors? (small, minority and/or female) 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • include minimum qualifications for contractors, and provide for the evaluation of 
     contractor credentials, including the contractor’s license/registration number? 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • include appropriate measures to deny participation to contractors who fail to perform 
     in a satisfactory manner? 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • require the preparation of a detailed work write-up and cost estimate for each unit? 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • include general Rehabilitation specifications that adequately prescribe materials, 
     methods and workmanship quality? 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

   • include a grievance procedure or other mechanism to correct deficiencies in the 
     Housing Rehabilitation program after final inspection? 
   ___________________________  ___________________________  ___________________________

Comments / Recommended Corrective Action: _______________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________
This checklist must be completed for each unit reviewed.

Owner/Occupant (Head of Household) ____________________________________________

Address ___________________________________________________________________

Deffered loan amount $ ___________________________

Check all that apply: [ ] single family [ ] duplex [ ] upper income HH [ ] low/moderate income HH

[ ] Number of units in structure undergoing rehabilitation

[ ] Date of final verification of all household application data

[ ] Date work write-up and cost estimate prepared

[ ] Date of advertisement for bids for this unit

[ ] Date contract signed

[ ] Date Notice to Proceed issued

1. Was household income data verified? [ ] Yes [ ] No

2. Is information available which indicates that the eligibility criteria of the program guidelines have been met? _______ _______

3. Was the work write-up and/or plans signed by the owner? _______ _______

4. Were bids in line with the preliminary cost estimates and work write-up? _______ _______

5. Was contracting done on a competitive basis? _______ _______

6. Contractor ___________________________ Date cleared ________________

   Contractor ___________________________ Date cleared ________________

   Was the prime contractor(s) clear prior to contract execution? _______ _______

7. Was D.S.S. contracted to verify that the contractor(s) is current in his child support payments, if applicable? _______ _______

8. Was contractor’s general liability and workman’s compensation insurance verified? _______ _______
9. Does the contract include:
- Title VI Clause
- E.O. 11246 Standard Clause (*above $10K*) or 3 paragraph E.O. Provisions (*$10K or less*)
- Notice of Requirement for Affirmative Action (*above $10,000*)
- Standard E.O. 11246 Specifications (*goals inserted - above $10,000*)
- Section 109 Clause
- Section 3 Clause
- Segregated Facilities Clause
- Lead Base Paint Clause
- Access to Records/Maintenance of Records Clause
- Conflict of Interest
- Contractor/Subcontractor certification of EEO HUD 950.1 and 950.2 (*above $10,000*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Was the homeowner required to temporarily relocate to another unit?
- If **Yes**
  - Was the unit inspected for Section 8 compliance?
  - Did this unit pass ____ or fail ____ Section 8 compliance?
  - Was the homeowner notified of the pass/fail status of this unit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Were systematic site inspections made prior to making progress payments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Was a final inspection made upon receipt of the final invoice from the contractor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Is there a dated notification "Watch Out for Lead-Based Paint Poisoning" form signed by the homeowner or tenant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Are homeowners being insured through the national flood insurance program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Was this home in a flood zone?
- If **Yes**, did grantee follow its adopted Floodplain Ordinance for construction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. Did grantee address deficiencies identified in the application? (*handicapped features, etc*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. Was the job completed in accordance with the contract and warranty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18. Was a "Notice of Acceptance of Work" issued?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19. Was a "Notification of Release of Lien" and applicable warranties received from the contractor, all subcontractors and suppliers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20. Was final payment made at the end of the required lien period?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. Was a lien filed on the rehab unit at the clerk of court's office as per our minimum 5 year deferred loan program policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments / Recommended Corrective Action: ________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime 1 General Info</th>
<th>Prime 2 General Info</th>
<th>Prime 3 General Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Day Call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Opening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;TDC&quot; Decision A*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage Mod A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;TDC&quot; Decision B*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage Mod B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Day Worked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "TDC" Decision means the 10-Day Call Decision in effect, according to DOL, at the time of the 10-day call.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime 1 Interviews</th>
<th>Prime 2 Interviews</th>
<th>Prime 3 Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Worker Classifications and Rates as Determined by Employee Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of Sub(s) 4

Employee Interviews

Name of Sub(s) 6

Employee Interviews

Name of Sub(s) 7

Employee Interviews
1. Were "some" interviews, as listed on the previous page and defined on page 4, done?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primes</th>
<th>Subs</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Were weekly payrolls and Statements of Compliance submitted?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primes</th>
<th>Subs</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Were Statements of Compliance signed by a company officer or an authorized official?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primes</th>
<th>Subs</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Did the inspection reports provide the basic elements needed to verify Davis-Bacon such as a description of work performed, worker classifications, and equipment present on jobsite?  
   Comment: ____________________________  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Did the wage decision(s) have all job classifications needed by each contractor based on factors such as inspection reports, project type, site visits and common sense?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Did the contractor request an additional classification(s)?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Did the payrolls (or corrected payrolls) properly classify workers?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Did the wage decision(s) require fringes for any classification used by each contractor?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. If fringes were required, did the contractor check Box 4-b indicating payment in cash?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Did Statement of Compliance Box 4-a indicate payment into an approved plan?  
    | Yes | No |
    |-----|----|
    | No  | Yes |

11. Did hourly rates paid always meet or exceed the total Davis-Bacon package where the total package = required hourly rate + Fringe Benefits?  
    | Yes | No |
    |-----|----|
    | No  | Yes |

12. Were fringe benefit payments to a receiving institution verified?  
    | Yes | No |
    |-----|----|
    | No  | Yes |

13. Was there any Davis-Bacon deficiency(ies)? (From questions 1-12 or for any other reason)  
    | Yes | No |
    |-----|----|
    | No  | Yes |

14. Describe the Davis-Bacon deficiencies:  
    ___________________________________________________________________
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A Labor Standards Enforcement Report (LSER) is required when: (1) restitution by a contractor, exceeds $1,000 or (2) there were any overtime violations under CWHSSA. Violations under CWHSSA require Liquidated Damages to be addressed. The LSER is normally submitted before conditional close and after restitution and Liquidated Damages, if any, have been addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who detected the Davis-Bacon deficiencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Davis-Bacon restitution procedures been initiated or completed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has there any overtime? (Under Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act--CWHSSA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there any deficiency in the calculation of overtime rates?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the overtime deficiency(ies):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who detected the overtime deficiencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have overtime restitution procedures been initiated or completed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has either of the requirements for a LSER been triggered? (as stated in the above paragraph)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the requirement for a LSER been triggered only due to Davis-Bacon deficiencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then there must be overtime violation(s) which require action regarding Liquidated Damages. Payment of Liquidated Damages or a request for waiver of payment of Liquidated Damages by the contractor is required. Has the process of dealing with Liquidated Damages been initiated?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the process of submitting a LSER been initiated and/or completed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there &quot;other&quot; deductions on the payroll reports?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there were &quot;other deductions, were employee consent forms used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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28. Was the Ten Day Call(s) made?
   No    Yes

29. Was the Ten Day Call(s) made in a timely manner?

30. Was the construction contract awarded more than 90 days after the bid opening?
   No    Yes

31. If more than 90 days elapsed, was a follow-up ten day call made?

32. Was the proper Wage Decision(s) used?

33. Was contractor clearance received prior to contract execution?

34. Was the "Notice of Contract Award" sent to OCD?
   No    Yes

35. Was the Notice of Contract Award received by OCD within 30 days of the award date?

36. Were the Davis-Bacon and EEO posters accessible to workers?

37. Was the Project Wage Rate Sheet or the Wage Decision, one of the two, accessible?

The Definition of "Some" Employee Interviews

"Some" interviews shall include employees of the following contractors:
   All Prime Contractors and any subcontractor with a contract of $100,000 or more
   Subcontractors with a large number of payroll problems with contracts of less than $100,000
   Other subcontractors, not listed above, that are on the jobsite on the day of the above interviews

"Some" shall also mean one person of each classification present on the interview date(s)
   and 50% of all laborers.

Comments:  

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
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1. Identify all professional services contracts and amounts executed by grantee, and determine whether the contract amounts exceed the amounts allowed by OCD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Amounts:</th>
<th>OCD approved amounts:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Consultant</td>
<td>(Pre-agreement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pre-agreement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(General Administration)</td>
<td>(General Administration)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the contract amount for pre-agreement and general admin. exceeds the OCD approved amounts, is there documentation of prior approval?  **Yes ___  No ___  N/A ___**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Amounts:</th>
<th>OCD approved amounts:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td>(Pre-agreement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pre-agreement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Basic Engineering)</td>
<td>(Basic Engineering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Inspections)</td>
<td>(Inspections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Topo Survey)</td>
<td>(Topo Survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Property Survey)</td>
<td>(Property Survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Testing)</td>
<td>(Testing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Construction Staking)</td>
<td>(Construction Staking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Other)</td>
<td>(Other)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If contract amount for any item listed above exceeds the OCD approved amount, is there documentation of prior approval?  **Yes ___  No ___  N/A ___**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testing:</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraiser:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Appraiser:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grantee: __________________________  Contract #: __________________________  FY: ______  Type: ______  LGR: __________________________  Date: __________

Procurement

June, 2003
Review all sole source contracts and a sample of the others.

2. For the **Small Purchase** method, does the file have…
   (when fees are less than $100,000)
   - a minimum of 3 quotes rec'd by phone, fax or mail
   - documentation for basis of selection

3. The **Competitive Negotiation** method.  (when fees exceed $100,000)
   a. Using "**Requests for Proposals**", does the file have…
      - a copy of the Request for Proposal?
      - Was RFP published in nearest MSA newspaper?
      - copies of proposals received?
      - a written evaluation of each proposal received?
      - evidence costs were reviewed for reasonableness
      - evidence the selection process was thorough and uniform
        and the criteria & point system identified in the RFP was
        used to make the selection?

   b. Using "**Statements of Qualifications**", does the file have…
      - Was the request published in nearest MSA newspaper?
      - copies of statements received?
      - a written evaluation of each statement received?
      - evidence costs were reviewed for reasonableness?
      - evidence the selection process was thorough and uniform
        and the criteria & point system identified in the Request for
        Qualification Statements was used to make the selection?

4. For the **Non-competitive Negotiation** method, does the file have…
   (Used when procuring a planning district for admin. services; otherwise, OCD approval is required.)
   - rationale for using this procurement method?
   - justification for services provided?
   - evidence costs were reviewed for reasonableness?
   - If method used for other services, had OCD approved?

   Comments / Recommended Corrective Action: 

5. Date contractor cleared, if applicable:
   ~ Is clearance date before contract date?
   Yes ___ No ___  Yes ___ No ___
6. Does the contract include the following:
   - scope of services
   - contract amount, with breakout of fees by services
   - method of compensation
   - contract date (make note of)
   - Title VI
   - Section 3
   - Section 109
   - Equal Opportunity
   - Termination for Cause, and Convenience
   - Conflict of Interest
   - Access to Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Engineer</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Was contract amended?
   - If Yes, why?

8. Date of first invoice:
   - Is date after contract date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Does consultant’s contract stipulate 10% of contract amount will be held until program is conditionally closed?

10. Amount awarded grantee for general administration less pre-agreement:
   - Did grantee hold 10% for their administrative expenses?

11. Between FY'98 & FY'02, was testing contract between grantee and testing firm?

12. Did the grantee adopt the State's sample procurement policy?

13. Did grantee encourage and/or achieve Minority Business Enterprise participation?
   (Methods: Small Business Administration, newspaper ads, direct solicitation, divided project into smaller contracts, etc.)
   - If No, explain.

Comments / Recommended Corrective Action:

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
**Program Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee:</th>
<th>Contract #:</th>
<th>FY:</th>
<th>Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer:</td>
<td>LGR:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract End Date:</td>
<td>Percent Drawn To- Date:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Is the program progressing in accordance with the current time schedule?**
   - If **No**, list the activity(ies) that is behind schedule and explain why.
   - **Activity:**
     - **Reason for delay:**
   
   - **Activity:**
     - **Reason for delay:**

2. **Do you think the grantee can meet the current time schedule?**
   - **Yes**  **No**
   - If **No**, explain:

3. **Was a revised schedule discussed?**
   - **Yes**  **No**

4. **Are there problems which could make the overall program infeasible?**
   - **Yes**  **No**

**Comments / Recommended Corrective Action:**

---

**Record Keeping**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee:</th>
<th>Contract #:</th>
<th>FY:</th>
<th>Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **Does the filing system follow the model provided in the grantee handbook?**
   - **Yes**  **No**

2. **Was it difficult to find information or documentation during the review?**
   - **Yes**  **No**
   - If **Yes**, explain:

3. **Does grantee have another active grant, conditionally closed grant or grant that received a final closeout in the last four years?**
   - **Yes**  **No**
   - If **Yes**, view files and review past monitoring letters for repetitive deficiencies.

**Comments / Recommended Corrective Action:**

---
1. a. Is there a Certificate for Compliance with Minimum Standards for Accessibility by the Physically Handicapped?
   
   ~ If Yes, identify?

2. Is there documentation to support that acquisition of property was not necessary?

   ~ If Yes, identify?

3. Did DHH review/approve plans/specs for the sewer/water project?

   ~ If Yes, is DHH’s letter dated prior to start of construction?

4. Is any additional work being performed?

   ~ If Yes, explain?

5. Does the project site in the application compare to the actual site? (view site)

6. Is the project sign prominently displayed?

7. a. If grant provides hook-ups or service line repairs to low/mod income families, does the residents’ application for services include documentation which supports amount of annual income? (effective beginning Feb. 1, 2000)

   b. Were work authorizations obtained from the property owners?

8. Were special assessments levied on property owners as a result of this project? (hook-up or tap-on fees)
9. Budget changes more than 10% or program changes that delete, add or change an approved activity require prior written approval. If applicable, was a Request for Program Amendment submitted to OCD?

10. a. Identify resident inspector: 

   b. Was the inspector's Qualification Certificate sent to OCD prior to start of construction? (for FY 2000 and later)

11. Are inspection reports available for review? (applicable beginning FY 2000)

12. Was ad for bids published once a week for 3 weeks according to State Bid Law? (July 1, 1999 to date: the first ad must appear at least 25 days prior to bid opening.)

13. Did advertisement for bids include time/place of bid opening?

14. Did advertisement for bids call bidders attention to the following?
   - conditions of employment and minimum wages
   - Section 3 and Section 109
   - E. O. 11246
   - Segregated Facility

15. Was a bid guarantee equivalent to 5% of bid submitted by the lowest responsible bidder? (bid bond, certified check)

16. Were there minutes of the bid opening and a tabulation of bids?

17. Did bid/contract document contain the following?
   - Federal Wage Decision(s) - #'s
   - Contractor's Guide to Davis-Bacon/Payroll Requirements (beginning FY'03)

   #8 EO Provisions (A.) for contracts not subject to EO11246 ($10,000 & under)
   - EO Provisions (B. & C.) for contracts subject to EO11246 (above $10,000)
     (must include goals for minority and female participation)
   - Civil Rights Act of 1964 - Title VI Clause
   - Section 109 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974
   - Section 3 Compliance for Training, Employment, Business Opportunities
   - Section 503 Non-discrimination for Handicapped
   - Age Discrimination Act of 1975

   #9 Certification of Compliance with Air and Water Acts (above $10,000)

   #12 Access to Records/Maintenance of Records

   #13 Conflict of Interest
   - Bonding and Insurance Requirements

18. Were bid/contract documents reviewed by grantee's attorney? (A recommendation only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractors:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Improvements/Force Account
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Contractors/ Subs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. If applicable, were copies of all addendum(da) sent to all bidders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Did contractor(s) prepare a 'Section 3' Plan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Were Tables A and B completed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Did subcontractor(s) prepare a 'Section 3' Plan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Were Tables A and B completed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Did contractor(s) sign the following certifications?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Equal Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Section 3 and Segregated Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Labor Standards/Prevailing Wage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Did subcontractor(s) sign the following certifications?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Equal Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Section 3 and Segregated Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Labor Standards/Prevailing Wage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Is there a performance bond and a payment bond for the contract amount?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Were the U.S. Treasury Dept. and the LA Insurance Commissioner's Office contacted regarding the surety company?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Was the contract awarded to the lowest responsible bidder?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Did the contract document include all items contained in the bid package and was it executed by the contractor?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Was the contract awarded within the time frame established in State Bid Law?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ 45 days; time frame may be extended in 30-day increments by mutual consent.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Were change orders approved by OCD prior to execution?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ applicable beginning FY 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Has the 'Certificate of Substantial Completion' been recorded?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Has there been a final inspection of work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Has final payment been made to contractor less retainage?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Has the 'Clear Lien Certificate' been issued?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Has contractor been paid their retainage?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Will grantee transfer ownership of system to another entity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If Yes, has an intergovernmental cooperative agreement been executed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force Account</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Did grantee have prior written approval from OCD to use &quot;Force Account&quot;? Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If Yes, did grantee follow the &quot;LCDBG Guidelines for Force Account&quot;?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Refer to the guidelines to review.)

Comments / Recommended Corrective Action:

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________
Grantee: ______________________  Contract #: ___________  FY: _______
Reviewed By: ___________________  LGR: ___________________  Date: _______

Review grantee’s involvement in permanent relocation of persons displaced by acquisition of property and non-Uniform Act activities. The checklist is for both relocation activities under the Uniform Act and non-Uniform Act. A minimum of five parcels must be reviewed if the total number of relocations is less than fifty. For more than fifty, a total of 10% or a maximum of twenty must be reviewed for compliance.

### Uniform Act Relocation And Displacement

1. Was or is permanent displacement anticipated as a result of the LCDBG Program?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A  
   Comments: ____________________________
   
   ▼ If Yes, continue. If No, it is not necessary to complete this checklist.

2. Total number of displacements subject to the Uniform Act: ____________
   ▪ How many are 180 day owner occupied? ____________
   ▪ How many are 180 day renter occupied? ____________
   ▪ How many are 180 day business related? ____________
   ▪ How many are 180 day farm related? ____________
   ▪ Other (specify): ____________________________
   Comments: ____________________________

3. Total number of displacements not be subject to the Uniform Act: ____________

4. Were the displacements carried out in accordance with the Act?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A  
   Comments: ____________________________
   
   ▼ If No, explain how these relocations do not conform to the Act? ____________________________

5. Were replacement units inspected for Section 8 compliance?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A  
   Comments: ____________________________

6. Were relocation/displacement payments made in accordance with Uniform Act requirements?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - N/A  
   Comments: ____________________________
Complete the “Residential Relocation/Displacement Checklist (part 2)” for Uniform Act activities.

### Non-Uniform Act Relocation And Displacement

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Does the grantee have a locally adopted relocation policy covering non-Uniform Act relocation procedures?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Were non-Uniform Act displacements carried out in accordance with the relocation policy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESIDENTIAL RELOCATION / DISPLACEMENT (part 2)

(For Uniform Act Activities Only)

Grantee: ____________________________ Contract #: ____________ FY: ____________ Reviewed By: ____________

1. ~ Parcel A ~
   Relocation No: ____________________________
   Address: __________________________________
   Name of Head of Household: ____________________________
   __ 180-day homeowner __ 90-day homeowner __ tenant
   Relocation (other): __ business __ farm
   Relocation Status: ____________________________
   Prior to Notice of Displacement: ____________________________
   Date of 90-day Notice: ____________________________
   Date of Move: ____________________________
   Date of Claim Payment: ____________________________

2. ~ Parcel B ~
   Relocation No: ____________________________
   Address: __________________________________
   Name of Head of Household: ____________________________
   __ 180-day homeowner __ 90-day homeowner __ tenant
   Relocation (other): __ business __ farm
   Relocation Status: ____________________________
   Prior to Notice of Displacement: ____________________________
   Date of 90-day Notice: ____________________________
   Date of Move: ____________________________
   Date of Claim Payment: ____________________________
2. Is there a file on the displaced person?  
   ~ Parcel A ~  
   Yes  No  Comment  
   ~ Parcel B ~  
   Yes  No  Comment

3. Was a “Notice of Displacement” sent?  
   ~ Parcel A ~  
   Yes  No  Comment  
   ~ Parcel B ~  
   Yes  No  Comment

4. Did the “Notice of Displacement” include:  
   • the required brochure or procedures?  
     ~ Parcel A ~  
     Yes  No  Comment  
     ~ Parcel B ~  
     Yes  No  Comment
   • a copy of the grievance procedure?  
     ~ Parcel A ~  
     Yes  No  Comment  
     ~ Parcel B ~  
     Yes  No  Comment
   • the name and phone number of a contact person?  
     ~ Parcel A ~  
     Yes  No  Comment  
     ~ Parcel B ~  
     Yes  No  Comment

5. Is there evidence of receipt of the “Notice of Displacement?”  
   ~ Parcel A ~  
   Yes  No  Comment  
   ~ Parcel B ~  
   Yes  No  Comment

6. Was a household survey done?  
   ~ Parcel A ~  
   Yes  No  Comment  
   ~ Parcel B ~  
   Yes  No  Comment

7. Were at least 3 referrals made for replacement housing?  
   ~ Parcel A ~  
   Yes  No  Comment  
   ~ Parcel B ~  
   Yes  No  Comment

8. If referrals were made, were replacement units:  
   • decent, safe and sanitary?  
     ~ Parcel A ~  
     Yes  No  Comment  
     ~ Parcel B ~  
     Yes  No  Comment
   • suitable or comparable?  
     ~ Parcel A ~  
     Yes  No  Comment  
     ~ Parcel B ~  
     Yes  No  Comment
   • affordable?  
     ~ Parcel A ~  
     Yes  No  Comment  
     ~ Parcel B ~  
     Yes  No  Comment
   • located outside low/mod or minority concentrations (at least one unit)?  
     ~ Parcel A ~  
     Yes  No  Comment  
     ~ Parcel B ~  
     Yes  No  Comment

9. Did the displaced person encounter housing discrimination?  
   ~ Parcel A ~  
   Yes  No  Comment  
   ~ Parcel B ~  
   Yes  No  Comment

10. If the displaced person faced discrimination, was assistance provided?  
    ~ Parcel A ~  
    Yes  No  Comment  
    ~ Parcel B ~  
    Yes  No  Comment

Residential Relocation/Displacement (part 2)
11. Was a 90-day “Notice to Vacate” issued?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. If a 90-day notice was issued, was it:  
   • issued after the Notice of Displacement?  
     | Yes | No | Comment |
     |-----|----|---------|
   • issued after referrals to replacement housing?  
     | Yes | No | Comment |
     |-----|----|---------|
   • received by the displaced person?  
     | Yes | No | Comment |
     |-----|----|---------|
   • followed by a 30-day “Notice to Vacate”?  
     | Yes | No | Comment |
     |-----|----|---------|

13. Is there evidence of receipt of the 30-day “Notice to Vacate”?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Was the displaced person moved into an inspected housing unit?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. If the displaced person moved into a substandard unit, was required letter sent?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. Is there evidence of receipt of that letter?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. Was a claim for moving costs submitted?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18. If a moving costs claim was submitted, was the claim:  
   • completely documented?  
     | Yes | No | Comment |
     |-----|----|---------|
   • verified?  
     | Yes | No | Comment |
     |-----|----|---------|
   • paid?  
     | Yes | No | Comment |
     |-----|----|---------|

19. Was a claim for replacement housing assistance (homeowner, or down payment assistance or rental assistance) submitted?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel A</td>
<td>Parcel B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20.</strong> If a claim was submitted, was the claim:</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• completely documented?</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• verified?</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• paid in a lump sum?</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21.</strong> If any claims were not paid, is there documentation of the basis for denial?</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22.</strong> Did grantee invoke &quot;Last Resort Replacement Housing&quot; provisions in this case?</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23.</strong> If &quot;Last Resort&quot; was invoked, note the form and amount of assistance provided:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24.</strong> Comments / Recommended Corrective Action:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Areas Reviewed</td>
<td>Identify Problems to be Corrected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition (05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-displacement (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Participation (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance/Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental (02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH/EO/Section3/504 (04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management (01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation (07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Standards (03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Objective (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Performance (09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement (08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Improvements (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Keeping (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation (06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Honorable John Smith  
Mayor, Village of Someplace  
Post Office Box 123456  
Someplace, Louisiana 99999

RE: Monitoring Report  
FY 20xx LCDBG Public Facilities Program  
Contract Number 777777

Dear Mr. Smith:

On March 13, 20xx, a visit to the Village was conducted for the purpose of monitoring your FY 20xx Louisiana Community Development Block Grant (LCDBG) program. The courtesy and cooperation extended to our staff during the visit is appreciated.

During the visit a review of selected items was undertaken in the following program areas: (a) Acquisition, (b) Citizen Participation, (c) Disclosure, (d) Displacement, (e) Environmental Review, (f) Fair Housing/Equal Opportunity and 504 Requirements, (g) Financial Management, (h) Labor Standards, (i) National Objectives, (j) Procurement, (k) Program Performance, (l) Public Facility Improvements and (m) Record Keeping.

Our review indicated that you have the continuing capacity to carry out the program activities in a timely manner. The program has been implemented in accordance with the requirements and primary objectives of the Housing and Community Development Act and other applicable laws, with the exceptions identified herein. Although other deficiencies may exist, they were not detected during our review.

FINDINGS OF DEFICIENCY

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

The citizen participation files were reviewed for completeness and accuracy.

Finding Number 777777-1-1-131

The Village’s Citizen Participation Plan was adopted on December 11, 20xx, which was after the first public hearing on September 30, 20xx. Page 12 of the FY 20x0/20x1 Application Package states, “The local Citizen Participation Plan must be made available to the public at the first public hearing.”

Honorable John Smith
Corrective Action Required: The Village must send us an explanation as to why the program requirements for the timely adoption of the Citizen Participation Plan and presentation at the public hearing were not followed and written assurance that required Citizen Participation procedures will be followed under the remainder of this program and under any future LCDBG programs.

Finding Number 777777-1-1-132
During our review we noted that the Village did not have a roster of attendance or minutes of the first public hearing. Task A-14 in the FY 20xx Grantee Handbook indicates that Citizen Participation is a major file category which should contain “…List of persons attending public hearings and minutes of the meetings…”

Corrective Action Required: The Village must provide us with an explanation as to why there was no roster of attendance and minutes of the first public hearing and written assurance that program requirements regarding Citizen Participation will be followed under the remainder of this program and under any future LCDBG programs.

DISCLOSURE

The initial and updated disclosure reports were reviewed for compliance with the LCDBG program requirements.

Finding Number 777777-1-1-141
During our monitoring visit, an updated Disclosure Report was submitted, but not within the required thirty days of the signing of the contract with the prime contractor, ABC Contractors. The FY 20xx Grantee Handbook states on page 202, “Grantees must…ensure that an updated disclosure report is submitted within thirty days of any change that meets one of the five criteria discussed above…”

Corrective Action Required: The Village must send us a written explanation as to why a timely updated Disclosure Report was not sent and written assurance that Disclosure Reports will be submitted to this office in a timely manner during the remainder of this program and under any future LCDBG programs.

PROCUREMENT

The Village's general files on procurement were reviewed in addition to the procurement procedures utilized in hiring consulting and engineering services.

Honorable John Smith
Finding Number 777777-1-1-081
We received documentation which indicated that engineering costs were reviewed for reasonableness but such documentation was not signed until the day of our monitoring visit. The FY 20x0/20x1 Application Package, on page 31, states, “If qualification statements are requested, the cost and price detail form must be used when negotiations on the fees to be charged begin with the firm that was selected based on the evaluation of the selection criteria.” Therefore, the cost and price detail form should have been completed prior to the execution of the contract with the engineering firm.

Corrective Action Required: The Village must provide us a written explanation of the reason(s) why documentation which indicated that engineering costs were reviewed for reasonableness was not prepared and signed at the appropriate time.

PUBLIC FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS

The review of this area encompassed the bid documents, construction contracts, project plans/specifications and contractor certifications.

Finding Number 777777-1-1-111
The Qualification Certification and resume for inspection services performed by Mr. Qual I. Fied was not sent to us before construction began and was not available during our monitoring visit. The Grantee Handbook states on page B-31, “…the engineer shall attest to the RPR’s qualifications….The Qualification Certification…must be submitted to the Office of Community Development along with a copy of the RPR’s current resume…before construction begins….”

Corrective Action Required: The following three things must be prepared and sent to this office: (1) an explanation of the reason why the Qualification Certification was not properly submitted, (2) a Qualification Certification and resume for the project inspector, Mr. Qual I. Fied and (3) written assurance that Qualification Certifications and accompanying resumes will be submitted to this office according to program requirements under any future LCDBG programs.

AREA OF CONCERN

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

A review of the financial management records of the Village's FY 20xx LCDBG Program was conducted. The records were reviewed for compliance with OMB Circulars A-87 and A-102 and with other federal and state laws, regulations, and policies.

LCDBG Revenue for the fiscal year ending December 31, 20xx was not properly included in the Village’s financial report. We note that funds associated with Request for Payment #1 were not

Honorable John Smith
requested until January 9, 20xx; however, revenue should have been accrued at the time of invoice approval for those invoices which were approved prior to December 31, 20xx. Please insure that all LCDBG funds are accounted for, including accrued amounts, in the upcoming financial report for the fiscal year ending December 31, 20xx.

**FINDINGS OF MERIT**

**ACQUISITION**

The Town’s files were reviewed to determine compliance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. Acquisition of property was not necessary to carry out the street project according to a certification from the Village’s Attorney, Surely Smart, Jr., dated June 10, 20xx.

**DISPLACEMENT**

The Village’s Anti-Displacement Plan, certification, and resolution were checked and found to be in accordance with program requirements. Additionally, no displacement occurred as a result of this project.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

No activities or project sites have changed from those cleared in the original Environmental Review Record; therefore, your Environmental Review Record remains relevant and complete.

**FAIR HOUSING/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND SECTION 504 REQUIREMENTS**

Our review of this area encompassed recipient employment, Section 3 requirements, fair housing, Section 504 requirements and program beneficiaries. The Village is in compliance in the areas of fair housing and equal opportunity.

**LABOR STANDARDS**

A review was made of the bid documents, payroll sheets, employee interviews, the applicable federal wage decision and inspection reports for the fire protection project. Based on our review of these records, the Village was found to be in compliance with federal labor standards requirements.

Honorable John Smith
NATIONAL OBJECTIVES

Program benefit was reviewed by our staff. Based on the local survey forms and an inspection of the target area, it appears that approximately seventy-five percent of the persons benefiting from the fire protection project are of low and moderate income. Therefore, the Village was found to be in compliance with the national objective requirements of 24 CFR 570.483 (b) (1).

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

The Village's progress in completing the program activities in accordance with the Time Schedule submitted with your original application for funding under the LCDBG Program was reviewed. The Village’s project has progressed in a timely manner. The fire protection project will be completed prior to the contract termination date of August 24, 2004.

RECORD KEEPING

The Village is maintaining the program records in accordance with the State's program requirements. When the staff requested specific information during the monitoring visit, the supporting documentation was easily retrievable.

Please submit the items required to address the findings of deficiency to us no later than April 30, 20x1. Also, please make a copy of this letter available to your auditor, who will determine which of the above noted deficiencies, if any, are material and should be included in any of the applicable financial reports. Your cooperation in this matter is appreciated. Should you have any questions, please call Fred Jones at (000) 000-0000.

Sincerely,

Susan Elkins
Director
SE/FJ

c: Ms. Debbie Howe, Grants Consultant
   Uptown & Associates, Engineer
   Mr. John Doe, Office of Community Development
   Ms. Jane Public, Office of Community Development
   Mr. Fred Jones, Local Government Representative
File: Public Facilities, FY 20xx, Monitoring
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding Seq #</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application #</td>
<td>PF-2002-058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Avoyelles Parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract #</td>
<td>600813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Finding</td>
<td>On-Site (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness of Finding</td>
<td>Serious (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area</td>
<td>Financial Management (01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Finding Description

RFP #3 which was in excess of $5,000 was not expended within three working days.

### Monitored Date

6/28/2005

### Monitoring Letter Due Date

7/28/2003

### Finding Letter Date

7/29/2005

### Grantor's Response

Due Date: 6/29/2003

Received Date: 12/30/2005

### Re-Target

Due Date: 

Received Date: 

### Finding Cleared

Date: 1/31/2006

By: Dotty Tappcott
EXHIBIT 11

Louisiana Community Development Block Grant (LCDBG) Program
Corrective and Remedial Actions
aka Sanction Policy

Introduction

This policy describes the types of administrative actions that can be taken by the Office of Community Development in cases of improper or inadequate performance by recipients of LCDBG Program grants. In each instance, to the extent possible under the circumstances, the action taken will be intended, first, to prevent a continuation of the deficiency; second, to mitigate any adverse effects or consequences of the deficiency; and, third, to prevent a recurrence of the same or similar deficiencies.

Types of Deficiencies

A deficiency is an instance of non-performance of activities or non-compliance with requirements set forth in the contract between the State of Louisiana and the recipient of LCDBG funds. Examples of deficiencies include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Failure to clear monitoring findings within 120 days of the issuance date by the Office of Community Development. An on-site monitoring visit (for the purpose of assuring the grant recipient’s compliance with the federal and state requirements governing the LCDBG Program) may be conducted as a matter of routine monitoring or whenever problems come to the attention of the Office of Community Development. Following the monitoring visit, a letter is written to the grant recipient which identifies findings of deficiency as well as findings of merit, the corrective action required to clear findings of deficiency, and a target date for the accomplishment of the corrective actions. Upon receipt and review of the grant recipient’s response, the Office of Community Development determines whether or not the response is sufficient to resolve the findings. If any monitoring findings are not properly resolved by the initial target date, the grant recipient is advised of such and is assigned a second target date for the clearance of those findings. All monitoring findings not resolved by the second target date remain open until resolved.

2. Failure to file reports as required or failure to file reports within established timeframes. Such reports include but are not limited to the Minority Business Report, financial reports, and closeout documents.

3. Failure to resolve an audit finding within 120 days of the issuance date by the Office of Community Development.

4. Incurring costs for ineligible activities in accordance with state and federal regulations.

5. Lack of continuing capacity to administer the LCDBG program.
6. Failure to execute approved activities in accordance with the implementation schedule included between the State and the grant recipient.

7. The implementation of a program change without prior written approval from the Office of Community Development.

**Notice of Deficiency**

The first step in the corrective procedure is for the Office of Community Development to send a written Notice of Deficiency to the grant recipient. The notice will describe the deficiency specifically and objectively, describe actions the grant recipient must take in order to remedy the deficiency and a deadline for doing so, and describe the consequences for failure to remedy the deficiency (i.e. administrative sanctions or legal action).

**Sanctions**

If the deficiency remains uncorrected, one or more sanctions will be imposed. The choice of the sanction(s) to be issued is governed by the objectives identified in the Introduction, the type of deficiency, and the seriousness of the deficiency. Possible sanctions include but are not limited to:

1. Required administrative change: For example, if the consultant administering the program is doing a poor job but the grant recipient has the continuing capacity to administer the grant, the grant recipient may be required to discharge the consultant and engage someone else to administer the program.

2. Suspension of grant payments.

3. Reduction of grant amount.

4. Termination of grant.

5. Reimbursement of costs disallowed by the Office of Community Development.

6. Disqualification from consideration for other LCDBG funds. The criteria for disqualification shall be consistent with, but not limited to, the State’s threshold requirements for funding.

7. Legal action pursued by the State.

If the grant recipient does not address the cited problem after having been sanctioned, additional sanctions may be imposed, or the matter may be referred for legal action.

**Appeals**

The grant recipient may appeal any imposed sanctions through the following process. The grant recipient must submit a written request for an appeal within ten working days after the written
notice of sanction has been received. A written decision shall be rendered within ten working days of receipt of the request for appeal unless additional time is agreed to by the recipient.

**Duration of Imposed Sanction**

The Office of Community Development will maintain a sanction list of those sanctions which render the grant recipient ineligible for additional grant awards. The list will identify the grant recipient, a brief description as to why the sanction was imposed, and what steps must be taken to remove the sanction.

The sanction will remain in effect until the deficiency has been corrected or for no more than ten LCDBG program years with the following exception. Sanctions involving LCDBG funds which were expended for ineligible activities as identified in the federal regulations (24CFR 570.207) cannot be excused unless those funds have been repaid to the State or a satisfactory arrangement for the repayment of those funds have been made and payments are current. The grant recipient will be advised in writing when the sanction has been lifted.

**Internal Procedures for Issuing/Clearing Sanctions**

1. If a Local Government Rep (LGR) feels that he/she should issue a sanction, he/she should set up a meeting which includes his/her Program Manager, the Policy and Programs Coordinator, and the Community Development Director. The purpose of this meeting will be to determine if a sanction should be issued. If a determination is made to issue a sanction, the penalty/time frame attached to that sanction will also be determined. Every effort will be made to insure consistency among the sanctions imposed.

2. The LGR will advise the grant recipient in writing of the sanction. That letter will identify the deficiency which has resulted in the sanction, the steps that can be taken to correct the deficiency, the penalty which will be imposed, and any timeframe associated with the sanction. If the grant recipient will be prohibited from receiving LCDBG funds for a specified time period, the timeframe must be clearly and specifically identified. A copy of this letter will be given to the Policy and Programs Coordinator.

3. The Policy and Programs Coordinator will be responsible for maintaining the Sanction List which tracks those sanctions having an effect on a potential applicant’s eligibility for future funding. The information contained in the letter issuing the sanction will be summarized on this list.

4. When the grant recipient corrects the deficiency or the timeframe associated with the sanction period ends, the LGR will advise the grant recipient of such in writing. A copy of that letter will be given to the Policy and Programs Coordinator who will remove the grant recipient from the Sanction List, if applicable.

5. The permanent working files for the grant associated with the sanction must remain in the Office of Community Development as long as the sanction is in effect; these files cannot be archived until the sanction has been lifted.
6. The final determination of the issuance and clearance of each sanction rests with the Director of the Office of Community Development.

Original Effective Date: August 20, 1987
Revised Date: March 11, 2004
EXHIBIT 12

Application #: PF-2002-014  Church Point  Contract #: 599849

Local Govt Representative: Donna Ramirez

Program Completion Report
- Requested: 9/8/2004
- Received: 10/18/2004
- Accepted: 11/19/2004

- Cover Sheet
- Grant Progress
- Program Beneficiary
- Applicant Data
- Housing Opportunities
- Miscellaneous Information
- Section 3 Report

Monitoring Findings Cleared: 9/17/2004
Audit Findings Cleared:

- Clear Lien Received
- Final Financial Report Accepted
- Final Wage Compliance Report Accepted

Certificate of Completion
- Received Date: 10/18/2004
- Accepted Date: 10/19/2004

Closeout
- Conditional Date: 10/22/2004
- Final Date: 1/19/2003

Closeout Comments:
10/10: FWCR to WD; Section3 to KG; C/C to PC. [Construction contract amount agrees, 10/19/04, WF]
EXHIBIT 13

Date

Honorable John Smith  
Mayor, Village of Someplace  
Post Office Box 123456  
Someplace, Louisiana 99999

RE:  Request for Closeout Documents  
FY 20xx LCDBG Public Facilities Program  
Contract Number 777777

Dear Mayor Smith:

According to our records, eighty-four percent of your FY 20xx Community Development Block Grant (LCDBG) funds have been requested and received. The Village should begin to undertake the procedures necessary to closeout this program.

The closeout requirements are fully described in the last section of your FY 20xx LCDBG Handbook and are summarized below:

1. Two copies of the Program Completion Report must be submitted to our office; a copy of this report is enclosed for your use. Specific items which must be submitted as a part of this report include, but are not limited to:

   a. Any change orders, including a final reconciliation, that have not yet been submitted to the LCDBG engineer.

   b. A recorded clear lien certificate(s) for any projects involving infrastructure improvements or housing construction.

   c. A Final Wage Compliance Report for any projects involving infrastructure construction which was subject to Davis Bacon and Related Acts; this item is not required for housing projects or projects involving the purchase of fire trucks or firefighting equipment only.

   d. Three copies of the Certificate of Completion, all of which have original signatures, must also be submitted.

2. All program findings (monitoring/audit) must be cleared.
3. In order to receive a final closeout, all LCDBG funds received and expended must be covered in financial reports and/or other acceptable documentation.

We look forward to a prompt closeout of your program. If you have any questions regarding closeout, please do not hesitate to contact Fred Jones at (000) 000-0000.

Sincerely,

Susan Elkins
Director

SE/FJ

Enclosure: 1
c: Ms. Debbie Howe, Administrative Consultant
Mr. Fred Jones, Local Government Representative
File: Public Facilities, FY 20xx, Closeout
Honorable John Smith
Mayor, Village of Someplace
Post Office Box 123456
Someplace, Louisiana 777777

RE: LCDBG Financial Report Requirements
FY 20xx Public Facilities Program—Contract Number 777777

Dear Mayor Smith:

Federal law OMB Circular A-133 requires a single audit from local governments having $500,000 or more in total federal funds expended in a fiscal year. Our records show your fiscal year end December 31, 20x0. If $500,000 or more in total federal funds was expended, a single audit is required. The single audit, which will have a full set of financial statements, will meet Federal and State requirements. If less than $500,000 in total federal funds (LCDBG and other sources) was expended in the fiscal year, a single audit will not be required.

If you determine that a single audit is not required, State law and your LCDBG contract require you to submit one of the following types of financial reports based on revenues received from all sources, federal, state and local, during a fiscal year: 1) sworn financial statements if revenue received was $50,000 or less; 2) an annual compilation if revenue received was between $50,000 and $350,000; 3) a biennial audit if revenue received was between $350,000 and $3,500,000; or, 4) an annual audit if revenue received was over $3,500,000.

Financial reports are due within six months of the fiscal year end date. If you determine that a single audit is required, please send us a copy of the single audit. If you determine that a single audit is not required, please send us the appropriate type of report required by State law and your LCDBG contract as described in the preceding paragraph.

You are advised to provide your auditor with a copy of this letter. If you have questions concerning State or Federal audit requirements, call Ms. Karen Money at (000) 000-0000.

Sincerely,

Susan Elkins
Director

SE/FJ

c: Ms. Debbie Howe, Grant Administrator
Mr. Fred Jones, Local Government Representative
Public Facilities, FY 20xx, Financial Management
December 20, 20x1

Honorable John Smith
Mayor, Village of Someplace
Post Office Box 123456
Someplace, Louisiana 77777

RE: Request for Past-Due Financial Report
FY 20xx Public Facilities Program
Contract Number 777777

Dear Mayor Smith:

In our letter of May 30, 20x1 we requested a copy of the Village’s financial report for the year ending December 31, 20x0. The letter indicated that the financial report was due no later than June 30, 20x1 which was six months after the end of the Village’s fiscal year. To date, we have not received that financial report.

Please forward us a copy of the financial report if it is available. If you are unable to provide this office with a copy of the requested financial report, please provide a written explanation of any problems causing the delay.

If you have questions concerning State or Federal audit requirements, call Ms. OCD Chief Financial Officer at (000) 000-0000.

Sincerely,

Susan Elkins
Director

SE/FJ

c: Ms. Debbie Howe, Grant Administrator
Ms. OCD Chief Financial Officer, Office of Community Development
Mr. Fred Jones, Local Government Representative
Public Facilities, FY 20xx, Financial Management
Honorable John Smith  
Mayor, Village of Someplace  
Post Office Box 123456  
Someplace, Louisiana 999999  

FY 20xx LCDBG Public Facilities Program  
Contract Number 777777  

Dear Mayor Smith:  

On June 25, 20x2, we received a copy of the Village’s financial report for the fiscal year ending December 31, 20x1. Our in-house review noted that the financial report covered $123,456 in FY 20xx Louisiana Community Development Block Grant (LCDBG) funds. The financial report did not question any costs and was in compliance with our financial records. Accordingly, we accept this financial report, which is considered as the second interim financial report for this program.  

Please forward us copies of all future financial reports that include funds received under this FY 20x0 LCDBG Program. Your assistance in this matter is appreciated.  

Sincerely,  

Susan Elkins  
Director  

SE/FJ  

c: Ms. Debbie Howe, Grant Consultant  
Mr. Fred Jones, Office of Community Development  
File: Public Facilities, FY 20xx, Financial Management
EXHIBIT 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Report: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application #:</strong> PF-2002-162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Report Seq #:</strong> 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Report Type:</strong> Single Audit (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auditor:</strong> Lee Gray, CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period Covered</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Date: 1/1/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Date: 12/31/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Date: 6/30/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Date: 7/1/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewed By</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If Applicable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector General's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reported Amount:</strong> $56,409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unreported Amount:</strong> $571,906.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questioned/Disallowed Cost:</strong> $0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revision Requested Date:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptance Letter Date:</strong> 8/3/2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Financial Report Comments:** 7/21: emailed Margie Allen asking that she send the FY'03 audit to DSS, per WH.
EXHIBIT 18

Date

Honorable John Smith
Mayor, Village of Someplace
Post Office Box 123456
Someplace, Louisiana 999999

RE: Conditional Closeout
FY 20xx LCDBG Public Facilities Program
Contract Number 777777

Dear Mayor Smith:

We have received the closeout documents submitted for the FY 20xx Louisiana Community Development Block Grant (LCDBG) Program. We have reviewed all of the documents required for a conditional closeout and have found them acceptable. Our office has previously cleared all findings, if any, relative to this LCDBG Program. Therefore, a Certificate of Completion for contract number 777777 is enclosed. The Village is to be commended for conditionally closing out this LCDBG Program.

This program is closed out contingent upon our approval of an acceptable financial report(s) covering the unreported expenditures of $123,123. Any questioned costs arising from the financial report(s) will have to be resolved. The Village will be responsible for disallowed costs, if any. Until the financial documentation is received and accepted, we cannot issue a final closeout on this program.

Please note that all records and correspondence relating to this LCDBG Program must be retained for at least four years beginning with the date of FINAL closeout. If you have any questions, please call Fred Jones at (000) 000-0000.

Sincerely,

Susan Elkins
Director

SE/FJ

Enclosure

c with enc: Ms. Debbie Howe, Administrative Consultant
Ms. Pat Robertson, Office of Finance and Support Services
Ms. Donna Lynn, Office of Community Development
Mr. Fred Jones, Local Government Representative
File: Public Facilities, FY 20xx, Closeout
EXHIBIT 19

Date

Honorable John Smith
Mayor, Village of Someplace
Post Office Box 123456
Someplace, Louisiana 999999

RE: Final Closeout
FY 20xx LCDBG-Public Facilities Program
Contract Number 777777

Dear Mayor Smith:

We have received the closeout documents submitted for the FY 20xx LCDBG PF Program. We have reviewed all of the documents required for a closeout and have found them to be acceptable. Our office has previously cleared all findings relative to this program. Also, all LCDBG funds received have been included in acceptable financial reports. Therefore, a Certificate of Completion for contract number 777777 is enclosed. Both you and the Village are to be congratulated for closing out this grant.

We are issuing a final closeout on this Public Facilities program.

Please be reminded that all records and correspondence relating to the FY 20xx LCDBG PF Program must be retained for at least four years from the date of this letter.

Sincerely,

Susan Elkins
Director

SE/FJ

Enclosure

c: Ms. Debbie Howe
Ms. Pat Anderson, Office of Finance and Support Services
Ms. Donna Lynn, Office of Community Development
Mr. Fred Jones, Local Government Representative
File: Public Facilities, FY 20xx, Closeout
Honorable John Smith
Mayor, Village of Someplace
Post Office Box 123456
Someplace, Louisiana 999999

RE: Final Closeout
FY 20xx LCDBG Public Facilities Program
Contract Number 777777

Dear Mayor Smith:

On February 31, 20x2, a letter and Certificate of Completion were sent to you conditionally closing out the FY 20xx Louisiana Community Development Block Grant (LCDBG) Program. In that letter it was stated that a final closeout would be issued upon our receipt and approval of an acceptable financial report covering the unaudited expenditures of $123,123. We have since received a financial report which was accepted in our letter of June 31, 20x2. All funds received and expended under this LCDBG Program have now been audited.

We are officially closing out this LCDBG Program.

Please be reminded that all records and correspondence relating to the FY 20xx LCDBG Program must be retained for at least four years from the date of this letter.

Sincerely,

Susan Elkins
Director

SE/WD

c: Ms. Debbie Howe, Administrative Consultant
Ms. Pat Anderson, Office of Finance and Support Services
Ms. Donna Lynn, Office of Community Development
Mr. Fred Jones, Local Government Representative
File: Public Facilities, FY 20xx, Closeout
Appendix 7

Prioritization Criteria
January 19, 2006

State of Louisiana
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION
FACILITY PLANNING AND CONTROL
P.O. BOX 94095, BATON ROUGE, LA 70804-9095
(504) 342-0620 FAX (504) 342-7924
## Appendix 8 - Katrina

**NOTES:**
Information is still being received particularly from DOD and the Military.

The costs shown are the base numbers for damage. Estimates are preliminary and based on apparent damage. Some facilities may have damage and even extensive damage that is not apparent at this time.

The effect of salt water on metal building components is still being evaluated. Undisclosed damage is still being reported as user agencies discover problems. For example, rain is revealing previously unidentified roof leaks.

Estimates are based on current dollars. Substantial inflation may be expected as construction activity increases.

Estimates are for construction costs only and do not include designer fees, contingency or administration costs.

Estimates are for damage only and do not include costs for mitigation and COTS/ADA upgrades.

Estimates do NOT include replacement of Charity Hospital or University Hospital.

### Table: Hurricane Impacted Facilities

| PARISH | STATE ID | SITE CODE | LOCATION IDENTIFICATION | FACILITY NAME | BUILDING NAME | ADDRESS | CITY | USE | TILES | FLOOR AREA | MOTHERs | MOTHERs/RENEWAL COST | CONTRACTOR | PROJECT MANAGER | MONETARY IMPACT | COST IMPACT | COST IMPACT | COST IMPACT | COST IMPACT |
|--------|----------|-----------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------|------|-----|-------|------------|---------|----------------------|------------|---------------|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| ORLEANS | 302 | 1-08-501 | 205 | CABACO PRESBYTERIAN-HUGHES-BRIDE SOUTH MORE | CABACO | 1130 CHARLES STREET | NEW ORLEANS | MUSEUM | 26,305 | $4,992,580 | N ORLEANS | K | N | K | $4,992,580 | 4 |
| ORLEANS | 302 | 1-08-501 | 205 | CABACO-PRESBYTERIAN-HUGHES-BRIDE SOUTH MORE | PRESBYTERIAN | 574 CHARLES STREET | NEW ORLEANS | MUSEUM | 28,500 | $7,449,243 | N ORLEANS | K | N | K | $7,449,243 | 20 |
| ORLEANS | 518 | 1-10-312 | 124 | THE LOUISIANA SUPREME | LOUISIANA SUPREME | 1650 POYATAS ST | NEW ORLEANS | STADIUM/MEETING | 1,000,000 | $877,416,000 | N ORLEANS | L | S | K | $877,416,000 | 3 |
| ORLEANS | 302 | 1-08-501 | 205 | LOWER ST. PONTIACA BUILDING | LOWER PONTIACA | 800-10 QUARTERS+41-47 ST. | NEW ORLEANS | SHOP/DWELLINGS | 9,725 | $1,12,326 | N ORLEANS | K | N | K | $1,12,326 | 4 |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

### FEMA - Floodplain Inundation

| PARISH | STATE ID | SITE CODE | LOCATION IDENTIFICATION | FACILITY NAME | BUILDING NAME | ADDRESS | CITY | USE | TILES | FLOOR AREA | MOTHERs | MOTHERs/RENEWAL COST | CONTRACTOR | PROJECT MANAGER | MONETARY IMPACT | COST IMPACT | COST IMPACT | COST IMPACT | COST IMPACT |
|--------|----------|-----------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------|------|-----|-------|------------|---------|----------------------|------------|---------------|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| JEFFERSON | 121 | 1-08-003 | 416 | NEW STATE POLICE TROOP B HEADQUARTERS | TROOP B HEADQUARTERS | 2911 L 1ST SERVICE ROAD | NEW ORLEANS | K | 15,000 | $1,176,800 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $1,176,800 | 5 |
| ST TAMMANY | 811 | 1-08-004 | 416 | TROOP H HEADQUARTERS | TROOP H HEADQUARTERS | 8000 NORTH CAUSEWAY BLVD | HAMMERS COMMUNITY | K | 25,000 | $495,750 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $495,750 | 5 |
| ST TAMMANY | 811 | 1-08-005 | 416 | TROOP E HEADQUARTERS | TROOP E HEADQUARTERS | 2900 L 1ST SERVICE ROAD | NEW ORLEANS | K | 15,000 | $1,176,800 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $1,176,800 | 5 |
| TERRASSE | 4445 | 3-42-001 | 416 | STATE POLICE TROOP C HEADQUARTERS | TROOP C HEADQUARTERS | 8800 NORTH CAUSEWAY BLVD | TERRASSE | K | 15,000 | $1,176,800 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $1,176,800 | 5 |
| ST TAMMANY | 811 | 1-08-005 | 416 | TROOP L HEADQUARTERS | TROOP L HEADQUARTERS | 5900 NORTH CAUSEWAY BLVD | TERRASSE | K | 15,000 | $1,176,800 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $1,176,800 | 5 |
| ST TAMMANY | 811 | 1-08-006 | 416 | TROOP K HEADQUARTERS | TROOP K HEADQUARTERS | 2800 NORTH CAUSEWAY BLVD | TERRASSE | K | 15,000 | $1,176,800 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $1,176,800 | 5 |
| EAST BATON ROUGE | 1348 | 3-17-017 | 416 | LA-600 DOAPv | DOAPv | 1400 W RIVER ROAD | BATON ROUGE | K | 25,000 | $1,176,800 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $1,176,800 | 5 |
| BATON ROUGE | 1348 | 3-17-090 | 416 | STATE POLICE RADIO TOWER | RADIO TOWER | 2210 PARISH WAY | BATON ROUGE | COMMUNICATIONS | 25,000 | $1,176,800 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $1,176,800 | 5 |
| LAPORTE | 4445 | 3-42-001 | 416 | STATE POLICE RADIO TOWER | RADIO TOWER | 3200 L 1ST SERVICE ROAD | LA PORTE | K | 25,000 | $1,176,800 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $1,176,800 | 5 |
| EAST BATON ROUGE | 1348 | 3-17-017 | 416 | LA-600 DOAPv | DOAPv | 1400 W RIVER ROAD | BATON ROUGE | K | 25,000 | $1,176,800 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $1,176,800 | 5 |
| JEFFERSON | 121 | 1-08-004 | 409 | NEW STATE POLICE TRAINING ACADEMY | NEW STATE POLICE TRAINING ACADEMY | 2000 INDEPENDENCE BLVD | BRIDGETOWN | K | 25,000 | $2,520,000 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $2,520,000 | 10 |
| JEFFERSON | 121 | 1-08-004 | 409 | NEW STATE POLICE HEADQUARTERS | NEW STATE POLICE HEADQUARTERS | 2000 INDEPENDENCE BLVD | BRIDGETOWN | K | 25,000 | $2,520,000 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $2,520,000 | 10 |
| JEFFERSON | 121 | 1-08-004 | 409 | NEW STATE POLICE TRAINING ACADEMY | NEW STATE POLICE TRAINING ACADEMY | 2000 INDEPENDENCE BLVD | BRIDGETOWN | K | 25,000 | $2,520,000 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $2,520,000 | 10 |
| JEFFERSON | 121 | 1-08-004 | 409 | NEW STATE POLICE TRAINING ACADEMY | NEW STATE POLICE TRAINING ACADEMY | 2000 INDEPENDENCE BLVD | BRIDGETOWN | K | 25,000 | $2,520,000 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $2,520,000 | 10 |
| JEFFERSON | 121 | 1-08-004 | 409 | NEW STATE POLICE TRAINING ACADEMY | NEW STATE POLICE TRAINING ACADEMY | 2000 INDEPENDENCE BLVD | BRIDGETOWN | K | 25,000 | $2,520,000 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $2,520,000 | 10 |
| JEFFERSON | 121 | 1-08-004 | 409 | NEW STATE POLICE TRAINING ACADEMY | NEW STATE POLICE TRAINING ACADEMY | 2000 INDEPENDENCE BLVD | BRIDGETOWN | K | 25,000 | $2,520,000 | N ORLEANS | K | K | K | $2,520,000 | 10 |

### FEMA - Floodplain Inundation

| PARISH | STATE ID | SITE CODE | LOCATION IDENTIFICATION | FACILITY NAME | BUILDING NAME | ADDRESS | CITY | USE | TILES | FLOOR AREA | MOTHERs | MOTHERs/RENEWAL COST | CONTRACTOR | PROJECT MANAGER | MONETARY IMPACT | COST IMPACT | COST IMPACT | COST IMPACT | COST IMPACT |
|--------|----------|-----------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------|------|-----|-------|------------|---------|----------------------|------------|---------------|----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| ORLEANS | 1-35-065 | 7395 | L | NEW ORLEANS CITY PARK | SOUTH SHELTER F/W-SOCCER 2 | DRETVOY AVENUE | NEW ORLEANS | |
| ORLEANS | 1355 | 1-35-066 | 7395 | L | NEW ORLEANS CITY PARK | SOUTH HOUSE FOR N-GOLF | DRETVOY AVENUE | NEW ORLEANS | |
| ORLEANS | 1355 | 1-35-066 | 7395 | L | NEW ORLEANS CITY PARK | NORTH HOUSE FOR N-GOLF | DRETVOY AVENUE | NEW ORLEANS | |
| ORLEANS | 1355 | 1-35-066 | 7395 | L | NEW ORLEANS CITY PARK | NORTH HOUSE FOR N-GOLF | DRETVOY AVENUE | NEW ORLEANS | |
| ORLEANS | 1355 | 1-35-066 | 7395 | L | NEW ORLEANS CITY PARK | CONCESSION STAND-E CASE | DRETVOY AVENUE | NEW ORLEANS | |
| ORLEANS | 1355 | 1-35-066 | 7395 | L | NEW ORLEANS CITY PARK | CONCESSION STAND-W TEE | DRETVOY AVENUE | NEW ORLEANS | |
| ORLEANS | 1355 | 1-35-066 | 7395 | L | NEW ORLEANS CITY PARK | GOLF SHELTER HOUSE | DRETVOY AVENUE | NEW ORLEANS | |
| ORLEANS | 2665 | 1-35-066 | 7395 | L | NEW ORLEANS CITY PARK | GOLF PAVILION | DRETVOY AVENUE | NEW ORLEANS | |

| TOTAL | 848,478.00 |

| ORLEANS | 1-35-066 | 112 | S | JACKSON BARACKS IN ORLEANS PARISH | MULTIPLE BUILDINGS | JACKSON BARACKS | NEW ORLEANS | Varies | Varies | $42,091,290.00 |
| ORLEANS | 1-35-066 | 112 | S | WOOD TRADING PASS/N-TREE NEW ORLEANS | MULTIPLE BUILDINGS | NW CREASY STREET JACKSON-BB | NEW ORLEANS | Varies | Varies | $9,454,569.00 |

<p>| TOTAL | $41,645,859.00 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE CODE</th>
<th>FACILITY NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Appendix 8 - Rita**

* R = Damage by Hurricane Rita

NOTES:

Information is still being received particularly from DOTD and the Military.

The costs shown are the base numbers for damage.

Estimates are preliminary and based on apparent damage. Some facilities may have damage and even extensive damage that is not apparent at this time.

The effect of salt water on metal building components is still being evaluated.

Undisclosed damage is still being reported by user agencies discovering problems. For example, rain is revealing previously unidentified roof leaks.

Estimates are based on current dollars. Substantial inflation may be expected as construction activity increases.

Estimates are for construction costs only and do not include designer fees, contingency or administration costs.

Estimates are for damage only and do not include costs for mitigation and Code/ADA upgrades.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY GROUP 5 - Projects Economic Development with Special Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRIPPE/SHORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIPPE/SHORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIPPE/SHORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMELIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERNON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERNON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERNON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERNON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIPPE/SHORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIPPE/SHORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERNON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERNON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIPPE/SHORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERNON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN THE
LOUISIANA RECOVERY AUTHORITY
AND THE
LOUISIANA DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION

WHEREAS the Governor created the Louisiana Recovery Authority (LRA) and appointed its 26 member board to provide broad oversight and guidance to the state’s rebuilding effort after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita;

WHEREAS the Congress has appropriated to Louisiana up to $6.2 billion in Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) for recovery and rebuilding the state;

WHEREAS Governor Blanco desires that the LRA develop and implement broad policy and program decisions for the CDBG program consistent with its oversight and guidance of the state’s rebuilding effort;

WHEREAS the Governor instructs that, as it develops the state’s CDBG program in response to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the LRA must take advantage of the capabilities and assets of the Division of Administration (DOA), which has operated the state’s CDBG program with great success and with recognition from state and federal auditors for operating a high quality and accountable program; and

WHEREAS the Governor directs that the LRA and the Division of Administration establish a clear and effective relationship for implementation of the Governor’s plan for the CDBG program.

The undersigned agree to the following:

- The LRA is designated by the Governor to be responsible for establishing the priorities to be incorporated into the Action Plan, Partial Action Plans, or Plan Amendments for use of CDBG funds appropriated to Louisiana in response to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

- The Office of Community Development (OCD) within the DOA is designated by the Governor to be the fiscal agent responsible to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the CDBG funds with responsibility for audit, monitoring, internal controls, cash management, contract management, reporting, and other fiscal services.

- The OCD will submit quarterly reports to the LRA detailing the status of CDBG funds appropriated in response to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, including the status of contracts issued pursuant to grant awards.

- The OCD will assist the LRA by reviewing draft plans submitted to the LRA from entities wishing to utilize CDBG funds. The OCD will review proposed activities for eligibility and for compliance with national objectives and other federal requirements and will provide technical assistance to the LRA regarding such requirements.
• The OCD, under the guidance of the LRA, will prepare the Action Plan, Partial Action Plans, or Plan Amendments consistent with the priorities established by the LRA. Such plans, once approved by the LRA, shall be submitted by the LRA to the Governor. Any Action Plan, Partial Action Plan or Plan Amendment shall be subject to legislative review and approval prior to submission by the Governor to HUD.

• The LRA is eligible to receive CDBG funding through OCD for eligible planning and operational costs and to support staff necessary to implement Louisiana’s recovery goals in accordance with the approved Action Plan or Partial Action Plans.

• The OCD and LRA will coordinate all policy meetings, policy calls, reports, and correspondence, including electronic correspondence, with HUD officials regarding the CDBG program, as related to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita recovery.

• The OCD will host grantee workshops and provide technical advice to assist grantees in complying with applicable federal regulations.

• Prior to grant award, the LRA may review any application for a project to determine that the project is consistent with LRA adopted recovery and mitigation policies. The OCD will provide to the LRA the results of the OCD review and analysis of the application to assist in such review.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this MOU has been signed by the undersigned duly authorized representatives, at Baton Rouge, Louisiana, this day of February, 2006.

WITNESSES:

STATE OF LOUISIANA
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION
Jerry Luke LeBlanc
Commissioner of Administration

LOUISIANA RECOVERY AUTHORITY
Dr. Norman C. Francis
Chairman
Appendix 10

DISASTER RECOVERY CDBG CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PLAN

States were given several waivers relative to the Citizen Participation regulations such as the requirement for public hearings at the state and local level, consulting with all units of local governments, etc. The State will employ innovative methods to communicate with our citizens and to solicit their views on the proposed uses of disaster recovery funds. These comments and the states response to the comments will be made a part of the Action Plan and amendments to the plan. A summary of the Disaster Recovery Action Plan and amendments will be published in a minimum of five MSA newspapers as well as placed on the Office of Community Development’s website for review and comments.

The Citizen Participation Plan will be distributed at public hearing(s) and will be posted on the Office of Community Development’s website. Citizens and units of local government may make comments on the Citizen Participation Plan and on any substantial amendments to the Citizen Participation Plan at any Disaster Recovery public hearing. The State will consider any comments or views received in writing or expressed orally at any public hearing held on the original Citizen Participation Plan or amended Citizen Participation Plan. For those unable to attend the public hearing(s), views and comments may be submitted to the address shown below.

The Citizen Participation Plan will be made accessible to persons with disabilities upon request by telephone or written request to the:

Office of Community Development
Post Office Box 94095
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9095
Telephone (voice) - 225/342-7412
LA Relay Service - 711

In order to facilitate citizen participation requirements and to maximize citizen interaction, the State will take whatever actions are necessary to encourage participation by all citizens, especially those of low- and moderate-income, those living in slum and blighted areas and in areas where CDBG funds are proposed to be used, non-English speaking persons, minorities, and those with disabilities.

Public Hearings

To maximize citizen participation, public hearings may be held prior to the development of the Disaster Recovery Action Plan and prior to the implementation of substantial amendments to the Disaster Recovery Plan. As is allowed by the federal regulations, the State may hold a public hearing for one or more purposes.
For example, the State may combine a hearing on a substantial amendment with a hearing on the previous year’s performance.

At a minimum, when a public hearing is held, the State will publish a notice of the public hearing in *The Advocate* which is the State's legal journal; such notice will appear a minimum of 7 calendar days prior to the public hearing. All public hearings will be held at a time and location convenient to potential and actual beneficiaries in a building that is accessible to persons with physical disabilities. Accommodations for non-English speaking persons and persons with other disabilities will be provided as necessary with a minimum notification of five working days to ensure a proper response to those needs. When the State is notified that a significant number of non-English speaking persons plan to attend a public hearing, the State will make every effort to have an interpreter available at the hearing.

**Development of the Proposed Disaster Recovery Plan**

Prior to the submittal of the initial Disaster Recovery Action Plan, to the Legislature and the United State Department of Housing and Urban Development, public notices including a summary of the proposed plan will be published in a minimum of five MSA newspapers providing an opportunity for citizens to comment. A limited number of proposed plans will be made available at no charge to persons requesting copies. Copies of the proposed plan will also be available for review in the Office of Community Development. The State will identify a deadline for the submittal of written comments on the proposed plan in the public notice. The period for submittal of comments will be no less than ten calendar days and a maximum of thirty calendar days. In addition, the summary as well as the entire plan will be posted on the Office of Community Development’s website for citizen’s review and comments. The plan will be posted in English, Vietnamese and Spanish.

**Amendments to the Disaster Recovery Plan**

The State will amend the Disaster Recovery Plan periodically whenever it makes one of the following decisions: to make a change in its allocation priorities or a change in the method of distribution of funds; to carry out an activity using disaster recovery CDBG funds (including program income) not previously described in the Plan, or to change the purpose, scope, location, or beneficiaries of an activity.

Only those amendments which meet the definition of a substantial amendment are subject citizen participation process previously identified herein. Substantial amendments are defined as those which eliminate or add a program category or activity, exclude a previously defined geographical area, or involve a change of more than fifteen percent of the allocation of funds in any one program category or activity. Citizens and units of general local government will be provided with reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment on proposed substantial amendments to the
Action Plan by way of a public hearing or public broadcast. Such hearing or broadcast will be held prior to the implementation of the amendment.

A summary of the proposed substantial amendment will be published in a public notice announcing the public hearing or public broadcast and will be included in the written notification of the public hearing. Copies of the proposed substantial amendment will be distributed at a public hearing or if a public broadcast is utilized instead of a public hearing, citizens will be informed where copies of the proposed substantial amendment may obtained. A copy of the proposed substantial amendment may also be reviewed in the Office of Community Development. The State will identify a deadline for the submittal of written comments on the proposed substantial amendment; that timeframe will allow no less than ten calendar days and a maximum of thirty calendar days depending on the urgency of the substantial amendment proposed. Written comments may be submitted to the Office of Community Development, Post Office Box 94095, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9095. A summary of all comments received and the State’s response to the comments will be attached to the substantial amendment to the Disaster Recovery Plan and submitted to HUD.

In addition, public notices summarizing the amendment and providing an opportunity for citizen’s comments will be published in six out-of-state newspapers. The out-of-state newspapers will be selected in areas where there are large numbers of Louisiana evacuees living. Copies of the summary and the amendment will also be sent to libraries in these cities so that citizens can review these documents. The State will identify a deadline for the submittal of written comments on the proposed substantial amendment.

**Performance Reports**

The State must prepare and submit to HUD quarterly reports on the various aspects of the uses of Disaster Recovery funds and of the activities funded with these monies. Once HUD accepts the State’s quarterly report, the report will be posted on the Office of Community Development’s website for citizens to review and comment. Written comments may be submitted to the Office of Community Development, Post Office Box 94095, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9095.

**Access to Records**

The State will provide citizens, public agencies, and other interested parties with reasonable and timely access to information and records relating to the State's consolidated plan and the State's use of assistance under the programs covered by the Consolidated Plan during the preceding five years. All requests for such information should be directed to the appropriate agency administering each program.
Complaints

The State shall respond to complaints from citizens related to the Disaster Recovery Plan or amendments, and quarterly reports. Written complaints must be directed to the Office of Community Development who will further direct the complaint to the appropriate agency as necessary. The State will provide a timely, substantive written response to the complainant within fifteen working days, where practicable.
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE LCDBG PROGRAM

To ensure applicant and subrecipient compliance with Section 508 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, the citizen participation requirements for units of general local governments applying for or receiving Disaster Recovery funds from the State are as follows:

Each applicant shall provide citizens with adequate opportunity to participate in the planning, implementation, and assessment of the CDBG program. The applicant shall provide adequate information to citizens, hold a minimum of one public hearing at the initial stage of the planning process to obtain views and proposals of citizens, and provide opportunity to comment on the applicant's previous community development performance.

All units of local government which receive CDBG funds must have a written and adopted Citizen Participation Plan which:

1. Provides for and encourages citizen participation, with particular emphasis on participation by persons of low and moderate income who are residents of slum and blighted areas and of areas in which funds are proposed to be used;

2. provides citizens with reasonable and timely access to local meetings, information, and records relating to the State's proposed method of distribution, as required by regulations of the Secretary, and relating to the actual use of funds under Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, and the unit of local government's proposed and actual use of CDBG funds;

3. provides for technical assistance to groups representative of persons of low and moderate income that request such assistance in developing proposals with the level and type of assistance to be determined by the grantee;

4. provides for public hearings to obtain citizen views and to respond to proposals and questions at all stages of the community development program, including at least the development of needs, the review of proposed activities, and review of program performance, which hearings shall be held after adequate notice, at times and locations convenient to potential or actual beneficiaries, and with accommodations for the disabled;

5. provides for a timely written answer to written complaints and grievances, within fifteen working days where practicable;

6. identifies how the needs of non-English speaking residents will be met in the case of public hearings where a significant number of non-English speaking residents can be reasonably expected to participate;
7. Establishes procedures and policies to ensure non-discrimination, based on disabilities, in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance as required by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended.

The plan must be made available to the public at the beginning of the planning stage, i.e., the first public hearing. The plan must include procedures that meet the following requirements:

**Scheduling and Providing Notices of Public Hearings**

In order to provide adequate notice of all public hearings, a minimum of five calendar days notice shall be given. The hearing may be convened on the fifth day excluding the date the notice was published. The applicant must provide citizens with reasonable and timely access to all hearings. The location and time of these hearings must be scheduled in such a manner as to be convenient to potential or actual beneficiaries. Citizens must be made aware of where they may submit their views and proposals should they be unable to attend any public hearing. Where a significant number of non-English speaking residents can be reasonably expected to participate in a public hearing, an interpreter must be present to accommodate the needs of the non-English speaking citizen and this must be so stated in the public notice. Additionally, all notices for public hearings shall state that accommodations for persons with disabilities will be provided.

A public hearing must be scheduled early in the planning process to ensure adequate public participation and still have time to develop an application. Citizens, with particular emphasis on persons of low and moderate income, and those who are residents of slum and blighted areas, must be encouraged to submit their views and proposals regarding community development and housing needs.

Citizens must be provided with the following information at the public hearing prior to application submittal to the state, and these items must be included in the first public notice as items to be discussed at the hearing:

1. The amount of funds available for proposed community development and housing needs;
2. The range of activities that may be undertaken, including the estimated amount proposed to be used for activities that will benefit persons of low and moderate income;
3. The plans of the applicant for minimizing displacement of persons as a result of activities assisted with such funds and the benefits to be provided to persons actually displaced as a result of such activities;
4. If applicable, the applicant must provide citizens with information regarding the applicant's performance in prior LCDBG programs funded by the State.

Written minutes of the hearing and an attendance roster must be kept for review by State officials.
Nothing in these requirements shall be construed to restrict the responsibility and authority of the applicant for the development of the application.

A **second** notice regarding the content of the application must be published after the first public hearing has been held but **before** the application is submitted. This notice must be published a minimum of seven calendar days prior to application submittal, and must inform citizens of the proposed objectives, proposed activities, the location of the proposed activities, and the amount of funds to be used for each activity. Citizens must be given the opportunity to submit comments on the proposed application. The notice must state the proposed submittal date of the application, and provide the location at which, and hours when, the application is available for review.

Applicants must submit a notarized proof of publication of each public notice with the application.

**Technical Assistance**

The applicant must provide technical assistance to facilitate citizen participation where requested, particularly to groups representative of persons of low to moderate income. The level and type of technical assistance shall be determined by the applicant/recipient based upon the specific need of the community’s citizens.

**Amendments**

The recipient must involve citizens in amendments to the Disaster Recovery program. This may be done by means of a public hearing or a public notice prior to the submittal of the request for a program amendment to the State.

**Complaint Procedures**

Each applicant/recipient must have written citizen and administrative complaint procedures. The written Citizen Participation Plan must provide citizens with information relative to these procedures or, at a minimum, provide citizens with the information relative to the location and hours at which they may obtain a copy of these written procedures.

All written citizen complaints which identify deficiencies relative to the applicant/recipient's community development program will merit careful and prompt consideration by the applicant/recipient. All good faith attempts will be made to satisfactorily resolve the complaints at the local level. Complaints must be filed with the Chief Elected Official who will investigate and review the complaint. A written response from the Chief Elected Official to the complainant will be made within fifteen working days, where practicable.
A copy will be forwarded to the Office of Community Development, Division of Administration. The complainant must be made aware that if she or he is not satisfied with the response, a written complaint may be filed with the Office of Community Development, Division of Administration.

All citizen complaints relative to Fair Housing/Equal Opportunity violations involving discrimination will be forwarded to the following address for disposition: Louisiana Department of Justice, Public Protection Division, Post Office Box 94095, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9095. The telephone numbers for that office are 1-800-273-5718 (voice) or 1-225-342-7412.

The Plan must also state that persons wishing to object to approval of a Disaster Recovery application by the State may make such objection known to the Office of Community Development, Division of Administration in writing. The State will consider objections made only on the following grounds:

1. The applicant's description of needs and objectives is plainly inconsistent with available facts and data;
2. The activities to be undertaken are plainly inappropriate to meeting the needs and objectives identified by the applicant; and
3. The application does not comply with the requirements set forth in the Disaster Recovery Plan and amendments to the plan or other applicable laws.

Such objections should include both identification of the requirements not met and, in the case of objections relative to item 1 on the previous page; the complainant must supply the data which she or he relied upon.

**Performance Hearings**

Prior to close-out of the disaster recovery program, the recipient must have a public hearing to obtain citizen views and to respond to questions relative to the recipient's performance. This hearing shall be held after adequate notice, at times and locations convenient to actual beneficiaries and with accommodations for the disabled and non-English speaking persons provided.

Documentation must be kept at the local level to support compliance with the aforementioned requirements.
# Louisiana Extended Bridge Loan Program
## Participating Banks List
### as of March 24, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Contact Title</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  City Savings Bank</td>
<td>Glen D. Bertrand</td>
<td>President &amp; CEO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gbertrand@citysavingsbank.com">gbertrand@citysavingsbank.com</a></td>
<td>301 North Pine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  First Federal Bank of Louisiana</td>
<td>James A. White</td>
<td>Sr. Vice President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jim.white@firstfedlc.com">jim.white@firstfedlc.com</a></td>
<td>P. O. Box 1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  First Federal Bank of Louisiana</td>
<td>Rusty Guidroz</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:qguirroz@firstfedlc.com">qguirroz@firstfedlc.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  First Bank and Trust</td>
<td>Stephen D. Dickey</td>
<td>Executive Vice President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sdictey@ftronline.com">sdictey@ftronline.com</a></td>
<td>2316 Manhattan Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  First National Bank of Louisiana</td>
<td>Rose M. Miller</td>
<td>Executive Vice President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmiller@fnb-la.com">rmiller@fnb-la.com</a></td>
<td>P. O. Box 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Gulf Coast Bank &amp; Trust Company</td>
<td>Bruce Falkenstein</td>
<td>Sr. Vice President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brucefalkenstein@gulfbank.com">brucefalkenstein@gulfbank.com</a></td>
<td>200 St. Charles Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Hancock Bank of Louisiana</td>
<td>Edward Francis</td>
<td>Sr. Vice President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Edward_Francis@hancockbank.com">Edward_Francis@hancockbank.com</a></td>
<td>2600 CitiPlace Drive, Suite 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Hibernia National Bank</td>
<td>Bill Alt</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bat@hibernia.com">bat@hibernia.com</a></td>
<td>1201 S. Clearview PKWY, STE 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Hope Community Credit Union</td>
<td>Dennis Manshack</td>
<td>Louisiana Credit Team Leader</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmanshack@ecd.org">dmanshack@ecd.org</a></td>
<td>11748 S. Harrel's Ferry Road, Suite A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.</td>
<td>Larry Conley</td>
<td>Sr. Vice President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:larry.conley@chase.com">larry.conley@chase.com</a></td>
<td>6300 Harryhines Blvd, 2nd Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Metairie Bank and Trust Company</td>
<td>Reginald H. Smith, Jr.</td>
<td>President and Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rsmith@metariebank.com">rsmith@metariebank.com</a></td>
<td>3344 Metairie Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Parish National Bank</td>
<td>Gary B. Blossman</td>
<td>President &amp; CEO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:garyb@parishnational.com">garyb@parishnational.com</a></td>
<td>404 Kirkland Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 AmSouth Bank</td>
<td>William E. Horton</td>
<td>Executive Vice President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:khorton@amsouth.com">khorton@amsouth.com</a></td>
<td>400 Poydras Street, Suite 10C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Cameron State Bank</td>
<td>Mike Harmonson</td>
<td>Executive Vice President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mharmson@csbbankng.net">mharmson@csbbankng.net</a></td>
<td>4440 Nelson Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Omni Bank</td>
<td>James M. Hudson</td>
<td>President and CEO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jim@omnibk.com">jim@omnibk.com</a></td>
<td>2900 Ridgelake Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Whitney Bank</td>
<td>Tim Babin</td>
<td>Whitney National Bank</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tbabin@whitneybank.com">tbabin@whitneybank.com</a></td>
<td>400 LaBarre Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Regions Bank</td>
<td>Joanie Dubroc</td>
<td>Sr. Vice President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joanie.dubroc@regions.com">joanie.dubroc@regions.com</a></td>
<td>5353 Essen L.n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Central Progressive Bank</td>
<td>James J. Veneez</td>
<td>Executive Vice President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 ASI Federal Credit Union</td>
<td>Audrey Cerise</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 First American Bank and Trust</td>
<td>Frank Bourgeois</td>
<td>President &amp; CEO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fbourgeois@fabt.com">fbourgeois@fabt.com</a></td>
<td>5508 Citrus Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Crescent Bank &amp; Trust</td>
<td>Fred Morgan</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fnmorgan@cbtno.com">fnmorgan@cbtno.com</a></td>
<td>PO Box 61813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 St. Martin Bank and Trust</td>
<td>Paul Durand</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul_durand@stmartinbank.com">paul_durand@stmartinbank.com</a></td>
<td>PO Box 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 M C Bank &amp; Trust Company</td>
<td>Larry Callais</td>
<td>President &amp; CEO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:larry.callais@mcbt.com">larry.callais@mcbt.com</a></td>
<td>P. O. Drawer 200C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 MidSouth Bank</td>
<td>Paul Petterser</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paulpetterser@midsouthbank.com">paulpetterser@midsouthbank.com</a></td>
<td>P. O. Box 3745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State, Zip</td>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>Fax Number</td>
<td>800/Number</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeRidder, LA 70634</td>
<td>(337) 463-8661</td>
<td>(337) 462-1034</td>
<td>(800) 920-8661</td>
<td>Kitty Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Charles LA 70602</td>
<td>(337) 433-3611</td>
<td>(337) 421-1323</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan Rodericks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey, LA 70058</td>
<td>(504) 586-2646</td>
<td>(504) 361-9294</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Watsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowley, LA 70527</td>
<td>(337) 521-8701</td>
<td>(337) 521-8727</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Thibodeaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA 70130</td>
<td>(504) 841-7355</td>
<td>(504) 841-2890</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tracy Caldwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA 70808</td>
<td>(225) 248-7481</td>
<td>(225) 248-7447</td>
<td>(800) 738-2625</td>
<td>Cindy Michelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson, LA 70121-1013</td>
<td>(504) 533-3847</td>
<td>(214) 544-4841</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kyle Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Charles, LA 70602</td>
<td>(337) 439-3654</td>
<td>(337) 439-1628</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Eason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, TX 75235-5259</td>
<td>(214) 904-3526</td>
<td>(214) 904-3386</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wendy Eckstrom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metairie, LA 70001</td>
<td>(504) 832-5641</td>
<td>(504) 832-3235</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reginald H. Smith, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convington, LA 70433</td>
<td>(985) 898-5466</td>
<td>(985) 801-8704</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vennie Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA 70130</td>
<td>(205) 560-2897</td>
<td>(205) 560-3820</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Charles, LA 70605</td>
<td>(337) 312-7020</td>
<td>(337) 312-7029</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond L. Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metairie, LA 70002</td>
<td>(225) 248-1408</td>
<td>(225) 0248-1457</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Arceneaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson, LA 70121</td>
<td>(504) 846-2575</td>
<td>(504) 846-2585</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Babin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA 70809</td>
<td>(225) 767-9331</td>
<td>(225) 767-9353</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joanie Dubroc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harahan, LA 70123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cynthia Jenkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacherie, LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phyllis McLaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA 70161-1813</td>
<td>(504) 552-4471</td>
<td>(504) 552-4467</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark A. Berard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan City, LA 70381-2000</td>
<td>(985) 384-2100</td>
<td>(985) 384-6351</td>
<td></td>
<td>Larry Callais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette, LA 70502</td>
<td>(337) 477-7187</td>
<td>(337) 477-1904</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Pettefer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENT: Unfair Allocation of Infrastructure Funds

Response: Regarding your concerns with the possibility of an unfair funding allocation for the affected parishes, we feel that the amount allocated for each category will be sufficient in order to fund all applications the State receives from every affected parish. If our agency anticipates a shortfall for any category we could request additional funds from the Louisiana Recovery Authority.

COMMENT: Program Should Ensure Hiring Local Contractors

Response: Concerning the effort to hire local contractors, Louisiana Public Bid law will be enforced for all projects which will ensure an open and fair contract awarding process. Newspaper advertisements for these construction projects are required to encourage all small and minority owned firms and women’s business enterprises to submit a bid on the project. These contracts include specific goals for both minority and female participation for each trade on all construction work in the area (regardless of whether it is federally assisted or not). The contracts also include Section 3 compliance requirements for the provisions of training, employment and business opportunities. The State will ensure that all contractors fully participate in these areas and document those actions taken to achieve compliance with these regulations.

The State is committed to ensuring that maximum participation of local businesses in the rebuilding process. Therefore, contracts with local governments will strongly encourage the use of local firms and employees. These contracts are also mandated by the State to include non-discrimination clauses as well as clauses which require the contractor to take affirmative action to ensure the recruitment and employment of local citizens, particularly those of low to moderate income.

Moreover, the contractor is required by law to list all employment openings with the Louisiana Department of Labor (LDOL) through the local Job Center. Contact information will be provided to each successful bidder by the State’s Office of Community Development. These contractors will also be provided contact information for the Louisiana Economic Development department and their directory of Small and Emerging Businesses. The State will ensure that successful bidders utilize this information when sub-contracting any of their work.

COMMENT: Program Should Ensure Hiring Local Employees

Response: Work performed under all contracts is subject to Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 1701u. The purpose of Section 3 is to ensure that employment and other economic opportunities generated by HUD assistance or HUD-assisted projects covered by Section 3, shall, to the greatest extent feasible, be directed to low-
moderate and very low income persons, particularly persons who are recipients for the HUD assistance for housing.

All projects utilizing Federal CDBG dollars will be monitored by the State for Federal Section 3 hiring goals. Contractors/subcontractors will be expected to comply with Section 3 requirements. These requirements established that a goal of at least 30% of the new hires be local residents of low to moderate income. This requirement extends only to full-time jobs which may be permanent, temporary or seasonal.

**COMMENT: Program Should Ensure the Utilization of Minority and Female Contractors in the Rebuilding Process**

**Response:** Contractors shall lawfully comply with Executive Order 11246, Section 202 Equal Opportunity Clause in which goals for minority and female participation are addressed. The nationwide goal for female participation is 6.9% and minority goals are specific to MSA and “economic areas”, which vary throughout Louisiana but is set at 30% for the New Orleans area.

Lists of minority and female owned businesses are available from various sources including the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development, LA Department of Economic Development, LA Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (N.O. office). These lists are available to assist the contractor in meeting Equal Opportunity Conditions.

**COMMENT: Program Should Include a Workforce Training Component for Hurricane Victims**

**Response:** The State and the Louisiana Recovery Authority are currently formulating proposals for workforce training programs to ensure that local citizens have the capacity and skills to fully participate in the rebuilding process. In addition the Department of Labor receives monies for workforce training. The State will forward these comments to the Department of Labor for consideration.

**COMMENT: A Need for More Citizen Participation, Especially Those Persons Displaced**

**Response:** A concern about the ability of citizens to have maximum input into the planning process was well taken. The emergency nature of the programs included in the current Action Plan necessitated the short comment period. However, future plans and amendments regarding housing and other programs will have a longer comment period. In addition, the State has written a separate Citizen Participation Plan for the use of Disaster Recovery CDBG funds which details the methods by which citizen participation will be encouraged. The plan is made a part of the Action Plan.
The Citizen Participation Plan includes methods for outreach to those persons displaced by the storms. The plan includes, “In addition, public notices summarizing the amendment and providing an opportunity for citizen’s comments will be published in six out-of-state newspapers. The out-of-state newspapers will be selected in areas where there are large numbers of Louisiana evacuees living. Copies of the summary and the amendment will also be sent to libraries in these cities so that citizens can review these documents.”

**COMMENT: Plan Should Include Language to Address Capacity of Non-profit Organization That Provide Housing and Services to the Homeless**

**Response:** The commenter stated that the Action Plan should include language that addresses the need to build the capacity of the non-profit organizations that provide the housing and services to those who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. The commenter suggested that the following language be inserted on page 27 of the plan. “These funds will be used as a source of funding support for expanding nonprofit capacity to develop and operate supportive housing, for securing sites and services for homeless programs, and to allow facility expansion to help eliminate or lessen gaps of unmet needs within local service delivery and homeless housing.”

The ability to use these funds to acquire sites for the provision of these services is currently being considered in the homeless plan that is being drafted for submittal to the Louisiana Recovery Authority (LRA). The current Action Plan also envisions the use of these funds to allow for facility expansion to help eliminate or lessen the gaps of unmet needs within local service delivery and homeless housing systems. The State, however, has no objection to inserting the suggested sentence and will do so.

**COMMENT: A Need to Respond to Persons with Disabilities and Those Who Pay More Than 30 Percent of the Income for Rent**

**Response:** The Action Plan in its current form explicitly addresses this concern. On page 25, the first sentence states that priority will be given "to prevent low-income individuals and families with children (especially those with incomes below 30 percent of median) from becoming homeless."

The second paragraph under prevention identifies those paying more than 30 percent of income as at risk. In the first paragraph under prevention it states "to prevent homelessness, mainstream government agencies must assist the most vulnerable clients--those with severe disabilities or extreme poverty in obtaining housing and keeping them housed." Paragraph 3 identifies those who would need rental assistance and persons with disabilities are again mentioned.
COMMENT: A Need to Give Maximum Priority to Activities That Benefit Low and Moderate Income Persons

Response: Congress has reduced the overall benefit of the use of funds for low to moderate income activities to 50%. The majority of the monies are allocated under the housing activities. It is estimated that at least 56% of those receiving housing assistance will be persons of low and moderate income. In addition, some of the infrastructure projects are of an area wide benefit in areas that exceed 51% low mod according to census data. These activities can be counted towards meeting the 50% standard. Also infrastructure projects that are located and serving residents in census tracts which contain low and moderate income persons greater than 51% can also be counted towards the 50%. The State feels comfortable that this requirement will be met.

COMMENT: More Specific Language in the Action Plan Relative to the Bridge Loan Program and Priority be Given to Minority and Women Owned Businesses and Enterprises that Generate Jobs for Local and Displaced Residents

Response: More details regarding eligibility and the application process have been included under the Bridge Loan Section in the Action Plan. All businesses were impacted by the storms in these areas and it is felt that all should be given equal treatment.

COMMENT: Ensure Transparency and Public Accountability

Response: The State is required to report to HUD, the Louisiana Recovery Authority, and the Louisiana Legislature on the performance and impact of the activities funded with Disaster Recovery CDBG dollars. All reports will be available to the public at the following website: http://www.doa.louisiana.gov/cdbg/drhome.htm.

COMMENT: The Bridge Loan Program Should Focus More on the Severely Impacted Areas

Response: The State has revised the method of allocation for the Bridge Loan Program. Fifty percent of the funds will be allocated to the 13 parishes that were most impacted by the hurricanes. The balance will be used in the other 24 parishes impacted by the hurricanes.