Welcome

Please help yourself to breakfast.
Agenda

8:00 - 8:45am  Registration and Breakfast
8:45 - 8:55am  Welcome
8:55 - 9:25am  Stanley Gimont, HUD
9:25 - 9:55am  Q&A and Discussion
9:55 - 10:00am Closing
LESSONS AND SUCCESSES AT HUD
—SUPPORTING COMMUNITIES

Stan Gimont
February 22, 2017
HUD AND THE NATION’S COMMUNITIES

- FY 2016 Budget - $48 billion
- Major External Facing Components - CPD, FHA, FHEO, PIH
- Bottom line - HUD programs touch every community in the country
- Focus today is on how HUD has and is providing communities skills, knowledge, tools, capacity and systems to successfully implement HUD-funded programs
CPD EXPERIENCE WITH TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

- CPD is HUD component with most direct contact with local officials as well as non-profit homelessness assistance providers
- Key programs – CDBG, HOME, SNAPS ($6 billion in FY 2016)
- Non-uniform funding for TA efforts prior to 2010
- Effort generally lacked control, coordination and impact
- No departmental coordination
- Ripe for change
CHANGING COURSE - NSP

- Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP)
- $7 billion in funding via 3 appropriations 2008-2010
- $70 million dedicated to technical assistance
- Purpose – Address limited capacity on real property activities at local level as well as tight statutory expenditure deadlines
- What worked - Multi-prong strategy providing direct TA, continual webinars, problem solving clinics, on-line resource exchange
- High level of HUD management oversight
TA HISTORY - TRANSITION TO HUD-WIDE EFFORT

- **Pre-2010**: Multiple program appropriations and NOFAs for TA
- **2010**: OneCPD centralized funding and administration for CPD
- **2011-2016**: Incremental steps to Department-wide TA NOFA and consolidation as Community Compass
IMPLEMENTING OneCPD — 2010-2012

- Expanded on NSP experience
- Consolidated CPD TA funding streams
- Increased base of providers through competitive process
- Instituted structured decision-making process
- Three approaches to getting help — grantees-initiated, CPD field staff or HQ (demand-response)
- What worked - Aggressive deployment in situations with strong identity of interest between HUD and recipient
MOVING TO COMMUNITY COMPASS

- Secretarial desire to coordinate TA efforts across agency
- Community Compass resulted from steps over several years
- Established integrated TA and capacity building initiative
  - Proposals requested via single competitive NOFA
  - Internal coordination effort led by HUD’s PD&R Office
  - Management of demand-response structure through program offices with administrative oversight by CPD’s TA division
OVERALL TA PLANNING / PRIORITY SETTING

HOW IS THE TA PLAN PUT TOGETHER?

1. PD&R REQUESTS TA PRIORITIES FROM OFFICES
2. PROGRAM OFFICES LIST PRIORITIES
3. MEETING TO DISCUSS
4. REQUESTS SET
5. TA PLAN FINALIZED
COMMUNITY COMPASS MODEL

**Opportunities**

- Increased collaboration
- Cross-cutting approaches
- Place-based
- Single NOFA/Competition
- Funds obligated faster = work begins faster

**Constraints**

- Additional partners participating (complicated)
- Staffing/resource limitations
- Multi-award cross-program system does not fit other HUD models
- Fewer funds for individual programs
- Constant retooling of systems and processes
COMMUNITY COMPASS ACTIVITIES

- Needs Assessments
- Direct TA and Capacity Building Engagements
- Develop and Maintain Tools and Products
- Self-Directed and Group Learning
- Knowledge Management
- Data analysis, reporting, and performance measurement
- Support for NAHASDA Allocation Formula Administration and Negotiated Rulemaking and Consultation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
<th>Funding details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| FY10        | $48 million    | • Congress specified funding for specific TA projects, including $23 million for OneCPD  
               • Danger of lapsing funds because not obligated |
| FY11        | $40 million    | • Congress specified funding for specific TA projects, including $23 million for OneCPD  
               • To avoid lapsing, some FY11 funds awarded through OneCPD NOFA |
| FY12        | $38 million    | • Congress specifies funding for specific projects, but PIH Integrated TA allows for flexibility  
               • $23 million for OneCPD and $5 million for National Resource Network |
| FY13        | $36 million    | • HUD has flexibility to determine project allocations  
               • OneCPD+ NOFA includes portion of PIH and Housing $ (pilot)  
               • CPD expenditures increase; legacy TA $ expended |
| FY14        | $25 million    | • Congress must approve TA plan ($7M for CPD)  
               • Single NOFA (Community Compass) and rebranding; all funds in DRGR |
| FY15        | $22 million    | • Congress must approve TA plan ($7M for CPD)  
               • No TI Funds for TA included in Research & Technology account |
| FY16        | $25 million    | • $6.5M for CPD |
NDRC - $1 billion competition to address unmet disaster recovery needs for major disasters in 2011-2013

HUD limited field to 67 potential applicants (13 grants)

Rockefeller Foundation funded parallel TA effort for applicants

Focused expert resources on post-disaster resilience needs

What worked - Resilience Academies conducted for both phases of competition received strong positive feedback from applicants

HUD considering how best to build on this effort
HUD’S PLACED-BASED INITIATIVES

- What do we mean by place-based and why is it important?
- HUD was active participant in several government-wide placed-based initiatives 2010-2016
- Internal effort established framework in 2016 for incorporating place-based approaches into HUD’s work
- Will need to integrate TA with place-based initiatives
- Further implementation awaits overall direction
TA PRIORITIES GOING FORWARD

- Improve data analysis and reporting; program evaluation and outcomes measurement
- Streamline TA delivery to provide quicker response
- Make better use of HUD staff expertise through placed-based efforts
- Establish reasonable expectations internally and externally
- Continue to increase focus on getting greatest return on every programmatic dollar
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