



Rushern L. Baker, III
County Executive

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY CONSOLIDATED PLAN FY 2016 – 2020



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT



**AFFORDABLE
HOUSING**



**HOUSING
COUNSELING &
HOMEOWNERSHIP
ASSISTANCE**

**RENTAL
&
SPECIAL
NEEDS
HOUSING**



**NEIGHBORHOOD
STABILIZATION &
REVITALIZATION**



**HOUSING
REHABILITATION**



**HOMELESSNESS
PREVENTION
SERVICES**



EQUAL HOUSING
OPPORTUNITY

Prepared by Prince George's County Department of Housing and Community Development

Final: May 12, 2015



Prince George's County FY 2016 - 2020 Consolidated Plan

**Rushern L. Baker, III
County Executive**

Prince George's County Council

Mel Franklin, Chairman
9th District

Derrick Leon Davis, Vice Chairman
6th District

Mary A. Lehman
1st District

Andrea Harrison
5th District

Deni Taveras
2nd District

Karen R. Toles
7th District

Dannielle M. Glaros
3rd District

Obie Patterson
8th District

Todd M. Turner
4th District

Prince George's County Department of Housing & Community Development

Eric C. Brown, Director
Estella Alexander, Deputy Director

Con Plan Work Group

DHCD Consolidated Plan Work Group:

LeShann Murphy, Lead Coordinator
Katherine Carter, Assistant Coordinator
Shirley Grant
Veda Hunter
Patricia Isaac
Edna Krzyzaniak
Sheila Roberts
Pamela Wilson

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission - Prince George's County

Department of Planning:
Dr. Michael Asante

Prince George's County Department of Social Services:

Renee Ensor-Pope

Prince George's County Human Relations Commission

D. Michael Lyles, Esq.



Prince George's County affirmatively promotes equal opportunity and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, gender, religion, ethnic or national origin, disability, or familial status in admissions or access to benefits in programs or activities.



Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	9
1.1 Summary of the Objectives and Outcomes Identified in the Plan Needs Assessment.....	10
1.2 Evaluation of Past Performance.....	13
1.3 Summary of Citizen Participation Process and Consultation Process.....	18
1.4 Summary of Public Comments.....	19
1.5 Summary of Comments or Views Not Accepted.....	20
1.6 Summary	20
2. Development of the Consolidated Plan	21
2.1 Lead and Responsible Agencies	21
2.2 Consultation.....	22
2.3 Citizen Participation	26
3. Prince George’s County Perspective & TNI.....	34
4. Housing Needs Assessment.....	36
4.1 Needs Assessment Overview	36
4.2 Housing Needs Assessment	38
4.3 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems.....	50
4.4 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems.....	56
4.5 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens.....	62
4.6 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion	63
4.7 Public Housing.....	67
4.8 Homeless Needs Assessment.....	72
4.9 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment	76

4.10 Non-Housing Community Development Needs.....	80
5. Housing Market Analysis	83
5.1 Overview	83
5.2 Number of Housing Units.....	85
5.3 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing	88
5.4 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing.....	92
5.5 Public and Assisted Housing	95
5.6 Homeless Facilities and Services.....	99
5.7 Special Needs Facilities and Services	104
5.8 Barriers to Affordable Housing	107
5.9 Non-Housing Community Development Assets.....	109
5.10 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion.....	120
6. Strategic Plan	123
6.1 Overview	123
6.2 Geographic Priorities	124
6.3 Priority Needs	126
6.4 Influence of Market Conditions	132
6.5 Anticipated Resources	134
6.6 Institutional Delivery Structure.....	139
6.7 Goals Summary	145
6.8 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement.....	148
6.9 Barriers to Affordable Housing	149
6.10 Homelessness Strategy	151
6.11 Lead-Based Paint Hazards.....	155
6.12 Anti-Poverty Strategy.....	158

6.13 Monitoring	162
7. Appendices	166
Appendix 7.1 – Exhibit 1 - Agencies, Groups, and Organizations who Participated.....	166
Appendix 7.2 – Exhibit 2 - Other Local/Regional/Federal Planning Efforts	172
Appendix 7.3 – Exhibit 3 - Citizen Participation Outreach	174
Appendix 7.4 – Exhibit 4 - Housing Problems Table	175
Appendix 7.5 – Homeless At-Risk and Special Needs Population Continued.....	176
Appendix 7.6 – Exhibit 5 – Crowding Information – 2/2.....	179
Appendix 7.7 – Exhibit 6 – Vacant Units	180
Appendix 7.8 – Program Income Methodology.....	181
Appendix 7.9 – Goals Methodology.....	182
Appendix 7.10 – CB-112-2012	183
Appendix 7.11 – CB-067-2014	190
Appendix 7.12 – Exhibit 7 – Section 3 Implementation Timeline	202
Appendix 7.13 – TNI Analysis of 6 Targeted Areas	203
Appendix 7.14 – Analysis of Impediments – Action Plan.....	219
Appendix 7.15 – Public Hearing Comments.....	222

Index of Figures and Tables

Figures

Figure 1 – Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative Sites	35
Figure 2 – Median Household Income & Poverty Level.....	39
Figure 3 – Comparison: Poverty Level.....	39
Figure 4 – Poverty Status of Families in Prince George’s County	40
Figure 5 – Disproportionately Greater Need Summary of Household Incomes	50
Figure 6 – Disproportionately Greater Need 0-30% AMI.....	51
Figure 7 – Disproportionately Greater Need for 30-50% AMI	52
Figure 8 – Disproportionately Greater Need for 50-80% AMI	53
Figure 9 – Disproportionately Greater Need 80-100% AMI.....	54
Figure 10 – Severe Housing Problems Summary of Household Incomes	56
Figure 11 – Severe Housing Problems 0-30% AMI.....	57
Figure 12 – Severe Housing Problems 30-50% AMI.....	58
Figure 13 – Severe Housing Problems 50-80% AMI.....	59
Figure 14 – Severe Housing Problems 80-100% AMI.....	60
Figure 15 – Poverty & Disability Among Veterans	65
Figure 16 – Public Improvement Needs.....	80
Figure 17 – Annual Foreclosure Events.....	83
Figure 18 – Median Sale Price Comparison	84
Figure 19 – Median Household Income	89
Figure 20 – Fair Market Rents.....	90
Figure 21 – Changes in Percentages of Renter Units for Gross Rent Categories.....	90
Figure 22 – Percentage of Owners Cost Burden	91
Figure 23 – Percentage of Renters Cost Burden	91
Figure 24 – Old Housing Stock	93
Figure 25 – Lead-Based Paint Risk by Zip Code.....	94
Figure 26 – Countywide Trends & Unemployment Rate	109
Figure 27 – Very Low to Moderate Household Income	120
Figure 28 – TNI Sites.....	120
Figure 29 – Percentage of Blacks/African Americans	121
Figure 30 – Percentage of Hispanics	121
Figure 31 – Community Assets – Library & Park Property	122
Figure 32 – Community Assets – Police & Fire Station	122
Figure 33 – Very Low to Moderate Household Income	124
Figure 34 – TNI Sites.....	124
Figure 35 – Lead-Based Paint Risk by Zip Code.....	156

Tables

Table 1 - Summary of Specific Objectives (Affordable Housing) 15

Table 2 - Summary of Specific Objectives (Public Facilities and Infrastructure)..... 16

Table 3 - Summary of Specific Objectives (Economic Development) 17

Table 4 - Responsible Agencies 21

Table 5 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics 38

Table 6 - Total Households Table 40

Table 7 - Summary of CHAS data in Exhibit 4 41

Table 8 - Housing Problems 2 43

Table 9 - Cost Burden > 30% 43

Table 10 - Summary of 2007-2011 CHAS Cost Burden 44

Table 11 - Tenure of Households with Cost Burden is Greater than 30% 44

Table 12 - Cost Burden > 50% 45

Table 13 - Summary of 2007-2011 CHAS Cost Burden > 50%..... 45

Table 14 - Overcrowding Information – 1/2 45

Table 15 - Disproportionately Greater Need 0-30% AMI..... 51

Table 16 - Disproportionately Greater Need 30-50% AMI..... 52

Table 17 - Disproportionately Greater Need 50-80% 53

Table 18 - Disproportionately Greater Need 80-100% 54

Table 19 - Summary of Disproportionately Greater Needs Table 55

Table 20 - Severe Housing Problems 0-30% AMI 57

Table 21 - Severe Housing Problems 30-50% AMI 58

Table 22 - Severe Housing Problems 50-80% AMI 59

Table 23 - Severe Housing Problems 80-100% AMI 60

Table 24 - Summary of Severe Housing Problems 61

Table 25 - Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI..... 62

Table 26 - Poverty and Disability Among Veterans..... 64

Table 27 - Public Housing by Program Type 67

Table 28 - Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type 67

Table 29 - Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type 68

Table 30 - Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type..... 69

Table 31 - Homeless Needs Assessment..... 75

Table 32 - Characteristics of HIV/AIDS Population 78

Table 33 - HIV Housing Needs..... 79

Table 34 - Housing Tenure 85

Table 35 - Property Type: All Residential Properties 85

Table 36 - Unit Size by Tenure 85

Table 37 - Generational Housing Needs 87

Table 38 - Cost of Housing 88

Table 39 - Rent Paid 88

Table 40 - Housing Affordability	89
Table 41 - Monthly Rent	89
Table 42 - Condition of Units	92
Table 43 - Year Unit Built	92
Table 44 - Risk of Lead-Based Paint by Year	94
Table 45 - Total Number of Units by Program Type	95
Table 46 - Name of Property and Total Number of Units by Bedroom Size	95
Table 47 - Distribution of Public Housing Units	96
Table 48 - Public Housing Condition	96
Table 49 - Summary of Revitalization Needs	97
Table 50 - Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households	100
Table 51 - HOPWA Assistance Baseline Table.....	105
Table 52 – Business Activity.....	110
Table 53 – Labor Force.....	110
Table 54 – Occupations by Sector.....	110
Table 55 – Travel Time	111
Table 56 - Educational Attainment by Employment Status.....	111
Table 57 - Educational Attainment by Age	111
Table 58 - Educational Attainment: Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months.....	112
Table 59 - Priority Needs Summary	126
Table 60 - Influence of Market Conditions	132
Table 61- Anticipated Resources	134
Table 62 - Non-Entitlement Leveraged Funds	137
Table 63 – Institutional Delivery	139
Table 64 - Homeless Prevention Services Summary.....	142
Table 65 - Goals Summary	145

1. Executive Summary

The Prince George's County Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) is the local grantee, working in partnership with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) that is responsible for administering federal entitlement programs designed to address the needs of low-to-moderate income (LMI) persons. Based on the County's demographics, housing and economic profile, HUD allocates annual funding enabling the County to address and implement programs supporting its housing and community development priorities, strategies, goals and performance benchmarks. The Consolidated Plan for Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 – 2020 seeks to identify a myriad of critical needs based on a comprehensive data analysis, literature review, stakeholder's consultations and an objective assessment of recent performance measures.

The Consolidated Plan for FY 2016 – 2020 provides the rationale and strategy to utilize an estimated \$38 million of federal entitlement funds , including Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Home Investment Partnerships (HOME), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) and Housing Opportunities for Persons with HIV/AIDS (HOPWA) Programs, to employ strategies for building and preserving affordable housing, creating economic development opportunities and to improve the quality of life for LMI persons and communities. While far more funds are required to adequately address the LMI population's housing and community development needs, the DHCD seeks to utilize all available funds in an effective and efficient manner, while continuing to work with a myriad of public and private stakeholders. Importantly, this Plan is predicated on the leveraging of an estimated \$510 million of non-entitlement funds to assist the targeted population(s).

The Consolidated Plan for FY 2016 – 2020 seeks to build upon the County's assets and the County Executive's Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative (TNI) which focuses on six (6) communities including Langley Park, Suitland/Coral Hills, Glassmanor/Oxon Hill, East Riverdale/Bladensburg, Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights, and Kentland/Palmer Park. The TNI coordinates the provision of County resources to improve these communities. The County's LMI population is located primarily inside the Capital Beltway and in the TNI communities. They are predominately Black/African American or Hispanic. They are housing cost burdened, residing in older housing units, and they experience comparatively high poverty levels. Within this context, the data reflect growing challenges in addressing the housing and related needs for the general LMI population and the special needs population including the elderly, frail-elderly, homeless, disabled and persons at-risk.

As required, the Consolidated Plan for FY 2016 – 2020 represents the collaborative efforts and contributions of local citizens, the County Executive's Office, the Prince George's County Council, non-profit partners, and public and private stakeholders.

This Consolidated Plan is based on the regulation requirements under 24 C.F.R. Part 91 and the American Communities Survey (ACS) and HUD's Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS). As indicated, more current data is also presented and analyzed.

In conclusion, the Consolidated Plan for FY 2016 – 2020 represents the Department of Housing and

Community Development’s portfolio for the next five years in the fulfillment of its missions to provide affordable housing, create economic development opportunities and improve the quality of life for the County’s LMI population.

1.1 Summary of the **Objectives** and **Outcomes** Identified in the Plan Needs Assessment

Overview

The Consolidated Plan for FY 2016 – 2020 is data driven and predicated on a comprehensive analysis of the American Communities Survey for 2007 through 2011 and the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy 2007 – 2011. As required by HUD, the objective of the needs assessment is to provide a concise summary of the County’s projected housing needs for the ensuing five-year period. Housing data included in this portion of the Plan is based on U.S. Census data, as provided by HUD, applicable updates and studies, and consultation with social service agencies. The Plan incorporates input from stakeholders engaged through the citizen participation process conducted in accordance with C.F.R. §91.105. Additionally, this Consolidated Plan describes the housing and supportive services unmet needs of low-income persons with HIV/AIDS.

The Plan estimates the number and type of families in need of housing assistance for:

- Extremely low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income families;
- Renters and owners;
- Elderly persons;
- Single persons;
- Large families;
- Public housing residents;
- Families on the public housing and Section 8 tenant-based waiting list;
- Persons with HIV/AIDS and their families;
- Victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;
- Persons with disabilities; and
- Formerly homeless families and individuals who are receiving rapid re-housing assistance and are nearing the termination of that assistance.

Based on the aforementioned “housing” population subgroups, the County’s Consolidated Plan examines the current and future housing needs considering the following conditions and characteristics.

First, the Plan presents a summary analysis of the cost burden and severe cost burden, overcrowding (especially for large families), and substandard housing conditions being experienced by extremely low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income renters and owners compared to the jurisdiction as a whole.

Second, the Plan examines “disproportionate impact” based on ethnicity. Specifically, it assesses the extent that any racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need¹ in comparison to the needs of that category as a whole.

Third, the Plan examines the housing and community development needs of the homeless and persons at-risk of homelessness. This Plan addresses the number of persons who are not homeless but require supportive housing, including the elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities (mental, physical, developmental), persons with alcohol or other drug addiction, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, public housing residents, and any other categories the jurisdiction may specify, and describe their supportive housing needs.

Fourth, the Plan addresses the adverse impact of and hazards of lead-based paint on the availability and need for affordable housing, including an estimate of the number of housing units within the jurisdiction that are occupied by low-income families or moderate-income families that contain lead-based paint hazards.

In compliance with 24 CFR Part 91, the Consolidated Plan for FY 2016 - 2020 evidences the following salient needs and characteristics.

Highlights: Housing Needs Assessment

- The CHAS and ACS data show the significant housing problems impacting the LMI population in Prince George’s County are housing cost burden or affordability, substandard housing, and overcrowding.
- The County has experienced a substantial increase in population and households, suggesting the need for additional suitable and affordable housing.
- Approximately 62,411 representing 22.5% of households in the County are low or very low income with elderly persons and children.
- Housing affordability is a major challenge in the County. Thousands of households both owner and renter, and especially those with lower incomes, experience housing cost burden. The incidence of housing cost burden is growing. The current (2009 - 2013 ACS) data show a total of 132,594 households experience housing cost burden, including 44.6% of households occupying units with mortgages and 52.2% renter households.
- Not only do lower income households experience cost burden, almost half (36,130) experience severe cost burden; spending 50% or more of their household incomes to pay for housing and related costs.
- The ongoing increase in the County’s senior population results in high demand for a variety of senior-suitable market rate and affordable housing units.

¹ According to HUD. Disproportionately Greater Need exists when the members of racial or ethnic group at a given income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10% or more) than the income level as a whole.

- Existing units must be adapted to meet the needs and lifestyles of the elderly.

Highlights: Housing Conditions

- Thousands of households in the County experience substandard housing and overcrowding.
- A number of households (782 Countywide) live in substandard housing, lacking plumbing and kitchen facilities. Households living in substandard housing (644 or 82%) are low income renter households.
- Substandard housing is mostly concentrated in the old established communities bordering the District of Columbia and located inside the Capital Beltway.
- A large number (6,712) of households in the County do not have, or cannot afford, housing that is large enough to meet their needs, and therefore live in overcrowded conditions. Twenty-six percent (1,754) of these households live in severely overcrowded housing.
- The 2007 – 2011 CHAS data show 24,911 (96%) of renter households and 22,018 (84%) of owner households with incomes at 80% or less than AMI have 1 or more severe housing problems, such as, lack of kitchen or complete plumbing, severe overcrowding and severe cost burden.
- Current 2009 - 2013 ACS data show as many as 80,460 (25% of the total) housing units in the County are very old; built in 1959 or earlier. Old housing units typically require extensive maintenance and repairs, which owners cannot afford.
- The communities in the County most affected by the severe housing problems are concentrated near the boundaries of the District of Columbia, in places such as, Langley Park, Brentwood, Seat Pleasant, Bladensburg, District Heights, Forest Heights, and Landover.

Highlights: Housing for Special Needs Population

- Almost 70,000 County residents 16 years and over have disabilities.
- The majority of residents with disabilities is not in the labor force and therefore cannot afford decent, safe and sanitary housing.
- Residents with disabilities generally have lower educational attainment than the population at large.

Highlights: Non-Housing Community Development Needs

- Domestic violence continues to trend upwards in the County. In FY 2014, there were 5,236 domestic violence cases filed with the District Court, comprising 22% of all domestic violence cases statewide.
- The fastest growing ethnic group in the County is the Hispanic population which increased by

126 percent from 2000 - 2010 (57,057/132,496). This population requires special public service programs to address a host of needs.

- Public facilities are critical to the sustainability of Prince George’s County communities and have a direct impact on the quality of life for all residents. The County’s 2035 General Plan estimates population growth will require the construction of two new public libraries, four new Fire/EMS stations, and nine new public schools by 2035.
- The County maintains 1,875 miles of roadway and municipalities maintain 543 miles of roadway within the County. The public improvement needs include street improvements, ADA compliance including assessable sidewalks and curbs, signage, street lighting, landscaping and connectivity to transportation.
- High school job training (inclusive of disabled and all skill levels) is critically needed.
- Housing counseling for renters and homeowners continue to be supported; and capacity building for nonprofit organizations.

1.2 Evaluation of Past Performance

According to the FY 2011-2015 Consolidated Plan, the County projected approximately 5,450 households will receive new or improved housing, at least 189,975 residents will receive new or improved services, nearly 230 jobs will be created and/or retained and 670 small businesses will be assisted.

Specific objectives were developed to address the County’s priority needs. Each objective was identified by a number and contains proposed accomplishments, the time period and annual program year numeric goals.

The following tables describe the specific objectives, including a comparison of the County’s expected number to the actual outcomes for FY 2011 – 2014. A summary of the activities and accomplishment details is reported in the County’s FY 2014 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER). The CAPER can be reviewed on DHCD’s website at:

<http://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/DHCD/Resources/PlansAndReports/Pages/default.aspx>

Decent Housing

The County considers renters with income between 0-50 percent and owners with income between 0-80 percent of the Median Family Income (MFI) a high priority and renters between 51-80 percent MFI a medium priority. These households experience more “housing problems” such as “cost burden” greater than 30 percent of the median family income and overcrowding and substandard housing conditions. The County does not address the housing needs for middle to high-income households (greater than 80 percent MFI) because it does not meet the national objective criteria described by HUD and is therefore not eligible for HUD funds (e.g., HOME, ADDI, CDBG, Section 8, etc.)

During FY 2011 - 2015, the County used its federal, state, local, and private funds for activities (e.g.,

homeowner rehabilitation loans, down payment and closing cost assistance, rental subsidies, etc.) that addressed the “unmet needs” of households identified as high priority between 51-80 percent Median Family Income. As highlighted below, the most recent Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) show:

- The County assisted 1,883 homeless and non-homeless with special needs populations, which is 59% of its 5-year goal.
- The County increased housing options for 3,221 households, which is 168 percent of its 5-year goal.
- The County helped to retain decent and affordable housing for 1,295 LMI renters and owners, which is 330 percent of its 5-year goal.

Table 1 - Summary of Specific Objectives (Affordable Housing)

Availability/Accessibility of Decent Housing (DH-1) – Homeless and Non-homeless with Special Needs							
Specific Objective		Source of Funds	Year	Performance Indicators	Expected Number	Actual Number	Percent Completed
DH1.1	Assist homeless persons to obtain permanent housing.	HOPWA, CDBG, HOME, Sect 202 Grant, HUD Predevelopment Grant, State RAD	2011	No. brought from	779	741	23%
			2012	substandard to	704	470	15%
			2013	standard condition	677	231	7%
	2014		No. qualified as	524	441	14%	
	2015		Energy Star	529		%	
Assist persons at risk of becoming homeless to obtain affordable housing.			No. occupied by elderly				
Assist persons with special needs to obtain affordable housing.			No. of units made accessible for persons w/disabilities				
			No. of households assisted				
			No. with rental assistance				
MULTI-YEAR GOAL					3213	1883	59%
Affordability of Decent Housing (DH-2) – Low to Moderate Income Renters and Owners							
Specific Objective		Source of Funds	Year	Performance Indicators	Expected Number	Actual Number	Percent Completed
DH2.1	Increase affordable housing options for low to moderate income households.	CDBG, ADDI, HOME, General Funds, Section 8	2011	No. affordable	375	615	32%
			2012	No. brought from	395	1147	60%
			2013	substandard to	345	862	45%
			2014	standard condition	395	597	31%
			2015	No. qualified as	395		%
			Energy Star				
			No. of first-time homebuyers				
			No. receiving down-payment assistance/closing cost				
MULTI-YEAR GOAL					1905	3221	168%
Sustainability of Decent Housing (DH-3) – Low to Moderate Income Renters and Owners							
Specific Objective		Source of Funds	Year	Performance Indicators	Expected Number	Actual Number	Percent Completed
DH3.1	Retain the affordable housing stock.	CDBG	2011	No. of units	125	32	8%
			2012	brought from	152	735	188%
			2013	substandard to	25	387	98%
			2014	standard condition	45	141	36%
			2015	No. qualified as	45		%
			Energy Star				
MULTI-YEAR GOAL					392	1295	330%

Source: FY 2014 CAPER

Suitable Living Environment

Public Facilities and Infrastructure

The cost of public facilities and infrastructure improvements (street resurfacing, sidewalks, sewer, community centers, health facilities, etc.) is significant for 34 LMI communities in the County, particularly those in the established communities due to the need for repairs. The goal was to leverage CDBG funds to improve and/or expand access to facilities and infrastructure to at least 149,119 residents of the County by FY 2015. To date, the County assisted 212,847 households, which is 142 percent of its 5-year goal.

Public Services

Public services address the health and safety concerns of the County's LMI and other populations such as at-risk children, youth and families, seniors and frail elderly, persons with disabilities, immigrants, homeless individuals and families, and ex-offenders re-entering to the County.

The goal was to leverage CDBG funds to support activities and programs essential to improving the quality of life for at least 54,164 residents by FY 2015. To date, the County has achieved 119 percent of its 5-year goal by providing new and/or improved services to 64,210 individuals.

Table 2 - Summary of Specific Objectives (Public Facilities and Infrastructure)

Sustainability of Suitable Living Environment (SL-3) Public Facilities and Infrastructure							
Specific Objective		Source of Funds	Year	Performance Indicators	Expected Number	Actual Number	Percent Completed
SL3.1	Improve or expand public facilities and infrastructures in areas with high concentrations of low to moderate-income.	CDBG	2011	No. of persons assisted with new or improved access to a facility or infrastructure	40,239	38,403	26 %
			2012		27,220	67,335	45%
			2013		27,220	14,107	9%
			2014		27,220	93,002	62%
			2015		27,220		%
			MULTI-YEAR GOAL				149,119
Availability/Accessibility of Suitable Living Environment (SL-1) Public Services							
Specific Objective		Source of Funds	Year	Performance Indicators	Expected Number	Actual Number	Percent Completed

SL1.1	Improve or expand needed public services for low to moderate income residents.	CDBG	2011	No. of persons assisted with new or improved access to a service	11,064	25,346	47%
			2012		10,775	10,680	20%
			2013		10,775	20,860	38%
			2014		10,775	7,324	14%
			2015		10,775		%
			MULTI-YEAR GOAL				54,164

Source: FY 2014 CAPER

Economic Opportunities

There is a need to improve the delivery of technical information and financing for small businesses and new entrepreneurs. Both small and medium sized businesses need a trained work force. Workers in the County at all income levels, particularly LMI workers, lack access to employment opportunities because they do not have the required skills. The County proposed to leverage CDBG funds to expand employment opportunities for at least 230 residents, increase affordable options for at least 343 existing and new businesses, and stabilize and expand 670 small businesses in revitalization areas by FY 2015. To date, with the use of CDBG funds, the County has created and/or retained 627 jobs, exceeding its 5-year goal, assisted 177 small businesses, representing fifty-one percent of its 5-year goal, and stabilize 342 existing and new businesses in revitalization areas.

Table 3 - Summary of Specific Objectives (Economic Development)

Availability/Accessibility of Economic Opportunity (EO-1)							
Specific Objective		Source of Funds	Year	Performance Indicators	Expected Number	Actual Number	Percent Completed
EO1.1	Expand access to employment opportunities for low to moderate-income residents.	CDBG	2011	Jobs Created or Retained: Employer-sponsored health care Type of jobs created Employment status before taking the job created	46	85	37 %
			2012		46	291	126%
			2013		46	1	0%
			2014		46	250	109%
			2015		46		%
			MULTI-YEAR GOAL				230
Affordability of Economic Opportunity (EO-2)							

Specific Objective		Source of Funds	Year	Performance Indicators	Expected Number	Actual Number	Percent Completed
EO2.1	Increase affordable options for new and existing businesses.	CDBG	2011	Businesses assisted	163	43	13 %
			2012	New and existing businesses assisted	45	29	8%
			2013		45	1	0%
			2014	DUNS number(s) of businesses assisted	45	104	30%
			2015		45		%
			MULTI-YEAR GOAL				
Sustainability of Economic Opportunity (EO-3)							
Specific Objective		Source of Funds	Year	Performance Indicators	Expected Number	Actual Number	Percent Completed
EO3.1	Support community revitalization strategies that will stabilize and expand small businesses (including micro-businesses).	CDBG	2011	Businesses assisted	142	139	21 %
			2012	New and existing businesses assisted	132	9	1%
			2013		132	0	0%
			2014	DUNS number(s) of businesses assisted	132	194	29%
			2015		132		%
			MULTI-YEAR GOAL				

Source: FY 2014 CAPER

1.3 Summary of Citizen Participation Process and Consultation Process

The DHCD facilitated a collaborative effort, consulting with County departments, community stakeholders, and beneficiaries of entitlement programs to develop the priorities and strategies contained in this Plan. As required, the DHCD utilized its Citizen Participation Plan to facilitate outreach to public and assisted housing providers, private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies, and stakeholders. The following citizen outreach and consultations were held in developing the Consolidated Plan:

- A Community Needs Survey² was conducted to solicit input from residents of Prince George's County.

² Survey results did not yield a significant representation of the County's sample size.

- Three Work Groups were established consisting of senior and management staff from various County and State agencies. These agencies provide services for planning, housing, homelessness, economic development, revitalization, community infrastructure, and public services in the County.
- DHCD conducted three Focus Groups to obtain input from non-profit organizations and local government agencies. Approximately 26 stakeholders attended.
- Nine face-to-face and phone interview consultations were conducted with stakeholders and agencies providing health services, and social service and fair housing services, including those focusing on services to children, elderly persons, persons with disabilities, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, and homeless persons.
- Two Community Forums were held to provide an introduction to the County's Five-Year Consolidated Plan, federal programs, the County's demographic profile, and to solicit input from residents, workers and stakeholders. Twenty-seven individuals attended the community forums.
- The proposed FY 2016 - 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan will be posted on the County's website, distributed to County libraries, distributed to organizations that provide services to LMI persons and areas, provided upon request, and presented at a third public hearing scheduled for April 14, 2015 at the County Administration Building hosted by the County Council located at 14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive, Upper Marlboro, MD. A comment period of no less than 30-days will be provided for citizens and other interested parties to solicit comment on the proposed Consolidated and Annual Action Plan. The 30-day comment period will begin March 19, 2015 and end April 17, 2015.

1.4 Summary of Public Comments

As required by HUD, the DHCD employed a participatory process in the development of this Consolidated Plan. Public sector stakeholders provided significant input and comments, corroborating data analysis, resulting in the identification of the following priority needs for the utilization of CDBG and HOME Program funds during the next five years:

Decent Housing

- Affordable Housing
- Accessible Housing for Disabled
- Housing Counseling
- Rehab Assistance for Homeowners

Suitable Living

- Healthcare funding for Low-Income Individuals
- Youth Services
- Job Training
- Transitional Housing for Homeless Persons
- Wrap around/support services for persons with subsidized housing
- Utilize green/sustainable building practices to help lower costs

Expand Economic Opportunities

- Grow Capacity of Non-profits
- Align resources with similar organizations and programs

Copies of the public comments and correspondence received regarding the Consolidated Plan are attached in **Appendix 7.15**.

1.5 Summary of Comments or Views Not Accepted and the Reasons for Not Accepting Them

All comments received to date have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan. Final summary comments will be included in the Appendix of the Consolidated Plan and 2016 Annual Action Plan for submission to HUD.

1.6 Summary

The federal entitlement programs (CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA) are intended to provide low to moderate income households with viable communities, including decent housing, a suitable living environment, and expanded economic opportunities. The County's FY 2016 - 2020 Consolidated Plan is the strategic plan for allocating and leveraging entitlement funds. The Plan utilizes qualitative and quantitative data gathered through citizen participation, a market analysis, and a needs assessment to identify the highest priority needs. The following goals were developed to meet high priority needs of County residents:

- Improve housing opportunities by creating and preserving affordable, accessible rental and homeowner housing in close proximity to transit, employment and public services.
- Enhance the County's economic stability and prosperity by increasing opportunities for job readiness and investing in economic development programs including capacity building in non-profit organizations.
- Strengthen neighborhoods by investing in the County's critical public facility and infrastructure needs.
- Assist individuals and families to stabilize in permanent housing after experiencing a housing crisis or homelessness by providing transitional /supportive housing and wrap around social services.
- Invest in public services that maximize impact by providing new and/or increased access to programs that serve low-moderate income families and individuals as well as special needs populations (i.e. elderly, veterans and disabled persons).
- Meet the needs of persons with special needs (i.e. HIV/AIDS and their families) through the provision of housing, health and support services.

2. Development of the Consolidated Plan

2.1 Lead and Responsible Agencies

The following are the agencies/entities responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source.

As stated, the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) is the lead agency responsible for the administration of federal entitlement programs on behalf of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) – including the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG), and the HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME). The Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG) is the only program not administered by DHCD; it is administered by the Department of Social Services. In addition to administering the programs, DHCD is responsible for the preparation of the Consolidated Plan, Annual Action Plans, and Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Reports (CAPER).

Table 4 - Responsible Agencies

Agency Role	Name	Department/Agency
Lead Agency	Prince George's County	Department of Housing and Community Development
Community Development Block Grant Administrator	Prince George's County	Department of Housing and Community Development
HOME Investment Partnerships Administrator	Prince George's County	Department of Housing and Community Development
Emergency Solutions Grant Administrator	Prince George's County	Department of Social Services

The CDBG Program is one of the longest-running programs of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, used to fund local community development activities, notably affordable housing, economic development, infrastructure, and public service. HOME is the largest program to state and local governments designed to create affordable housing for low-income households, expand the capacity of non-profit housing providers, strengthen the ability of state and local governments to provide housing, and leverage private sector participation in housing projects. ESG supports outreach to and shelters for homeless individuals and families as well as provide supportive programs that prevent homelessness.

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

Questions or comments regarding the FY 2016 - 2020 Consolidated Plan and/or the 2016 Annual Action Plan may be directed to:

Ms. Estella Alexander, Deputy Director

Prince George's County – Department of Housing and Community Development

9200 Basil Court, Suite 500

Largo, MD 20774

(301) 883-5531, Ealexander@co.pg.md.us

2.2 Consultation

Overview

The DHCD launched a comprehensive and collaborative effort to consult with County departments, community stakeholders, and beneficiaries of entitlement programs to inform and develop the priorities and strategies contained within this FY 2016 - 2020 Consolidated Plan. The County utilized its Citizen Participation Plan to facilitate outreach to public and assisted housing providers, private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies, and stakeholders that utilize funding for eligible activities, projects and programs. As explained below, the DHCD “comprehensive” engagement of stakeholders in developing this Five-Year Consolidated Plan consisted of: (1) administering a community needs survey; (2) establishing three Work Groups (Affordable Housing, Economic Development and Quality of Life); (3) convening of three Community Forums; and (4) agency consultations. As required, a Public Hearing will be held prior to approval of the Consolidated Plan. Last, to examine the needs of the homeless and at-risk populations, the DHCD coordinated with Continuum of Care service providers to address the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans, and unaccompanied youth) and persons at risk of homelessness. Each of the aforementioned consultation methods is described in detail under Section 2.3 Citizen Participation Plan.

- **Community Needs Survey³**

- **Work Groups**

The Prince George’s County Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) commenced the process of updating its Five-Year Consolidated Plan by establishing three Work Groups: Affordable Housing, Economic Development, and Quality of Life. Each group was composed of senior and management staff from various County and State agencies. These agencies provide services for planning, housing, homelessness, economic development, revitalization, community infrastructure, and public services in the County.

- **Focus Groups**

As required by HUD and supplementing the Work Group deliberations, DHCD conducted three Needs Assessment Focus Groups to obtain input from non-profit organizations and local government agencies.

- **Consultations**

Face-to-face and phone interviews were conducted with nine stakeholders listed below and agencies providing health services and social and fair housing services, including those focusing on services to children, elderly persons, persons with disabilities, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, and homeless persons.

1. Department of Social Services
2. Homeless Services Partnership – Continuum of Care
3. Housing Authority of Prince George’s County
4. Greater Washington Urban League, Inc.
5. Family Crisis Center

³ Survey results did not yield a significant representation of the County’s sample size.

6. Department of Family Services – ADA Coordinator
7. Department of Family Services – Aging Services Division
8. Prince George’s County Health Department – Division of Environmental Health
9. Human Relations Commission

▪ **Community Forums/Public Hearings**

Three Consolidated Plan Community Forums were conducted to provide an introduction to the County’s Five-Year Consolidated Plan and federal programs, the County’s demographic profile, and to solicit input from residents, workers, and stakeholders.

Describe coordination with the Continuum of Care and efforts to address the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans, and unaccompanied youth) and persons at risk of homelessness

Prince George’s County’s Continuum of Care (CoC) has more than 100 partners comprised of public, private, non-profit, faith and citizen representatives. Its services are provided through a combination of street outreach, prevention, diversion, rapid re-housing, hypothermia and emergency shelter, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing and permanent housing interventions. All CoC services are coordinated through a central intake system (the “Homeless Hotline”) which is accessible 24 hours, 7 days a week, and 365 days a year.⁴

In 1994, the Homeless Advisory Board was renamed the Homeless Services Partnership (HSP) and became the official advisory body to the County Executive. HSP’s primary purpose is to identify gaps in homeless services, establish funding priorities, and pursue an overall systematic approach to address homelessness. HSP is responsible for implementing the County’s Ten Year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness (2012 – 2021), which began in Prince George’s County’s Fiscal Year 2013.⁵

The County’s Ten Year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness is based upon six core strategies:

1. Coordinated entry;
2. Prevention assistance;
3. Shelter diversion;
4. Rapid re-housing;
5. Permanent supportive housing; and
6. Improved data and outcome measures.

The Plan also addresses housing for the County’s special needs populations including the chronically homeless, unaccompanied homeless youth, veterans, and domestic violence survivors, as well as incorporating the 2009 federal legislation in the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act.

⁴ Homelessness in Metropolitan Washington: Results and Analysis from the 2014 Point-in-Time Count of Homeless Persons in the Metropolitan Washington Region

⁵ Ending Homelessness Together: A Summary of Ten Year Plans to End Homelessness in the Metropolitan Washington Region, 2014

Describe consultation with the Continuum of Care that serves the jurisdiction’s area in determining how to allocate ESG funds, develop performance standards and evaluate outcomes, and develop funding, policies and procedures for the administration of HMIS.

The Prince George’s County Continuum of Care (CoC) for homeless persons is coordinated through the County’s Homeless Services Partnership (HSP); a coalition of more than 100 organizations inclusive of representation from the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) and the Housing Authority of Prince George’s County (HAPGC) that meets monthly and works collaboratively to establish strategic priorities, assess progress, and oversee full implementation of the County’s Plan to prevent and end homelessness. The HSP serves as the County Executive’s advisory board on homelessness and is responsible for needs assessments, gaps analysis, service coordination, resource development, policies and procedures for access, data collection (HMIS) and system performance evaluation of all homeless services.

DHCD frequently presents at HSP meetings and solicits feedback and guidance from its membership regarding County housing priorities, including but not limited to: the development and implementation of the 5 year Consolidated Plan, annual ESG allocations, home ownership and other housing grant opportunities, Family Unification Program (FUP) and other subsidized voucher policies, and predatory lending practices. In addition, as a member of the HSP, DHCD actively participated in development of the County’s 10-year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness and is currently involved in year 3 of implementation. The strategies are carefully designed to achieve purposeful and intentional reduction in the incidents of homelessness and collectively they form a plan that aligns County efforts with federal goals, shifts system focus from “shelter” to “housing”, prioritizes programming for special populations, enhances system accountability, builds on current success, and provides new flexibility and opportunity. Funding priorities for on-going services are determined using several factors: (1) Priority areas identified in the County’s Ten Year Plan, (2) Alignment with the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) and ESG regulations, (3) Level of need documented in HMIS (annual CAPER report), and (4) Funds currently available for similarly situated activities.

Policies, procedures, and performance measurements used by the County in the administration of ESG and other housing program activities impacting the effort to prevent and end homelessness have been developed by DHCD in partnership with the HSP and the local Department of Social Services (PGCDSS.) PGCDSS serves as the Lead Administering Agency for the CoC to ensure alignment with the County’s 10-Year Plan and Section 427 of the McKinney-Vento Act as amended by the HEARTH Act. Performance measures are universal across all members of the Continuum of Care, thereby ensuring that all members are working toward the same goals. Different program types (i.e. ES, TH, RRH, and Outreach) have different performance benchmarks but the goals for all programs are the same and are informed by HUD identified system performance measures. All efforts are routinely coordinated and reviewed to ensure:

1. Consistent evaluation of individual and family eligibility for assistance in accordance with the definitions of homeless and at risk of homelessness (24 C.F.R. § 576.2) as well as with recordkeeping requirements;
2. Coordinated and integrated service delivery among all impacted providers;
3. Clear and distinct eligibility requirements in place for homelessness prevention versus rapid re-housing assistance;
4. Single mechanism for prioritizing applicants who are eligible for assistance;

5. Matrix that identifies what percentage and / or amount (or range thereof) each participant must pay, if any, while receiving assistance, how long a single participant may receive assistance (including maximum number of months or times a participant may receive assistance), and adjustments in percentage and / or amount (or range thereof) the participant must pay (including the maximum amount of assistance a participant may receive), if any; and
6. Compliance with all rules and regulations.

Finally, PGCDSS serves as the County's HMIS Lead Agency and is responsible for hosting and maintaining all HMIS data, ensuring data quality, reporting, training, technical user support, custom report design, and other HMIS data activities. The HMIS Policy and Procedures Manual cover general operational protocols and privacy, security and data quality; and policies are updated annually by the HMIS lead. Significant changes are discussed with the CoC membership during regular plenary sessions and implemented uniformly system-wide.

2. Describe Agencies, groups, organizations and others who participated in the process and describe the jurisdictions consultations with housing, social service agencies and other entities.

(Please see Appendix 7.1, Exhibit 1 - Agencies, Groups and Organizations who Participated).

Identify any Agency Types not consulted and provide rationale for not consulting –

The DHCD was inclusive in conducting extensive outreach to local/regional/state agencies and non-profit community stakeholders.

Other local/regional/state/federal planning efforts considered when preparing the Plan

In addition to the focus groups, community forums, and consultations, the County considered various planning efforts. *(Please see Appendix 7.2, Exhibit 2 - Other Local/Regional/Federal Planning Efforts).*

Describe cooperation and coordination with other public entities, including the State and any adjacent units of general local government, in the implementation of the Consolidated Plan (91.215(l))

The County was very instrumental in involving all agencies and other stakeholders in assessing the County's needs and informing the public at all stages of the Consolidated Plan. In order to create opportunities for strategic planning, the County will continue to coordinate with local, regional, state and federal partners.

2.3 Citizen Participation

1. Summary of citizen participation process/Efforts made to broaden citizen participation Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting

HUD requires entitlement jurisdictions to provide for citizen participation in developing the Consolidated Plan. The County's citizen participation process plan is largely centered on community forums, public hearings, and public comment periods.

Focus Group Sessions

DHCD conducted three Needs Assessment Focus Groups to obtain input from non-profit organizations, municipalities, and County government agencies on the Five-Year Consolidated Plan. Special invitations were sent based upon the type of service provided in the areas of: Affordable Housing, Economic Development and Quality of Life. Approximately 26 stakeholders attended, and the focus groups were held at 1801 McCormick Drive, Largo, MD, on the following days:

- Affordable Housing – January 7, 2015 from 10:00 am to 12:30 pm
- Economic Development – January 7, 2015 from 2:00 pm to 4:30 pm
- Quality of Life – January 8, 2015 from 10:00 am to 12:30 pm

The focus groups engaged the stakeholders through an introductory presentation on the Consolidated Plan, how it functions, and its impact on the County. In addition, an overview of the County's demographic profile of housing and workforce trends, economic development, and community development needs collected by the County's Work Group partners was presented.

The presentation was followed by a series of facilitated breakout groups where participants discussed community needs and participated in an open-ended dialogue.

The focus groups concluded that there is a strong need for the following, but not limited to: accessible housing for disabled, rehabilitation assistance for homeowners, housing counseling, wrap around/support services, set aside funds for LMI housing, job training, capacity building for non-profits, senior services, healthcare for low income individuals, health services for veterans, and youth services. A complete summary will be provided in the appendix of the final Consolidated Plan. The interactive format of the focus group solicited strong participation. Each focus group session concluded with the announcement of upcoming Consolidated Plan meetings and next steps as opportunities to hear about the results and to further participate in the process.

Public Hearing/Community Forums

To encourage citizen participation in the consolidated planning process, the County holds at least two public hearings (informal and formal) each year. The public hearings provide an opportunity for all Prince George's County residents, non-profit organizations, and other community stakeholders to communicate their views and needs to the County.

The first public hearing was held on January 27, 2015 at the Hyattsville Public Library located at 6530 Adelphi Road, Hyattsville, MD from 6:00 pm to 8:30 pm to solicit public comments on the FY 2016 - 2020

Consolidated Plan process and the 2016 Annual Action Plan. A second public hearing was held on January 30, 2015 at the Wayne Curry Sports and Learning Complex located at 8001 Sheriff Road, Landover, MD from 6:00 pm to 8:30 pm. Approximately 27 individuals attended the informal public hearings. Public comment was encouraged at the previously listed hearings or could be submitted in writing to lbmurphy@co.pg.md.us. A summary of all public comments will be included in the final Consolidated Plan, along with the County's response to the comments, if any.

Public notices were published at least 14 days prior to the public hearings in three local newspapers, Enquirer Gazette, Prince George's Post, and The Sentinel. A Spanish version of the public notice was also posted on the Prince George's County Department of Housing and Community Development's website.

In addition to the public notices published in three local newspapers, over 500 email notifications were sent to the County's network of service delivery providers inviting them to attend. Those included network providers that provide services to LMI persons, minorities, non-English speaking persons and persons with disabilities.

The proposed FY 2016 - 2020 Consolidated Plan and 2016 Annual Action Plan will be posted on the County's website, distributed to organizations that provide services to LMI persons and areas, provided upon request, and presented at a third public hearing to be held April 14, 2015 at the County Administration Building hosted by the County Council located at 14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive, Upper Marlboro, MD. A comment period of no less than 30-days will be provided for citizens and other interested parties to solicit comments on the proposed Consolidated and Annual Action Plans. The 30-day comment period will begin March 19, 2015 and end April 17, 2015. Prior to submitting the final Consolidated and Annual Action Plans to HUD, the County will give consideration, incorporate necessary changes and, if appropriate, provide responses to the comments received during the public comment period.

During the Community Forums it was expressed that there is a need for the following: affordable housing for homeless, specifically single mothers with children; affordable childcare; jobs; financial assistance for elderly to maintain ownership of home; quality housing stock for LMI persons; reexamination of process for selecting developers; de-concentration of the poor within certain areas; foreclosure prevention; and services and affordable housing for the re-entry population.

Technical Assistance

Prince George's County makes technical assistance available to participating municipalities, nonprofit organizations, community groups, special interest groups and citizens developing proposals for Community Development Block Grant funding. DHCD's Community Planning and Development Division (CPD) can assist with needs identification, proposal concept development, budget development, general project and financial management. Technical assistance can be arranged by contacting CPD at (301) 883-5540.

In 2014, seven technical assistance sessions and workshops were held for the FY 2014 - 2015 grant cycle:

- One-on-one Technical Assistance – August 20, 2014
- One-on-one Technical Assistance – September 16, 2014
- One-on-one Technical Assistance – September 18, 2014

- One-on-one Technical Assistance – September 30, 2014
- Notice of Funding Availability Workshop – October 1, 2014
- 2 Sub-recipient Workshops – November 14, 2014

Citizen Participation Outreach

Exhibit 3 illustrates the outreach activities the County undertook to ensure maximum citizen participation in the process. *(Please see Appendix 7.3, Exhibit 3 – Citizen Participation Outreach).*

FY 2016 – 2020 Citizen Participation Plan

The Prince George’s County “Citizen Participation Plan” is a mechanism for managing the development of the County’s Consolidated Plan, Annual Action Plan (AAP) and the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER). Residents, nonprofit organizations, municipalities, and County agencies express their concerns, seek additional County resources and provide suggestions or solutions to address housing and community development needs.

The primary goals for the citizen participation process are:

- To solicit viewpoints and concerns affected by the Consolidated Plan, Annual Action Plan or Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report;
- To invite participation by persons interested in helping identify needs and development applicable strategies;
- To collect data that accurately describes and quantifies housing and community development needs and to suggest workable solutions; and
- To obtain comments on proposals for allocating resources.

The County ensures citizens have an opportunity to participate throughout the planning process.

Public Notice and Availability

Prince George’s County publishes in one or more newspapers a summary of the proposed Consolidated Plan, Annual Action Plan, and Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report for public comment. The summary describes the context and purpose of these documents, and sites the locations where copies of the entire document may be examined. Copies are available at government offices, libraries, on the County’s website, and by mail upon request.

A reasonable number of free copies of the proposed Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan and the draft of the CAPER are made available for citizens and groups of interest upon request. When proposed versions of the Consolidated Plan are released for comment, they are made available for comment for not less than 30 days. The draft CAPER is available for not less than 15 days before submission to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

The final or amended Consolidated Plan, Annual Action Plan, and Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report is distributed upon request and to those actively involved in developing these documents. Copies are provided to the local libraries and posted on the County’s website.

Access to Records

A list of all projects using CDBG, HOME, ESG, and HOPWA funds is made available upon request. This list includes the sub-recipient's name, allocation amount, a brief description of the activity, and the fiscal year in which the funds were distributed. DHCD maintains records and reports on all activities financed, and upon request, makes these materials available to the public.

Technical Assistance

Prince George's County makes technical assistance available to participating municipalities, non-profits, community groups, special interest groups and to citizens developing proposals for CDBG funding. The Community Planning Development Division and the Housing Development Division can assist with needs identification, proposal concept development, budget development and general program questions by contacting the DHCD at (301) 883-5540.

Public Hearing

Prince George's County holds at least two public hearings on the Consolidated Plan and the Annual Action Plan. DHCD sponsors an informal public hearing, the Housing and Community Development Needs Community Forum, at the beginning of the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan development process. The Forum gives citizens an opportunity to identify and describe needs for consideration, and to provide the scope, urgency and financing requirements for proposals to address those needs. The County Council schedules the second, formal public hearing at the time a proposed Plan is transmitted from the County Executive to them for consideration and adoption.

The time, date, location and subject of the hearings are announced in newspapers of general circulation within the County, notifying the public no less than fourteen (14) days before the hearing. Hearings are held at handicap-accessible sites, convenient to potential and actual beneficiaries. The advertisements include TTY phone numbers so hearing-impaired people can arrange for interpreters at the hearing. Those who need sign language interpretation are requested to contact the Community Planning and Development Division and the Housing Development Division at the phone number in the notice. Non-English speakers can also make arrangements for language translation provided courtesy of a CDBG-supported, nonprofit organization. Interpreted comments are incorporated within the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan as appropriate.

The public notices include instructions on how to receive a free copy of the proposed, final, or amended Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan. A minimum of 30 days is provided for comments on each Plan before submission to HUD.

Comments and Complaints

Comments and complaints regarding the Consolidated Plan, Annual Action Plan, or Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report are accepted through all stages of document preparation until the closing of the formal comment period. Written complaints and comments are referred to the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD). DHCD responds to written complaints within 30 days.

Criteria for Amendments to a Plan

Prince George’s County revises and submits to HUD, amendments to the final Consolidated Plan or Annual Action Plan whenever a “substantial change” is planned or actual activities require such an amendment. Revised or amended Plans are made available for public comment and the same public notice and 30-day public comment period observed as required under this Citizen Participation Plan. The County Council shall hold a public hearing for public input on any substantial revision or amendment to the Plans, and approve the amendment by resolution pursuant to Section 15A-106 of the County Code.

The Prince George’s County Consolidated Plan or Annual Action Plan is only amended for a “substantial change” whenever it makes the following decisions:

- A change in the allocation priorities or a change in the method of distribution of funds;
- The addition of an eligible activity not originally funded or described in the Annual Action Plan;
- A change in the location, description, regulatory reference, national objective citation, and status of an activity originally described in the Annual Action Plan;
- A change in the use of CDBG, Program Income, or ESG funds, exceeding at least \$250,000 from one existing activity to another existing eligible activity in any category within the applicable Program. All activities must have been in an approved Annual Action Plan. The CDBG categories include Affordable Housing, Economic Development, Public Facilities and Infrastructure Improvements, Public Services and Planning and Administration. The ESG categories include Emergency Shelter, Street Outreach, HMIS, Rapid-Rehousing, Homeless Prevention and Administration; and
- A change in the proposed uses of HUD 108 Loan Guarantee and Section 108 Program Income.

Non-Substantial Amendments for CDBG, Program Income and ESG Reprogramming Authorized

The County authorizes a “non-substantial amendment” process for CDBG, Program Income and ESG through the County Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) subject to the process, below, when there is a change in the use of CDBG, Program Income and ESG entitlement funds less than a total of \$250,000 in the County’s fiscal year [July 1 – June 30], from one existing activity to another existing eligible activity in any category within the applicable program.

Process to Identify Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds for Reprogramming:

The CDBG categories eligible to reprogram funds include Affordable Housing, Economic Development, Public Facilities and Infrastructure Improvements, Public Services, and Planning and Administration. The identification of funds for the purpose of reprogramming includes the following:

- **Voluntary Reprogrammed Funds:** Voluntary reprogramming represents those CDBG funds acquired when the sub-recipient has completed the originally funded activity and the DHCD staff has closed the activity in the HUD Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS). DHCD will take actions pertaining to voluntary reprogramming subject to a sub-recipient’s request and/or recommendation. However, when the eligible activity is completed and closed with a remaining balance,

this represents funds available for another approved eligible activity. A sub-recipient is not permitted to maintain any portion or a remaining balance for a completed and closed activity.

Under the voluntary reprogramming, the sub-recipient provides written notification to DHCD stating: 1) the project is complete and provides closeout documentation, as required; 2) the remaining balance dollar amount; and 3) a recommendation to reprogram the remaining balance into the CDBG Program to another eligible activity.

- **Involuntary Reprogrammed Funds:** Involuntary reprogramming represents when a CDBG activity is generally flagged as “At Risk”, under the HUD IDIS system, when the activity has required no draw down of funds for a year or more. The DHCD will take actions pertaining to involuntary reprogramming subject to the specific circumstances that are consistent with HUD’s IDIS system, which is used to provide administrative oversight of each entitlement jurisdiction.

In the case of involuntary reprogramming, the DHCD will issue a written letter specifying a sixty (60) calendar day intensive technical assistance period to the sub-recipient with a copy to the Prince George’s County Council. If the intense technical assistance period does not address the deficiency, DHCD will issue a written letter to the sub-recipient stating that funds will be reprogrammed, thirty (30) calendar days from the date of the letter based on the aforementioned “At Risk” condition subject to approval of the Prince George’s County Council.

- **Program Income:** Program Income (PI) is defined as the gross income received by the grantee and its sub-recipient directly generated from the use of CDBG funds pursuant to 24 C.F.R. § 570.504. As required, the DHCD’s Annual Action Plan lists anticipated CDBG program income each year. As program income is received, it is applied to an eligible and funded sub-recipient activity, resulting in “available” entitlement funds. The application of program income does not affect a sub-recipient’s original allocation award.

Criteria for Eligible CDBG Activities to Receive Reprogramming Funds:

County approved CDBG activities in prior program years that are eligible to receive reprogrammed funds include Affordable Housing, Economic Development, and Public Facilities and Infrastructure Improvements, Public Services, and Planning and Administration.

These activities must meet one or more of the following conditions:

- 1) must have submitted an application and received an approved funding allocation in a previously approved Annual Action Plan;
- 2) demonstrates evidence of a need for additional CDBG funding;
- 3) have a HUD approved environmental review on file;
- 3) show evidence of being ready to proceed in a timely manner;

- 4) DHCD agrees that the activity meets a **priority** in the approved 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan; or
- 5) DHCD had determined that the recommended activity and sub-recipient demonstrates the ability to expend funds in a timely manner.

Timeframe for Reprogramming

The DHCD may exercise its right to reprogram voluntary and involuntary CDBG, ESG and Program Income funds each during the County fiscal year (July 1 – June 30). These reprogrammed funds will be reported by DHCD in the annual CAPER submitted to HUD.

Reprogramming Notification and Approval Process

DHCD shall place a notice pertaining to the proposed allocations of reprogrammed funds on the DHCD/County's website at least thirty (30) calendar days prior to the proposed actions to be executed by the Director pertaining to reprogrammed funds. The notice shall contain information regarding the proposed reprogramming, including total amount, opportunity to comment and subject to County Council approval.

DHCD shall provide written notification thirty (30) calendar days prior to the proposed actions to be executed by the Director pertaining to reprogrammed funds to the Prince George's County Council, except when the County Council is in recess in August and December, including:

- Identification of where reprogramming funds are transferred from, specifically the program year, sub-recipient's name, project title, remaining balance amount, and the summation of facts pertaining to the DHCD action (i.e. voluntary or involuntary reprogrammed funds or program income).
- Identification of where reprogrammed funds will be transferred to, specifically, the program year, the sub-recipient's name, project title, scope, location, budget, term of performance and amount of reprogrammed funds.

DHCD shall timely provide any public comments or referrals received in response to the proposed reprogramming to the County Council prior to the expiration of the thirty (30) review period.

The County Council shall provide written notification to DHCD prior to the expiration of the thirty (30) calendar days whether the Council approves, disapproves or amends the reprogrammed funds. Failure by the County Council to provide the written notification within the thirty (30) calendar day time period shall be deemed an approval of the proposed reprogramming.

DHCD shall provide written notification of all final actions executed by the Director pertaining to reprogrammed funds to the Prince George's County Council and HUD. In all cases, DHCD shall place a notice pertaining to the final allocations of reprogrammed funds in three (3) local newspapers and update the DHCD/County's website.

Adoption of the Citizen Participation Plan

Prince George's County makes the Citizen Participation Plan available for public comment for 30 days in conjunction with the distribution of the Consolidated Plan. The Citizen Participation Plan is adopted along with the Consolidated Plan of which it is a part.

Countywide Public Meeting

Public meetings are held to provide information on the Consolidated Plan and to solicit feedback on the data analysis and ideas conceived by the focus groups. The County Council will hold two public hearings, one to obtain comments on the draft document and one to obtain final comments prior to the adoption of the Plan. Summaries of comments received during the development and completion of the Consolidated Plan will be attached.

Public Notices

Flyer and meeting invitations are sent to participants for focus group meetings. Flyers, email announcements, and advertisements in local newspapers are used to advertise the community-wide meetings. Also, DHCD advertises the Consolidated Plan activities on its website, cable television and through radio interview. Notices are posted in all County libraries and community centers.

3. Prince George’s County Perspective & TNI

Prince George’s County is strategically located within the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan region, which is home to 5.6 million residents and 3.9 million jobs. With an estimated population of 873,481 in 2013,⁶ Prince George’s County is the third most populous jurisdiction in the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan region following Fairfax County, Virginia and neighboring Montgomery County. The County’s population is forecasted to grow by approximately 99,455 residents to 972,936 by 2035.⁷

The County’s forecast of future population characteristics is best defined by age, diversity, and households. Census data further show that communities in the County most affected by the severe housing problems are concentrated near the boundaries with the District of Columbia. Six of them have been identified as having the worst conditions, and targeted in the County Executive’s Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative (TNI).

Age

The population in Prince George’s County is relatively young; the median age increased from 33.3 years in 2000 to 34.9 years in 2010; which is significantly lower than the national median of 37.2 years (2010 US Census). Between 2000 and 2010 the County also witnessed noticeable growth of the populations between the ages of 15 and 29; this age group is commonly referred to as the Millennial Generation. It steadily continued to grow and increased from 122,177 in 2000 to 202,763 in 2010. This matters because the housing preferences of the millennial will—as did those of the Baby Boomers before them—likely drive the future housing market. Based on forecasted demand, the most important future housing needs of this generation are related to affordability, unit size, layout, access to transit and amenities, accessibility, and walkability.

Between 2000 and 2010, the 55 to 64 age group, referred to as the Baby Boomer generation, grew by approximately 30,000 (36%). This was more than any other age group in the County. Forecasts indicate that over the next ten years seniors aged 65 years and older will account for the largest population gains in the County. An aging population will influence the future housing market. Recent trends show that they will demand opportunities to age-in-place and reside in communities offering smaller, lower-maintenance housing options in walkable and transit-accessible locations.

Diversity

The population in Prince George’s County is racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse. In 2010, 64% of County residents were African American, 15% were Hispanic or Latino, and 5 % were Asian. The fastest growing group is the County’s Hispanic population which increased by 126% between 2000 and 2010. It is anticipated that the growing population trend of Hispanics and Latinos and Asians will continue.

Households

There were 304,042 households in Prince George’s County in 2010. The median household income for Prince George’s County is higher than the nation’s, but continues to be outpaced by the region.

⁶ U. S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 American Community Survey, 5-year estimate

⁷ Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) Round 8.1 forecast

Housing Conditions

There were 329,855 housing units in the County in 2010; 67% were single-family. The proportions of housing units in the County that was owner-occupied or renter-occupied remained consistent between 2000 and 2010 with close to two thirds of the County's housing stock being owner-occupied. Currently, 7.6% of the housing units in the County representing almost 25,000 are vacant. Between 2002 and 2010 more than 65% of new housing completions in the County were single-family homes located outside the Beltway.

Forecasts show that the Millennial generation will drive the multi-family housing market and over the next 10 to 15 years they will likely transition from rental to affordable homeowner opportunities.


Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative (TNI)

The Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative (TNI) is an effort by the County to focus on uplifting six neighborhoods in the County that face significant economic, health, public safety and educational challenges. The neighborhoods are presented in the map at Figure 1. They include: Langley Park, East Riverdale/Bladensburg, Kentland/Palmer Park, Suitland/Coral Hills, Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights, and Glassmanor/Oxon Hill.

The County has determined that conditions in these communities have severe conditions that require a variety of policies and targeted responses in order to concurrently address the challenges and achieve the desired improvements. Recent trends show that even though the County, on an ongoing basis, invests in community improvements, the challenges continue to exist. One likely reason is that programs have been implemented Countywide on a piecemeal basis. The TNI concept echoes the interconnection between housing and the wide range of community indicators, hence the need to align departments and agencies efforts, focus resources, and maintain organizational efficiency.

Through the TNI initiative, the County aims to target resources to reduce violent and property crime, improve 3rd and 5th grade reading and math scores, reduce school absentee rates, increase income levels for residents, reduce foreclosure rates, decentralize Housing Choice Voucher residents, reduce residents on public assistance, and reduce pedestrian fatalities and injuries. Ultimately the vision is to establish a thriving economy, great schools, and safe neighborhoods with quality healthcare. Demographic and housing conditions in the TNI communities are presented as a separate document in the Appendix.

Figure 1 – Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative Sites



4. Housing Needs Assessment

4.1 Needs Assessment Overview

A thorough needs assessment is critical for an effective plan to address housing and related challenges in the County. Due to various demographic and economic factors and trends, several residents of Prince George's County currently experience challenges due to high unemployment rates, low incomes and poverty, low housing quality, overcrowding, homelessness, disabilities, and aging. Many of them struggle to pay for housing and related expenses. Even though housing affordability and quality of life challenges in the County mostly affect renter households, there are also thousands of owner households affected. In many cases, especially those involving low and very low income households, veterans, and the elderly, the challenges are severe and require immediate and urgent responses.

Overall, the households with the greatest need are mostly concentrated in the older established communities located inside the Capital Beltway and bordering the District of Columbia. These communities include: Langley Park, Brentwood, Seat Pleasant, Bladensburg, District Heights, Forest Heights, and Landover. Black/African American and Hispanic households have a disproportionately greater need because a large majority of them are affected by the housing and economic challenges, and also live in the oldest communities with low quality amenities and services. For many households, the challenges are severe due to the number of people affected and severity of poverty, unemployment, and disability. The Black/African American households are mostly located in communities such as Seat Pleasant, District Heights, Landover, and Forest Heights; the Hispanic households are mostly concentrated in Langley Park, Bladensburg, University Park, and parts of Brentwood. This Plan will emphasize and prioritize the needs of these households and communities as well as others with similar conditions.

Current trends in population growth and forecasts show that the population and households in the County are growing. At the same time, the numbers of households with incomes at or below the poverty level are growing by the thousands. Census data show that many of the households affected by these conditions include children, the elderly, veterans, and people with disabilities. The continued substantial growth in population and households living in poverty implies that, in the absence of strategies to bring about significant improvements in educational attainment, job skills, potential for high-wage employment, and earning capacity, economic conditions of many residents will remain poor. The result will be large numbers of residents struggling to afford decent housing, many households living in substandard housing in overcrowded conditions, and many communities lacking quality amenities and services.

Prince George's County continues to be highly affected by the foreclosure crisis. In total, almost a quarter of all foreclosure events in the state of Maryland occurred in the County, and many of the zip codes classified to be foreclosure hot spots are located in the County, within the communities with the most severe housing and economic development challenges.

Current census data show that 10% of the County population 16 years and older have a disability, and a significant percentage of them are not in the labor force. In addition, residents with disabilities generally have lower educational attainment than the general population, and are likely to have incomes below the poverty level. Because of these conditions, many residents with disabilities therefore have disproportionately greater need for affordable and suitably designed and located housing.

In addition to their lower incomes, thousands of the growing senior population have disabilities such as, cognitive, hearing, vision, and ambulatory. Many also have self-care and independent living difficulty. These conditions affect their quality of life. The growing numbers that choose to live with family require resources to modify their homes and support their caregivers, among other things, while those living alone require assistance for quality housing, healthcare, transportation, leisure, etc. to help them live independently.

4.2 Housing Needs Assessment

Population and Demographic Overview

Growth of Population and Households in Prince George's

The population of Prince George's County continues to increase. According to the 2007-2011 U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS), there were 790,931 residents in the County, reflecting a 7% increase from 2000. The current 2009-2013 ACS shows the County population is 873,481, reflecting an 82,550 (10.4%) increase between the two surveys. Forecasts show that the County's population will increase by 99,455 (11.4%) to 972,936 by 2035,⁸ implying that the County's population is on track to grow at a faster rate than in the recent past.

Concurrent to the increase in population in the County, the number of households has also increased by 10,231 (4%), from 266,866 to 277,097, between 2000 and 2011.⁹ Currently (2009-2013 ACS), there are 303,441 households in the County, reflecting a 9.5% increase from 2011.

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) forecasts show that the number of households will increase by 66,703 (21.9%) to 370,144 by 2035. The on-going substantial increase in population and households implies that large numbers of additional suitable and affordable housing units will be required to meet the critical mounting demand in the County.

Table 5 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

Demographics	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2011	Percent Change
Population	738,432	790,931	7%
Households	266,866	277,097	4%
Median Income	\$55,256.00	\$73,447.00	33%

Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2007-2011 ACS (Most Recent Year)

⁸ Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) Round 8.1 forecast. The forecast is critical to effective policy making and planning for the County's future growth. Forecasts provide reasonable estimates of future growth, components, and characteristics to: engage stakeholders in analysis and discussion about issues related to growth; prepare long range plans; guide preparation of comprehensive plans; provide other agencies, businesses and market researchers forecast data for their planning work; provide a basis for monitoring growth; and, better understand the forces influencing growth in order to more effectively respond to unexpected change.

⁹ Census data indicates that increases in population and household size occurred in other jurisdictions in the Washington Metro area. For example, the population in Washington, D.C. increased by 45,937 (8%) and households by 20,332 (8%). Also, the population and households in Montgomery County increased by 13% and 11%, respectively.

Other Demographic Changes Occurring Between 2000 and 2011

The following additional significant demographic changes occurred during the period 2000 and 2011: ACS data show that the median age in the County increased from 33.3 to 35.1, meaning overall, the population is comprised of older people. The senior population (65 years and over) increased by 2.1% from 61,952 in 2000 to 85,627 in 2011. There was a large increase in the Hispanic/Latino population, from 57,057 in 2000 representing 7.1% of the total population, to 132,496 in 2011, representing 15.2%. While the Hispanic/Latino population was growing, the White population was declining from 216,729, representing 27% of the total in 2000, to 189,580 representing 21.8% in 2011. The Black/African American population increased by 58,151 (1.7 percentage points) during the period.

Thousands of Residents Live in Poverty

The median household income in the County rose by 33% from \$55,256 in 2000 to \$73,447 in 2011.¹⁰ During the period, the median household income for other jurisdictions in the Washington, D.C. area increased significantly as well. For example, it increased by 56% from \$39,827 to \$62,214 in Washington, D.C., 59% from \$71,544 to \$114,098 in Montgomery County, and 58% from \$62,830 to \$99,533 in Arlington County, Virginia.

However, current ACS data show that household incomes in the County remained stagnant between 2011 and 2013. Even though the median household income in the County is significant compared to some jurisdictions in the state and the nation, the current (2009-2013 ACS) census data show that as many as 80,142 (9.4%) of the population in the County have incomes below the poverty level. As the following map (Figure 4) shows, the highest percentages of families with incomes below poverty level are located in the old established communities bordering the District of Columbia and inside the Capital Beltway.

Figure 2 – Median Household Income & Poverty Level






Figure 3 – Comparison: Poverty Level



¹⁰ U.S. Census Bureau, ACS, 3-year estimates

Figure 4 – Poverty Status of Families in Prince George’s County



Number of Households Table

Table 6 - Total Households Table

Households	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	>80- 100% HAMFI	>100% HAMFI
Total Households *	32,445	37,479	32,795	34,087	140,343
Small Family Households *	10,303	16,278	13,769	14,159	75,033
Large Family Households *	2,574	4,148	3,611	3,447	14,047
Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age	5,480	6,309	5,091	5,677	25,221
Household contains at least one person age 75 or older	4,341	3,587	2,303	1,927	7,587
Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger *	6,046	9,014	6,831	5,805	14,717

* the highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI

Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

The 2007-2011 CHAS data presented in Table 6 above demonstrate the types of households and incidence of poverty in the County. It shows that 136,806 (49.4%) of the households in the County have incomes at 100% or lower than HAMFI; 102,719 (37%) have incomes less than or equal to 80% of HAMFI, and as many as 69,924 (25.2%) have incomes 50% or lower than HAMFI.

Low Income Households Include Children and the Elderly

Several thousand (62,411 or 22.5%) low and very low income households include vulnerable people, such as the elderly and children 22,557 (16.5%) of the households with incomes 100% or less of HAMFI and include at least one person age 62-74 years. Also, households with incomes 100% or less of HAMFI (12,158 or 8.9%) include at least one person age 75 or older, and 20.2% include one or more children 6 years old or younger.

Housing Needs

Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed needs)

The section below examines the housing needs of the County’s LMI populations based on the following criteria: (A) general housing conditions; (B) severe housing conditions; (C) housing cost burdens for renters and homeowners at various income levels; (D) overcrowding conditions; and (E) housing needs of the County’s at-risk, homeless, veterans, disabled, and elderly populations.

A. General Housing Conditions

The 2007 - 2011 CHAS data below show the numbers and percentages of low income households that are experiencing substandard housing, overcrowding, and housing cost burden. To simplify the discussion, a summary of the table is presented below.

The table below is a summary of the CHAS data (***Please see Appendix 7.4 for Exhibit 4 – Housing Problems Table***) and shows that thousands of households experience substandard housing, overcrowding, and housing cost burden.

Table 7 - Summary of CHAS data in Exhibit 4

Housing Problems	Renter	Owner	Total
Substandard Housing – Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	644	138	782
Severely Overcrowded – With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	1,528	226	1,754
Overcrowded – with 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	3,727	1,231	4,958
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	20,034	24,490	44,524
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	23,111	18,514	41,625
Zero/negative income (and none of the above problems)	1,091	950	2,041

Households Live in Substandard Housing

A total of 782 households in the County live in substandard housing lacking plumbing and kitchen facilities. Most (644) are low income renter households, largely concentrated in the old established communities bordering the District of Columbia. A total of 519 (81%) renter households and 99 (72%) of owner occupied households between 0% – 80% of AMI, live in substandard housing.

Many Households Live in Overcrowded Conditions; in Some Cases the Overcrowding is Severe

Thousands of households in the County (6,712) do not have or cannot afford housing large enough to meet current needs, and therefore live in overcrowded housing. Twenty-six percent (1,754) of these households live in severely overcrowded housing even though they have a complete kitchen and plumbing. The living conditions of households in the targeted income range (0% - 80% AMI) is exacerbated with evidence of households that are severely overcrowded defined as having more than 1.51 persons per room. In addition, 1,293 (85%) of renter households and 107 (47%) of owner households experience severe overcrowding.

Several Thousands of Households Experience Severe Housing Cost Burden, Making Housing Affordability a Critical Challenge in the County

Housing affordability is a major challenge in the County. The CHAS data show that thousands of households, both owner and renter, and especially those with lower incomes, experience housing cost burden. A household is considered to experience housing cost burden if it spends 30% or more of their incomes to pay for housing and related costs. A total of 86,149 households in Prince George's County with incomes at 100% or lower than AMI experience cost burden; where 43,145 are renter households and 43,004 are owner households. The majority (44,524) of households experience severe cost burden, and spend more than 50% of their incomes to pay for housing.

Almost every household in the County with incomes at 0% to 80% AMI is cost burdened; with several households severely burdened, even though these households do not live in substandard housing or experience overcrowding. As many as 20,672 (89%) renter households and 10,527 (57%) owner households within that income range spend 30% or greater of their household incomes on housing. Even more critical, the data show that 19,859 (99%) of renters and 20,983 (86%) of owners experience severe cost burden, spending 50% or more of their income to pay for housing.

Households that spend large portions of their income on housing-related costs are left with little or no disposable income for other needs. Spending large percentages of incomes on housing cost alone, affects quality of life. These households do not have resources to acquire essential needs, including food, healthcare, transportation, clothing, etc. Not only does this adversely impact their quality of life, it also weakens the County's economy, because it reduces disposable income typically spent in the marketplace, and consequently reduces market potential for local businesses and service providers.

B. Housing Problems 2 (Households with one or more Severe Housing Problems: Lacks kitchen or complete plumbing, severe overcrowding, severe cost burden)

Table 8 - Housing Problems 2

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Having 1 or more of four housing problems	16,196	6,670	2,045	1,003	25,914	7,761	8,596	5,661	4,072	26,090
Having none of four housing problems	4,464	15,313	14,646	13,320	47,743	1,962	6,936	10,414	15,655	34,967
Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems	1,091	0	0	0	1,091	950	0	0	0	950

Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

The 2007 – 2011 CHAS data show that 24,911 (96%) of renter households and 22,018 (84%) of owner households with incomes at 80% or less than AMI have 1 or more severe housing problems, such as, lack of kitchen or complete plumbing, severe overcrowding and severe cost burden. The existence of severe housing problems for so many households implies that it is critical to provide affordable and quality housing for households below 80% of AMI.

Current (2009-2013 ACS) data show that as many as 80,460 (25% of the total) housing units in the County were built in 1959 or earlier. With some exceptions, such old housing typically have significant deficiencies in terms of structure and amenities. This likely explains why the CHAS data show 47,743 low income renter and 34,967 low income owner households experiencing one or more severe housing problems. In addition to the fact that many low income households are compelled to live in units that have problems, these houses affect the quality of neighborhoods, especially when they remain vacant for long periods.

C. Cost Burden Conditions

Cost Burden >30%

Table 9 - Cost Burden > 30%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	6,797	8,787	3,110	18,694	2,276	4,889	4,643	11,808
Large Related	1,403	1,539	343	3,285	787	1,798	1,694	4,279

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
Elderly	2,953	2,103	692	5,748	4,242	3,492	1,919	9,653
Other	6,887	5,899	2,765	15,551	1,791	1,982	2,671	6,444
Total need by income	18,040	18,328	6,910	43,278	9,096	12,161	10,927	32,184

Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Thousands of Households in the County Struggle to Pay for Housing

The 2007 - 2011 CHAS data to the right show that a total of 75,462 low income households experience cost burden greater than 30%, meaning thousands of households spend more than 30% of

Table 10 - Summary of 2007-2011 CHAS Cost Burden

	Renter	Owner	Total
Small Related	18,694	11,808	30,502
Large Related	3,285	4,279	7,564
Elderly	5,748	9,653	15,401
Other	15,551	6,444	37,396
Total need by income	43,278	32,184	75,462

their incomes to pay for housing and related costs. Even though the majority of these households are renter households (43,278 or 57%), the number of owner households experiencing cost burden is also substantial (32,184 or 43%). In addition, 30,502 (40%) of the households experiencing housing cost burden greater than 30% are small related households. Notably, a significant number of these households (15,401 or 20%) include the elderly, and the majority (63%) are renters.

The incidence of housing cost burden in the County is growing. The current 2009-2013 ACS data presented in Table 11 shows that a total of 132,594 households in the County experience housing cost burden. They comprise as many as 44.6% of the households occupying units with a mortgage and 52.2% of renter households. Many of the currently cost burdened households (62,726 or 47.3%) spend 35% or greater of their income on housing, and are therefore considered to be severely cost burdened.

Table 11 - Tenure of Households with Cost Burden is Greater than 30%

Tenure of Households	Households Spending 30% or More of Incomes on Housing	Percent
Housing units with a mortgage (excluding units where Selected Monthly Owner Costs as a Percentage of Household Income (SMOCAPI) cannot be computed)	70,999	44.60%
Housing units without a mortgage (excluding units where SMOCAPI cannot be computed)	4,467	15.20%
Occupied units paying rent (excluding units where Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income (GRAPI) cannot be computed)	57,128	52.20%

Cost Burden > 50%

Table 12 - Cost Burden > 50%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	6,130	2,008	163	8,301	2,105	3,672	2,337	8,114
Large Related	1,134	330	0	1,464	725	1,049	811	2,585
Elderly	2,102	579	160	2,841	3,206	2,042	701	5,949
Other	6,305	1,827	184	8,316	1,689	1,562	1,438	4,689
Total need by income	15,671	4,744	507	20,922	7,725	8,325	5,287	21,337

Not only do lower income households experience cost burden, almost half of those experiencing cost burden (42,259) spend 50% or more of their household incomes to pay for housing and related costs.¹¹

Table 13 - Summary of 2007-2011 CHAS Cost Burden > 50%

	Renter	Owner	Total
Small Related	8,301	8,114	16,415
Large Related	1,464	2,585	4,049
Elderly	2,841	5,949	8,790
Other	8,316	4,689	13,005
Total Need by Income	20,922	21,337	42,259

Many households experiencing

severe cost burden greater than 50% are small related households, representing 16,415 (45%) of the total. The numbers of small related renters and owner households experiencing severe cost burden are virtually the same. Notably, 8,790 of such households include the elderly, with 5,949 (68%) being owner households.

The 2007 – 2011 ACS data presented in Table 13 show that housing cost burden continues to be widespread in the County, and affects all types of households, including renters and owners with and without mortgages.

D. Overcrowding (More than one person per room)

Table 14 - Overcrowding Information – 1/2

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Single family households	1,240	1,547	940	464	4,191	154	235	336	358	1,083

¹¹ A household that spends 50% or more of its income to pay for housing is considered to be severely cost burdened.

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
Multiple, unrelated family households	79	303	359	148	889	8	100	95	162	365
Other, non-family households	59	84	100	90	333	0	0	0	10	10
Total need by income	1,378	1,934	1,399	702	5,413	162	335	431	530	1,458

Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Thousands of Low Income Renter Households Live in Crowded Conditions

Crowding is a condition where more than one person occupies a room in a residence. It affects predominately rental households with lower incomes. The data (Table 14) show that Countywide, 6,871 households experience overcrowding; 5,413 of them being rental households. Income levels also affect overcrowding. In total, 4,711 (87%) of renter households and 928 (64%) owner households, in the income category 80% of AMI or lower, experience overcrowding. The data also show that single family households experience overcrowding the most. Approximately 3,727 (89%) of renter single family households with incomes 80% or lower than AMI experience crowding, while 725 (67%) of owner single family households with incomes 80% or lower than AMI experience crowding. Multiple, unrelated low income households are not completely exempt from overcrowding, with 741 (83%) of renters and 203 (56%) of owners at 0% to 80% AMI experiencing the condition.

E. Homeless At-Risk and Special Needs Population

There is no defined way to measure personal resiliency (a major determinant in the long term stability of an individual at risk of experiencing homelessness); however there are key indicators that point to level of risk for housing instability and/or loss of housing. Vulnerable, low income individuals and families become homeless for a myriad of reasons including, but not limited to, deep poverty, inability to pay rent or mortgage, dislocation due to disaster, chronic physical and behavioral health problems, family conflict, domestic violence, incarceration, poor credit history, high debt, and limited affordable housing with barriers. The majority can be grouped into four broad areas: economics, education, behavioral health, and family dynamics which increase the challenges for housing instability for the County's at-risk and special needs population. ***(For a detailed description of each broad area, please refer to Appendix 7.5).***

Description and estimates of the at-risk population(s)

As part of the County's Ten Year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness, the Homeless Services Partnership (HSP) identified special populations requiring particular attention: domestic violence, chronically homeless- disabled-substance abusing, unaccompanied youth 14-24, returning citizens and veterans. The HSP has formed committees composed of HSP members, academics, behavioral health experts, government agencies, the judicial system, health professionals and businesses to address the needs of these sub-populations. A brief description addressing housing needs and challenges for the aforementioned groups follows.

Domestic violence survivors: Domestic violence continues to trend upwards in the County; where the occurrence of incidents has increased each year since the County began collecting data in this area. In FY

2014 there were 5,236 domestic violence cases filed with the District Court of Maryland, comprising 22% of all domestic violence cases statewide.¹² Many of these victims are women with children from households where the sole income is generated by the offending husband or significant other. Additionally, these women often have limited or no work history and an abbreviated educational background; both of which severely impact their ability to stabilize quickly post-violence, and often result in homelessness. For low-income women with children, the risk of homelessness is compounded by vulnerabilities such as high unemployment, low-wage earners, history of domestic violence and family conflicts, limited or poor-functioning support networks, poor rental and credit histories, etc. Of particular concern are subsets of this population who are currently under or unserved in existing facilities including: male survivors, survivors with male children over the age of 12, and survivors whose abuser was someone other than an intimate partner.

Chronically homeless, mentally ill: Studies show that although chronically homeless people represent a small share of the overall homeless population, their effect on the homeless system and the community is considerable. Emergency shelters are not designed to address the extensive needs of people with serious mental illness or other disabilities. Persons with mental illness are often difficult to place in permanent housing without supportive services. Moreover, they are often uninsured, utilize hospital emergency rooms at higher rates compared to other populations and lack skill sets to access and maintain traditional disability income streams such as SSDI or SSI without external support. In 2014, 59% of all singles and 18% of all families served by the County's emergency shelter had one or more of these conditions. The high frequency of disability, particularly among singles, indicates that this is another factor impacting a person's risk of homelessness.

Veterans: According to the U.S. Census Bureau, there are 61,842 veterans living in Prince George's County, representing the largest percentage (15%) of all veterans in the State (427,068). Although improving, the post 9/11 veteran rate of unemployment continues averaging 10%. With the return of service members and the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) losses, medical discharges and service separations grow, and more veterans will likely struggle to manage the high cost of living in the Metro area. Further adversely impacting the challenges of veterans and the threat of homelessness is mental illness and the lack of physical well-being. Unfortunately, veterans often resist accessing the homeless services system, outreach and intervention programs.

Unaccompanied homeless and unstably housed youth and young adults: Twenty-two (22) percent of youth ages 16 to 24 living in the inner Beltway communities are disconnected - not in school and not working. This is double the rate for the D.C. Metro area as a whole, and more than three times as high as more affluent and ethnically diverse regions of the County like College Park and Adelphi.¹³ These disconnected youth are more apt to live in poverty, need public assistance, become clients within the justice system and are at higher risk of homelessness. In 2011, Prince George's County began conducting annual housing instability surveys (two weeks in duration) in an effort to understand the scope and magnitude of homelessness among unaccompanied young people between the ages of 13 and 24 (185 young people were identified in 2011, 149 in 2012, and 147 in 2013). As a result, the County prioritized this population as a distinct group deserving separate attention given their issues and challenges, and programmatic solutions to their homelessness. Development of a single integrated system of care that is based upon meeting their immediate needs, connecting them with appropriate

¹² District Court of Maryland – Domestic Violence and Peace Order Activity Report, July 2013 – June 2014

¹³ Measure of America. Halve the Gap by 2030: Youth Disconnection in America's Cities, 2014

support systems, and supporting their personal development as they transition to adulthood is essential.

Returning Citizens: In 2013, 11,394 inmates were released from the Maryland Department of Corrections;¹⁴ nearly 50% of whom will return to state prison within three years.¹⁵ There are currently over 61,000 individuals under community supervision statewide - 6,443 of whom reside in Prince George's County.¹⁶ According to the Maryland Reentry Initiative, fewer than half have a high school diploma, most are unemployed at the time of arrest and most lack marketable job skills. When these citizens return from the criminal justice system without a structured reentry strategy that includes *at a minimum* the potential for a livable wage job and access to stable housing that does not exclude persons with a criminal history, they place additional stress on communities.

Housing characteristics linked with instability and an increased risk of homelessness

There are 42,259 households in the County who are severely cost burdened and spend over 50% of their income on housing. Of these 21,337 are homeowners, 20,922 are renters,¹⁷ and all are at risk of homelessness; clearly demonstrating the importance of a highly responsive and robust system of prevention, diversion and rapid re-housing.

Homeowners: While Prince George's County enjoys a relatively high homeownership rate of 62.4%, among the nearly 70,000 very low to extremely low income households (under 50% AMI) only 37.5% (26,205 households) are owners. 81% of these homeowners pay more than 30% of their income to meet housing costs (are cost burdened) and 61.2% are severely cost burdened paying more than 50% of their income toward housing.¹⁸ Cost burdened households have little money to cover basic necessities, much less unexpected emergencies, thereby putting them at high risk of homelessness. Of the 16,050 very low to extremely low income owner households that are severely cost burdened, one third are elderly. These households are particularly vulnerable if they become homeless and their needs present a special challenge to the emergency shelter system.

Of particular concern is the fact that the County has one of the highest foreclosure rates in the State. In 2013, the Office of the Sheriff received 533 writs of possession and instructions to schedule and supervise the foreclosure. Of those, 327 (61%) managed to refinance or move prior to the scheduled eviction; however, the remaining 206 (39%) have lost their homes.¹⁹ In many cases, while economically challenged, displaced households moved into available rental units, thereby increasing demand on the rental market and exacerbating the lack of low-cost rental housing. In addition, there has been a swell of jurisdictional movement from Washington D.C. into the County of young urban wage earners seeking more affordable housing, further depleting the available pool of lower rent units. This movement forces homeless and formerly homeless families to compete for limited affordable rental units.

Renters: The Landlord Tenant Division of the Prince George's County District Court processes approximately 10,000 summonses for non-payment of rent each month. In 2014, there were 157,066

¹⁴ Maryland Division of Correction, Annual Report ,2013

¹⁵ Maryland Task Force on Prisoner Reentry, Final Report on Prisoner Reentry, 2012

¹⁶ Maryland Community Supervision, Active Cases by Jurisdiction, 2013

¹⁷ 2007-2011 CHAS

¹⁸ Ibid

¹⁹ Prince George's County Office of the Sheriff, Annual Report, 2013

landlord tenant cases filed in District Court and accounted for 24.4% of all landlord tenant cases in the State.²⁰ In 2013, the Office of the Sheriff delivered 149,563 Notices to Appear for failure to pay rent which resulted in 3,969 actual evictions.²¹ During the 1st quarter of 2014 this average increased by 18%.

There are 43,734 renter households in the County with an income less than 50% of AMI. Of those, 20,415 pay 50% or more of their income for rent. This level of housing cost burden is considered by HUD to constitute a worst case housing need. The majority of the renters with worst case housing needs are either small families or non-elderly, unrelated individuals (16,270 households). While their percentages are low, 1,464 large families in this demographic are of particular concern because of the lack of low cost rental units available with three or more bedrooms and 2,681 elderly households who require special attention.²² Both of these latter groups are much more likely to experience overcrowding and/or continued housing instability.

²⁰ District Court of Maryland, Civil Case Activity Report, July 2013 – June 2014

²¹ Prince George's County Office of the Sheriff, Annual Report, 2013

²² 2007-2011 CHAS


4.3 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems

Overview

The CHAS data show that overall, large numbers of Black/African American and Hispanic households in the County have disproportionately greater housing problems, irrespective of household income levels. The problems include: lack of complete kitchen facilities, lack of complete plumbing facilities, overcrowding, and cost burden. The data also show that as median household incomes rise, the overall percentage of poor households of all ethnicities experiencing one or more of the four housing problems decline. The Tables and Figures below illustrate the following salient points related to disproportionate greater needs and housing problems.

- 0% to 30% AMI: Countywide 26,386 (83%) of households with incomes at 0% to 30% of AMI has one or more of the above housing problems. A majority of them 17,283 (54.6%) are Black/African American; 4,735 (14.9%) are White; and 3,019 (9.6%) are Hispanic households.
- 30% to 50% AMI: 30,547 (79.1%) of households in the County with incomes at 30 to 50% of the AMI have one or more of the four housing problems. A majority of these households, 20,964 (68.6%) are Black/African American; 4,475 (14.6%) are Hispanic; and 3,709 (12.1%) are White.
- 50% to 80% AMI: 15,556 (56.2%) households with incomes at 50 to 80% AMI experience one or more of the four housing problems. Approximately 10,273 (66.0%) of these households are Black/African American; 2,563 (16.5%) are Hispanic; and 1,964 (12.6%) are White.
- 80% to 100% AMI: 14,845 (44.6%) of households with incomes at 80% to 100% of Area Median Income experience one of more of the four housing problems. Approximately 10,344 (69.7%) of them are Black/African American; 1,966 (13.2%) are Hispanic; and 1,777 (11.9%) are White.

Figure 5 – Disproportionately Greater Need Summary of Household Incomes




0%-30% of Area Median Income

Table 15 - Disproportionately Greater Need 0-30% AMI

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a Whole	26,386	3,157	2,061
White	4,735	870	456
Black / African American	17,283	2,010	1,401
Asian	627	145	65
American Indian, Alaska Native	65	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	3,019	94	133

Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Figure 6 – Disproportionately Greater Need 0-30% AMI




30%- 50% of Area Median Income

Table 16 - Disproportionately Greater Need 30-50% AMI

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a Whole	30,547	8,049	0
White	3,709	2,759	0
Black / African American	20,964	4,137	0
Asian	913	296	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	10	29	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	4,475	490	0

Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Figure 7 – Disproportionately Greater Need for 30-50% AMI




50% -80% of Area Median Income

Table 17 - Disproportionately Greater Need 50-80%

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a Whole	15,556	12,115	0
White	1,964	2,556	0
Black / African American	10,273	7,634	0
Asian	441	491	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	10	100	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	2,563	1,227	0

Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Figure 8 – Disproportionately Greater Need for 50-80% AMI




80%-100% Of Area Median Income

Table 18 - Disproportionately Greater Need 80-100%

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a Whole	14,845	18,431	0
White	1,777	3,395	0
Black / African American	10,344	12,535	0
Asian	442	702	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	54	0
Pacific Islander	25	15	0
Hispanic	1,966	1,350	0

Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Figure 9 – Disproportionately Greater Need 80-100% AMI



The summary Table shows that low income Black/African American households are, by far, the most affected by the four housing problems regardless of income levels: lack of complete kitchen facilities, lack of complete plumbing facilities, overcrowding, and cost burden.

Table 19 - Summary of Disproportionately Greater Needs Table

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems			
	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	80-100%
White	18%	12%	13%	12%
Black/African American	66%	69%	66%	70%
Asian	2%	3%	3%	3%
Hispanic	11%	15%	17%	13%


4.4 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems

Overview

The CHAS data (Figure 10) show that, overall, exceptionally large numbers of Black/African American households, disproportionately experience severe housing problems irrespective of household incomes; including lack of complete kitchen facilities, lack of complete plumbing facilities, overcrowding, and housing cost burden. However, the data show that as median household incomes rise, the overall percentage of poor households experiencing one or more of the four severe housing problems declines significantly.

- 0% to 30% AMI: 22,915 (73%) of households with incomes at 0% to 30% of Area Median Income have one or more severe housing problems. A majority of these households 15,253 (67%) are Black/African American, 3,788 (17%) are White, and 2,760 (12%) are Hispanic households, as shown in Table 20 and Figure 11.
- 30% to 50% AMI: 14,490 (38%) of households with incomes at 30% to 50% of AMI have one or more of the four housing problems. A majority of households, 9,239 (64%) are Black/African American, 2,820 (20%) are Hispanic, and 1,692 (12%) are White, as shown in Table 21 and Figure 12.
- 50% to 80% AMI: 5,554 (20%) households with incomes at 50% to 80% of AMI experience one or more of the four severe housing problems. A majority of households, 3,229 (58%) are Black/African American, 1,507 (27%) are Hispanic, and 539 (10%) are White, as shown in Table 22 and Figure 13.
- 80% to 100%: 4,753 (14%) of households with incomes at 80% to 100% of AMI experience one or more of the four severe housing problems. A majority of households, 3,168 (67%) of them are Black/African American, 975 (21%) are Hispanic, and 418 (9%) are White, as shown in Table 23 and Figure 14.

Figure 10 – Severe Housing Problems Summary of Household Incomes




0%-30% of Area Median Income

Table 20 - Severe Housing Problems 0-30% AMI

Severe Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a Whole	22,915	6,601	2,061
White	3,788	1,798	456
Black / African American	15,253	4,049	1,401
Asian	547	235	65
American Indian, Alaska Native	45	20	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	2,760	352	133

Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Figure 11 – Severe Housing Problems 0-30% AMI




30%- 50% of Area Median Income

Table 21 - Severe Housing Problems 30-50% AMI

Severe Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a Whole	14,490	24,118	0
White	1,692	4,792	0
Black / African American	9,239	15,927	0
Asian	575	628	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	39	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	2,820	2,138	0

Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Figure 12 – Severe Housing Problems 30-50% AMI




50%-80% of Area Median Income

Table 22 - Severe Housing Problems 50-80% AMI

Severe Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a Whole	5,554	22,096	0
White	539	3,954	0
Black / African American	3,229	14,735	0
Asian	152	782	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	110	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	1,507	2,267	0

Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Figure 13 – Severe Housing Problems 50-80% AMI




80%-100% of Area Median Income

Table 23 - Severe Housing Problems 80-100% AMI

Severe Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a Whole	4,753	28,458	0
White	418	4,748	0
Black / African American	3,168	19,696	0
Asian	154	1,011	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	54	0
Pacific Islander	25	15	0
Hispanic	975	2,338	0

Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Figure 14 – Severe Housing Problems 80-100% AMI



Summary: Percentage of low income households with one or more severe housing problems

Table 24 - Summary of Severe Housing Problems

Severe Housing Problems	Has one or more of four severe housing problems			
	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	80-100%
White	17%	12%	10%	9%
Black/African American	67%	64%	58%	67%
Asian	2%	4%	3%	3%
Hispanic	12%	19%	27%	21%

4.5 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens

Overview

Black/African American households are in a disproportionate greater need for affordable housing

Although the data show that housing cost burden affects households of all ethnicities, in terms of numbers of households affected and severity, Black/African American households are the most affected, and most disproportionately in need of affordable housing. The majority of households, 78,222 or 71%, experiencing housing cost burden are Black/African American. In addition, 47,383 (61%) experience moderate to severe cost burden, and the other 30,839 (39%) experience extreme cost burden, spending more than 50% of their income on housing.

The degree of housing cost burden among White and Hispanic households are far lower than Black/African American; White households, 15,035 experience housing cost burden, with 6,409 (43%) experiencing extreme cost burden. Among the total of 24,945 Hispanic households, 12,209 (49%) experience housing cost burden with 5,935 (24%) experiencing extreme cost burden.

The 2007-2011 CHAS data included in Table 25 shows the extent to which housing cost burden affects households of different ethnicities in Prince George’s County.

Housing Cost Burden

Table 25 - Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Housing Cost Burden	<=30%	30-50%	>50%	No / negative income (not computed)
Jurisdiction as a Whole	159,729	65,584	45,328	2,101
White	36,320	8,626	6,409	456
Black / African American	104,926	47,383	30,839	1,441
Asian	5,823	2,040	1,313	65
American Indian, Alaska Native	402	74	30	0
Pacific Islander	25	0	25	0
Hispanic	9,603	6,274	5,935	133

Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

4.6 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion

Populations with Disproportionately Greater Need for Housing

- Disproportionately large numbers of Black/African American households, irrespective of household income levels, experience severe housing problems in the County. These problems include lack of complete kitchen facilities, lack of complete plumbing facilities, overcrowding, and housing cost burden. 47,383 (61%) of them experience moderate to severe cost burden, and the other 30,839 (39%) experience extreme cost burden, spending more than 50% of their income on housing.
- Black/African American households that are in disproportionately greater need for housing mostly reside in established communities in the central areas of the County, including Landover, Capitol Heights, District Heights, Seat Pleasant, and Suitland.
- White households, 15,035 experience housing cost burden, with a lower percentage (43%) experiencing extreme cost burden.
- Many Hispanic households experience various degrees of housing cost burden. Among the total of 24,945 Hispanic households in the County, 12,209 (49%) experience housing cost burden with 5,935 (24%) experiencing extreme cost burden.
- The numbers, as well as percentages of low income households that experience one or more of the severe housing problems, decline significantly as median household income increases.

Established Communities inside the Beltway are the Most Severely Affected by Housing Problems

Even though the CHAS and American Community Survey data show that housing problems affect households Countywide, geographic data (see Section 5.10 Housing Market Analysis) demonstrate conditions in communities worst affected by the problems. These communities are mostly located bordering the District of Columbia and inside the Capital Beltway. These communities include: Kentland/Palmer Park, Suitland/Coral Hills, Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights, Glassmanor/Oxon Hill, Seat Pleasant, and Capitol Heights which are predominantly made up of Black/African American residents. Other communities, such as, Langley Park, Riverdale, and Bladensburg are predominantly Hispanic households.

Household demographics such as housing conditions, affordability, and economic development data helps reinforce the County Executive's Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative which acknowledges the critical needs of the affected communities and implements appropriate responses to address the challenges.

Poverty and Disability among Veterans

The 2011-2013 ACS data show that there are 60,512 veterans in the County; 33,963 (56.1%) of them are 55 years and older, and 19,619 (32.4%) are 65 years and older. Four percent (2,427/4%) of veterans in the County 18 years and over have incomes in the past 12 months below poverty level.²³

The data show that the percentage of veterans for whom poverty is determined and have disabilities is higher (16.4%) than the general population (10%). Among the veterans, the percentage is slightly higher for the elderly 65 years and older. The data also show that the incidence of poverty among veterans is slightly higher for the elderly. For example, 4.2% for veterans 55 to 64 years, and 4% for those 65 years and older, have incomes below the poverty level. Veterans with low incomes as well as disabilities have special needs for suitably designed and affordable housing.

Table 26 - Poverty and Disability Among Veterans


	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Total Population 18 Years and Over:	658,638	
18 to 34 years:	215,176	100
Veteran:	5,513	2.6
Income in the past 12 months below poverty level:	379	6.9
With a disability	81	21.4
35 to 54 years:	250,873	100
Veteran:	21,026	8.4
Income in the past 12 months below poverty level:	654	3.1
With a disability	114	17.4
55 to 64 years:	104,080	100
Veteran:	14,354	13.8
Income in the past 12 months below poverty level:	608	4.2
With a disability	194	31.9
65 years and over:	88,509	100
Veteran:	19,619	22.2
Income in the past 12 months below poverty level:	786	4.0
With a disability	410	52.2

Source: 2011-2013 ACS 3-Year Estimates

²³ Poverty statistics presented in ACS reports and tables adhere to the standards specified by the Office of Management and Budget in Statistical Policy Directive 14. The Census Bureau uses a set of dollar value thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine who is in poverty. Further, poverty thresholds for people living alone or with nonrelatives (unrelated individuals) and two-person families vary by age (under 65 years or 65 years and older).

If a family's total income is less than the dollar value of the appropriate threshold, then that family and every individual in it are considered to be in poverty. Similarly, if an unrelated individual's total income is less than the appropriate threshold, then that individual is considered to be in poverty. The poverty thresholds do not vary geographically. They are updated annually to allow for changes in the cost of living (inflation factor) using the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

Figure 15 – Poverty & Disability Among Veterans



Source: 2011-2013 ACS 3-Year Estimates

People with Disabilities have Disproportionately Greater Need for Suitably Designed and Affordable Housing

Data from the 2009-2013 American Community Survey show that 65,666 (10%) of the County population 16 years and older have a disability, and that a significant percentage (66.2%) of them are not in the labor force. Overall, residents with disabilities have a lower educational attainment than the general population. For example, 22.1% of the population aged 25 years and over with disabilities are less than high school graduates compared to 13.5% for those without disabilities. Also, 18.3% of residents have a bachelor degree or higher compared to 31.3% for those without a disability. Furthermore, County residents with a disability earn less than those without a disability. The median earning for those with disabilities is \$31,604 compared to \$38,639 for those without disabilities. Also, residents with disabilities are more likely to have incomes below the poverty level.

The data show 14% of residents 16 years and older who have a disability have incomes below 100% of the poverty level compared to 8.7% for the general population. The high incidence of poverty implies that residents with disabilities have a disproportionately greater need for affordable and suitably designed accessible housing.

Seniors have Disproportionately Greater Need for Suitably Designed and Affordable Housing

Census data show that the senior population in Prince George’s County is increasing at an accelerated rate. The population aged 65 years and older increased by 23.1% between 1990 and 2000, and by 32% between 2000 and 2010. During 2010, 82,000 (9.4%) of the County’s residents were aged 65 years and older, and forecasts show the increase to continue in the foreseeable future. If these census projections hold true, by 2040 there would be more than 200,000 seniors in the County. This increase will result in a high demand for a variety of market rate and affordable housing as well as the need to adapt existing housing to suit the needs and lifestyles of seniors.

According to the 2009-2013 American Community Survey, currently 63,351 (21%) of households in the County have one person or more who are 65 years or older. Of these are one-person households,

20,437 (32%), meaning that these seniors live alone, and a majority (42,914 or 68%) live in two or more person households. Most seniors in the County (61,015 of them) live in family households.

Over 24,900 (24,959 or 31%) of seniors 65 years and older have a disability, associated with hearing, vision, cognitive, and ambulatory issues. Over 6,000 (6,023 or 8%) have self-care difficulty, and 11,914 (15%) have an independent living difficulty. The high incidence of disabilities among seniors implies that they have special housing and quality of life needs that must be addressed. Improvements in healthcare and the resulting longevity mean that the population of senior households will increase in the foreseeable future. Therefore, proactive actions are required to respond to their growing housing and other needs.

4.7 Public Housing

Overview

The Housing Authority of Prince George’s County, Maryland (HAPGC) was established in 1969 to provide Prince George’s County residents with low to moderate incomes with safe, decent, and affordable housing. The HAPGC receives federal funds directly from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to administer the Housing Choice Voucher program (HCV) and Public Housing Programs. Most of the affordable housing assistance is in the form of rental units that must meet rigorous housing quality standards. The HAPGC also provides its participant families with programs that encourage them to become self-sufficient which may potentially lead to homeownership opportunities. The Housing Assistance Division (HAD) and Rental Assistance Division (RAD) administers and implements the federal rental assistance and public housing programs for the County.²⁴

The Housing Assistance Division (HAD) manages approximately 400 rental units, including five public housing residential sites consisting of 376 units. The HUD operating subsidies and tenant rental revenues are the primary source of revenue used for the day-to-day operations of the public housing sites.

Table 27 - Public Housing by Program Type

Program Type	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers in use	0	188	376	4,732	101	4,114	141	376	0

*Includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Tables 28-30 highlight the characteristics, race and ethnicity of public housing residents in Prince George’s County.

Table 28 - Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Program Type	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	
Average Annual Income	0	16,773	14,335	17,656	12,644	17,450	17,578	16,304	

²⁴ <http://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/HousingAuthority/About/operates/Pages/default.aspx>

Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers				
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Special Purpose Voucher	
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program
Average length of stay	0	6	7	8	7	9	0	7
Average Household size	0	2	1.5	3	2	3	2	3.6
# Homeless at admission	0	0	0	9	0	8	0	1
# of Elderly Program Participants (>62)	0	21	151	667	9	617	20	21
# of Disabled Families	0	53	158	1396	25	1184	75	112
# of Families requesting accessibility features	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
# of HIV/AIDS program participants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
# of DV victims	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 29 - Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Program Type									
Race	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled*
White	0	0	18	143	2	113	8	20	0
Black/African American	0	188	335	4,572	99	3,988	132	353	0
Asian	0	0	3	12	0	12	0	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	0	17	0	14	1	2	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0	8	0	7	0	1	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

***includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition**

Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Table 30 - Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Program Type									
Ethnicity	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Hispanic	0	2	7	58	1	49	0	8	0
Not Hispanic	0	186	349	4,674	100	4,065	141	368	0

*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition
 Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act Needs Assessment: Describe the needs of public housing tenants and applicants on the waiting list for accessible units:

Seventeen percent (17%) of the families on the Housing Choice Voucher's (HCV) Waiting List self-identify as disabled households. The exact type of disability and related needs are not known at the waiting list stage as verification of eligibility factors are not processed until a family is screened for admission to a program. The HCV accommodations requests are more related to programmatic rules. Examples are as follows:

- Permitting applications and re-examinations to be completed by mail;
- Conducting home visits;
- Using higher payment standards (either within the acceptable range or with HUD approval of a payment standard outside the Public Housing Authority (PHA) range if the PHA determines this is necessary to enable a person with disabilities to obtain a suitable housing unit;
- Providing time extensions for locating a unit when necessary due to of lack of availability of accessible units or special challenges of the family in seeking a unit;
- Permitting an authorized designee or advocate to participate in the application or certification process and any other meetings with PHA staff; and
- Displaying posters and other housing information in locations throughout the PHA's office in such a manner as to be easily readable at wheelchair level.

For HCV participants, the accommodation most requested is for an additional bedroom for a live-in aide or medical equipment.

Approximately fifty percent (50%) of the households on the Public Housing Waiting List are elderly and families with disabilities. Thirty five percent (35%) of the families on the public housing waiting list receive Social Security, Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or Social Security Disability Income (SSDI) benefits.

Most immediate needs of residents of Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher holders

The most immediate need, for both the Public Housing and HCV populations, is access to safe, decent and affordable housing within the County. The most common issue raised amongst Housing Authority of Prince George's County (HAPGC) voucher holders is the ability to produce a security deposit for their potential rental home.

HCV holders have extremely low incomes. As of year-end 2014, the average income was \$17,656. As a result, many need assistance to build their assets, including targeted sector job training, financial literacy, credit score improvement, and the promotion of savings accounts through the Family Self-Sufficiency Program. Additionally, HCV holders need continued access to housing assistance resources. Many HAPGC participants also need assistance to maintain their stability in housing, including case management and access to mental health and disability services; primarily 17% of HAPGC's participants are living with disabilities.

How do these needs compare to the housing needs of the population at large

According to the Community Foundation of the National Capital Region²⁵, fifty percent (50%) of all Prince George's County renters are paying more than thirty percent (30%) of their income for rent. Eighty-eight percent (88%) of public housing families are cost burdened and have income less than the 30% of AMI. While the public housing and HCV participants are cost burdened, there is an affordable housing gap of approximately 18,000 units.

²⁵ *Housing Security in the Washington Region*. Community Foundation of the National Capital Region. July 2014.
Prince George's County FY 2016 - 2020 Consolidated Plan

4.8 Homeless Needs Assessment

Overview

Prince George's County Continuum of Care (CoC) for homeless persons is coordinated through the County's Homeless Services Partnership (HSP) and addresses issues of homelessness through on-going coordination, collaboration, planning, development and evaluation. The HSP is a coalition of more than 100 organizations that includes public and private non-profit agencies, faith-based organizations, service providers, mainstream programs, consumers and concerned citizens. The Prince George's County Department of Social Services serves as the lead administering agency for the CoC.²⁶

A person is considered *homeless* if he or she:

- Lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence; this includes an individual who resides in an emergency shelter or a place not meant for human habitation, or a person who is exiting an institution where he or she temporarily resides; or
- Will imminently lose their primary nighttime residence with no subsequent residence, resources or support networks; or
- Is an unaccompanied youth or a family with children and youth who are defined as homeless under other federal statutes and meet 3 additional criteria; or
- Fleeing or are attempting to flee domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or other dangerous or life-threatening conditions that relate to violence against the individual or a family member.

A person is considered *chronically homeless* if he or she:

- Is an unaccompanied individual who meets the "homeless" definition; and
- Has a disabling condition defined as "a diagnosable substance abuse disorder, a serious mental illness, developmental disability, or chronic physical illness or disability, including the co-occurrence of two or more of these conditions"; and
- The disabling condition limits an individual's ability to work or perform one or more activities of daily living."; and
- Has been continuously homeless for a year or more OR has had at least four episodes (separate, distinct, and sustained stay on the streets and/or in a homeless emergency shelter) of homelessness in the past three years

A person is considered *at risk of homelessness* if he or she:

- Has income below 30% of median income; has insufficient resources immediately available to attain housing stability; and meets one or more of 7 additional risk factors; or
- Is an unaccompanied child or youth who qualifies under other federal statutes; or
- Is a child or youth who qualifies under the Education for Children and Youth Program (Section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Act) and the parents or guardians of that child or youth if living with him/her.

²⁶ Ten Year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness in Prince George's County 2012 – 2021.

Full regulatory definitions are available at www.hudhre.info.

The CoC uses two primary sources of data to track homelessness; the annual Point-in-Time Survey and the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). Data reported in the needs assessment homeless table are pulled from these two sources. Each of these data sources is discussed below:

Point-in-Time Survey (PIT): The Homeless Services Partnership (HSP) conducts an annual inter-jurisdictional one-day count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless individuals in Prince George's County in January of each year. The count is planned and conducted in partnership with the Washington Metropolitan Council of Government's Homeless Advisory Board and the Governor's Advisory Board. Staff and volunteers associated with HSP recruit survey respondents (homeless individuals) from street locations (parks, libraries, metro stations, soup kitchens, shopping malls, community churches, etc.), emergency shelters, transitional and supportive housing projects, state and county agencies, and community churches. This count does not include the many households that are at risk of homelessness, but did not reach out for shelter or service on the day of the survey.²⁷

In 2014, the PIT identified 480 sheltered homeless persons of which 342 were families; including 19 chronically homeless, 3 unaccompanied youth, and 19 veterans. PIT volunteers also counted 179 unsheltered homeless persons; including 96 families, 37 chronically homeless, 1 unaccompanied youth, and 7 veterans. When reporting barriers, single adults reported severe mental illness (22%), chronic substance abuse (17%), physical disability (15%), and history of institutionalization (14%), representing the greatest barriers to permanent housing and independence. For adults within families, significant barriers included severe mental illness and chronic health problems at 19%, respectively each domestic violence at 17%, and chronic substance abuse (7%).

In addition, the HSP conducts a separate annual housing stability survey over a broader span of time of unaccompanied youth and young adults ages 13-24 who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

Homeless Management Information System (HMIS): Prince George's County was the first county in the State to utilize HMIS (initiated in January of 2002), a national requirement for the receipt of federal and state funds. The Prince George's County Department of Social Services serves as the CoC's HMIS Administrator and has licensed, trained professionals that provide ongoing technical support to more than 100 users, representing 30 organizations serving individuals and families in crisis. Collectively, these organizations have entered more than 54,000 customers into the system. HMIS maintains a record of each customer accessing services and allows critical data sharing among agencies to reduce duplication and maximize utilization of resources. The HMIS data provides a systemic and long term look at the issues of homelessness affecting the County.

At the beginning of 2014, there were 284 persons in families and 77 single adults housed by the Prince George's County Emergency and Transitional Shelter System. During the subsequent 12 months, the homeless hotline received new intakes from 1,056 families (3,298 people) and 1,427 single persons requesting temporary shelter of which an additional 188 families (542 people) and 355 single persons

²⁷ Ten Year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness in Prince George's County 2012 – 2021.

were sheltered. About 316 more households were assisted through diversion efforts and 50 households through prevention efforts, representing a total housing response for 909 (34%) homeless households.

If data is not available for the categories "number of persons becoming and exiting homelessness each year," and "number of days that persons experience homelessness," describe these categories for each homeless population type (including chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth):

The County used data collected in HMIS to project the numbers provided in this section. In summary, the number of people expected to become homeless is derived using a needs report for the prior year, the number of persons residing in shelter on the first day and the number of unaccompanied youth identified during the County's annual housing instability survey for that population. Once full implementation of the central assessment mode occurs, which includes in-person assessment and a street homeless registry, the County expands this date to include known sub-populations who do not normally enter the shelter system.

The number of days that a person experiences homelessness is derived from a quarterly analysis of all exits and is averaged over a one year period to account for anomalies. Table 31 represents the average number of exits, including all emergency and all transitional shelter exits. The data show the length of stay in the emergency shelter system averages 70 days for singles and 98 days for families. The data also show an average stay in the transitional shelter system averages 208 days for singles and 535 for families.

The CoC's Data and Outcomes Sub-Committee is focused on the development of additional performance reporting tools that drive funding and system change with the goal of ending homelessness.

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance for families with children and the families of veterans.

Table 31 - Homeless Needs Assessment

Population	PIT Sheltered	PIT Unsheltered	Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year	Estimate the # becoming homeless each year	Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year	Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness
Persons in Households with adults and children	342	96	3582	3298	328	317
Persons in Households with only children	3	1	51	0	25	Not Available
Persons in Households with only adults	135	82	1600	1427	195	140
Chronically homeless individuals	13	34	220	198	14	Not Available
Chronically homeless families	6	3	117	111	5	Not Available
Veterans	19	7	168	147	32	Not Available
Unaccompanied Youth	3	1	147	83	40	Not Available
Persons with HIV	0	0	9	8	5	Not Available

Data Source(s):

A: 2014 PIT Enumeration

B: 2014 PIT Enumeration

C: HMIS Needs Report, HMIS 1 day stayer report & 2013 Youth housing instability survey

D: HMIS Needs Report & LEA McKinney Vento report

E: HMIS annual ES/TH APR

F: HMIS ES/TH quarterly leavers report

4.9 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment

Overview:

The special needs populations include the non-homeless elderly and the frail elderly, persons with a disability (developmental, physical or mental), persons with HIV/AIDS, and victims of domestic violence.

Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community: What is the housing and supportive service needs of these populations and how are these needs determined?

Elderly and Frail Elderly

HUD defines elderly as age 62 and older, and frail elderly as those persons requiring assistance with three or more activities of daily living such as eating, bathing, walking, and performing light housework. According to the 2007 - 2011 CHAS Data, 24% of households (67,523) in the County contain at least one person that is 62 years old or older. In addition, the elderly population is the fastest growing age group in Prince George's County.

While they are the fastest growing population, the elderly households are more likely to be low-income, with 40% of households (27,111 households) containing at least one person age 62 years old or older being extremely low-income, very low-income or low-income, with incomes ranging from 0-80% AMI, compared to 37% for the County.

Elderly households are particularly vulnerable to a competitive housing market with increasing market rents, especially those with fixed incomes. This vulnerability is attributed to lower household incomes and a higher occurrence of housing cost burdens. According to the Prince George's County Department of Family Services, Aging Services Division, for Fiscal Year 2015, there is a waiting list of 840 persons for the Senior Care Program, and a waiting list of 80 persons for the Senior Assisted Living Subsidy Program; given the number of persons on the waiting list for both services, there is a high demand for supportive services to seniors.

The Prince George's County Aging Advisory Committee is comprised of twenty-four members appointed by the County Executive to advise on issues related to aging. The members are citizen leaders representing the public and private sectors. The Committee's mission is to support and advocate the promotion of choice, independence and dignity for all older Prince Georgians and their families. In addition, the Committee has oversight of all aging programs, including review of the Aging Area Plan to ensure that goals and objectives are met and reflect the needs of senior citizens.

Persons with Disabilities

HUD defines disability as a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities for an individual. According to the 2013 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, 8.7% of residents (77,102 individuals) are disabled. The largest number of disabled persons is found in the 18-64 year old age groups (42,262 individuals). However, the largest percentage of disablement is found among the 65 year old and older age group, with 30.9%. The most common disablement among those aged 18-64 is ambulatory difficulty (3.7%), followed by cognitive difficulty (2.7%) and independent living difficulty (2.1%).

Those with a disability face many disadvantages when searching for employment. In reviewing the 2013

American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, 3.7% of the working-age (18-64) disabled individuals are employed, compared to 86.9% of non-disabled employed individuals. In addition, those with disabilities earn less, with the median earnings for an individual with a disability at \$32,296 compared to \$37,335 for an individual with no disability.

As a subpopulation of persons with a disability group, veterans are faced with greater challenges. During the time period of the 2009-2011 ACS Estimates, data reflects that there are 60,570 veterans 18 years old and older. Given the number of veterans, 2,168 have income below the poverty level and of those, approximately 826 have a disability.

With employment challenges and earning wages lower than the median income, persons with disabilities often live on a fixed income. Based on an affordable housing focus group conducted January 7, 2015, affordability and accessibility are significant factors for those with disabilities.

Prince George's County established the Commission for Individuals with Disabilities in 1986 which consists of twenty volunteer members, appointed by the County Executive for three-year terms. Representatives include consumers with disabilities, employees of public and private agencies providing services to the disability community and interested citizens. These volunteers bring together a collective expertise evaluating services for the disabled, providing guidance on the implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and ensuring that all County services – (employment, housing, transportation and recreation) -- are fully accessible.

Victims of Domestic Violence

Domestic violence is used by one person in a relationship to control the other person. Victims of domestic violence can be of any age, sex, race, culture, religion, education, socioeconomic or marital status; however, 1 in 4 women are victims.

Given the most recent data available, in 2009, 1,073 domestic violence cases were reported in the County; the fifth highest number among all Maryland counties. While the number of domestic violence related deaths in the County has steadily declined every year since July 2006, between July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2010, 21 individuals died as a result of domestic violence. In a four-year time span, the Domestic Violence Advocate Unit at the Prince George's County Sheriff's Department witnessed a significant increase in the number of domestic violence victims seeking services, from 274 in 2007 to 3,675 in 2010.

The Family Crisis Center of Prince George's County is a non-profit organization which operates the Safe Passage Emergency Shelter. This program provides residential services for battered women and children fleeing abusive relationships. Clinicians provide individual and group counseling, case management, life skills workshops, employment training, and referrals to various services needed. This organization also has a 24-hour crisis hotline to call if there is an emergency.

Discuss the size and characteristics of the population with HIV/AIDS and their families within the Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area:

Table 32 - Characteristics of HIV/AIDS Population

Based on data from the Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, as of September 30, 2014, it is reported that Prince George’s County²⁸ has 6,212 HIV/AIDS cases. Of this total, 53% are persons living with AIDS and 47% are persons living with HIV.

Current HOPWA Formula Use:	
Cumulative cases of AIDS reported	6,212
Area incidence of AIDS	9%
Number of new cases prior year (3year data)	568
Rate per population	836.7
Current HIV Surveillance Data:	
Number of Persons living with HIV (PLWH)	2,936
Area Prevalence (PLWH per population)	395.5
Number of PLWA (AIDS only)	3,276
Number of new HIV cases reported last year	1,172

The supply of affordable rental units is very limited. Declines in vacancy rates and increases in average rents create an affordability barrier for residents. Individuals who do not receive rent subsidy have difficulty finding appropriate places to live. Apartments are generally too expensive for many low-income residents. Renters in this region often incur housing cost burdens.

It is projected that the need for services will continue to increase as the life span of persons living with HIV/AIDS continues to improve. Every effort must be made to stabilize adequate living conditions to prevent homelessness and premature placement of dependent children into foster care. Through the HUD-funded Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program, tenant-based rental assistance and housing related short-term assistance are offered to individuals and families living in shelters or who are in imminent danger of becoming homeless. HOPWA provides ongoing housing assistance to households with family member(s) affected by the virus. It also provides emergency assistance on a case-by-case basis for HIV/AIDS-affected households.

The Housing Authority of Prince George’s County is the Administrator for Suburban Maryland. This region includes Prince George’s County, Calvert County, and Charles County. The Housing Authority has contracted with Greater Washington Urban League, Inc. and the Suburban Maryland Tri-County Community Action Committee to administer the HOPWA Program. Suburban Maryland jurisdictions operate HOPWA programs in collaboration with nonprofit organizations that help clients meet their daily needs for housing, mental health, substance abuse treatment, and other supportive services. Each HOPWA agency assists participants toward self-sufficiency by providing referrals to job training and rehabilitation programs. All HOPWA agencies in Suburban Maryland participate in their respective county’s *Continuum of Care (CoC) Plan*. The priorities and allocations of the Suburban Maryland region correlate with those of the Washington, D.C. Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area.

All rental units in Suburban Maryland are available to individuals with HIV/AIDS as long as the rents are reasonable as defined by the HUD Fair Market Rents (FMRs) and as required by federal HOPWA

²⁸ Maryland HIV/AIDS Quarterly Update Third Quarter 2014. Center for HIV Surveillance, Epidemiology and Evaluation Infectious Disease Bureau Prevention and Health Promotion Administration Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

regulations. The most common types of housing units available for rent in Suburban Maryland are in apartment buildings, single-family homes, and townhomes.

Unmet Need/Gap

With the use of available HOPWA funds, it is anticipated that 183 individuals and families will receive housing assistance each fiscal year. Approximately 126 individuals and families will receive tenant-based rental assistance and 57 individuals and families will receive housing

Table 33 - HIV Housing Needs

Housing	Prior Estimates	Source
TBRA	126	HOPWA PY 21 Annual Performance Report (APR)
PH in facilities	N/A	
STRMU	57	HOPWA PY 21 Annual Performance Report (APR)
ST or TH facilities	N/A	
PH Placements	N/A	

related short-term assistance (short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance). This determination was based on the HOPWA Program Year 21 Annual Performance Report. Currently, Suburban Maryland does not use HOPWA funds for supportive services due to funding availability; however, Suburban Maryland does provide a linkage to supportive services.

Currently, there are 182 clients on the waiting list for housing. The housing gaps are emergency housing, transitional housing, long-term housing facilities, and supportive services. The County considers this need a “high priority”; therefore, the five-year goal is to provide housing opportunities for 182 additional persons with HIV/AIDS and their families and to provide supportive services for existing and new clients.

4.10 Non-Housing Community Development Needs

Describe the jurisdiction’s need for Public Facilities. How were these needs determined?

Public facilities are critical to maintaining a high quality of life for County residents and creating opportunities for personal enrichment, professional development, economic growth, and healthy living. As public facilities age, renovations to existing facilities and the construction of replacement facilities will be critical to addressing facility deficiencies.

In May 2013, Prince George’s County’s Planning Department conducted a Public Facilities Needs Assessment Study. The study addressed the provision of public facilities- fire and rescue, police, schools, parks and recreation, water and sewer, solid waste, and libraries – needed to serve existing and future County residents and businesses. The study concluded that forecasted population growth will require the construction of two new public libraries, four new fire and EMS stations, and nine new public schools by 2035.


The County’s 2013 - 2018 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) outlines planned capital improvements, given the projection of available financial resources. The highest priority is given to capital projects funded for construction in the first two years of the CIP.

Describe the jurisdiction’s need for Public Improvements. How were these needs determined?

Prince George’s County is a major gateway into Maryland for prospective residents, employers, investors and visitors. The need for the major roadway and bridge improvements identified in the Department of Public Works and Transportation’s portion of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) are based on an assessment of safety, structural and traffic service conditions. The improvements are intended to serve existing and projected population and economic activities in the County and to address safety and structural problems that warrant major construction and reconstruction.

The County maintains 1,875 miles of roadway, municipalities maintain 543 miles of roadway and the State maintains 353 miles of roadways within the County. The public improvement needs include, but not limited to, street improvements, ADA compliance construction and rehabilitation, assessable sidewalks and curbs, gutters, signage, street lighting, trees, landscaping and connectivity to transportation.

Figure 16 – Public Improvement Needs



The Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) Pavement Assessment Management System (PAM) of June 2014 provide a geographical review of roadway conditions. The Roadway Surface Conditions Map (Figure 16) shows roadway conditions of where work is needed immediately (in red), work is needed within a few years (in yellow), and green for good conditions. Some of the inner-beltway communities are TNI Communities that border municipalities that share some roadway corridors. They include Suitland, District Heights, and Capitol Heights, Seat Pleasant, Mount Rainier, Brentwood, North Brentwood, Langley Park and other areas eligible for CDBG funding.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Services. How were these needs determined?

The need for public services for LMI residents is great. During the Consolidated Plan FY 2016 - 2020 Needs Assessment Focus Group meetings, the following services were identified:

- High school job training (inclusive of disabled and all skill levels);
- Housing counseling for renters and homeowners;
- Rehab assistance for homeowners; and
- Grow capacity of nonprofit organizations.

In response to the economic and social data (ASC 2007-2011) analyzed by DHCD staff in partnership and consultation with the County's Planning Department, the Department of Social Services and the Department of Family Services, additional needs were identified. Prince George's County's population is racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse. In 2010, 65% of residents were African American, 15% Hispanic or Latino, and 5% Asian. International migration continues to diversify the population accounting for 24% of the County's population growth between 2000 and 2010. In 2010, foreign-born resident constituted 20% of the County's population, up from 14% in 2000. The fastest growing group is the County's Hispanic population which increased by 126%. The data also revealed veterans for whom poverty is determined have a comparatively higher percentage with disabilities compared to the general population at 16% and 10%, respectively. Among the veterans, the percentage is slightly higher for the elderly 65 years old and older.

In addition, the data show that the incidence of poverty among veterans is slightly higher for the elderly. People with disabilities have a disproportionately greater need for suitably designed and affordable housing. The American Community Survey show that 65,666 (10%) of the County population 16 years old and older have a disability, and that a significant percentage (66.2%) of them are not in the labor force. In addition, residents with disability generally have lower educational attainment than the population at large. The CHAS and ACS data show that the most common housing problems in Prince George's County are: housing cost burden (affordability), substandard housing, and overcrowding. Several thousand (62,411 representing 22.5 % of households in the County) have low or very low income, and many are households with elderly and children. The services identified include:

- Youth services programs;
- Literacy programs (adult and youth);
- Veteran service programs;
- Senior residents services programs;
- Special needs population programs;
- Rental assistance program;

- Foreign born services program;
- Employment and job skill training;
- Health care services; and
- Re-entry services.

5. Housing Market Analysis

5.1 Overview


Over the past 10 years, Prince George’s County has experienced a tremendous period of revitalization and growth affecting all sectors of the economy, particularly the demand and supply of housing. Growth forecasts predict that increases in jobs and an evolving workforce will generate many housing opportunities for County residents, such as the expansion of Transit Oriented Developments (TODs) in the County’s Developed Tiers, including the TNI neighborhoods. Additionally, the County’s aging population creates opportunities for new compact communities and high density development, featuring smaller, accessible units for residents to age in place.

The 2008 housing market crisis significantly impacted the County. The housing collapse caused thousands of foreclosures which reduced property values and halted construction. It also reversed the trend of easy access to credit and rising rates of homeownership experienced in the years leading up to the crisis. The foreclosure crisis caused a shift in demand for rental housing versus owner occupied housing, which in turn impacted the supply of affordable rental housing in the County.

Foreclosures are a Major Challenge in Prince George’s County

Foreclosures have been a major challenge in the County’s housing market during the past several years. Figure 17 shows that between 2012 and 2014 the number of foreclosure events increased by 6,074 (119%). The data reflected in Figure 17, shows a significant decline in foreclosure events, especially notices of default and notices of sales, between 2009 and 2011. However, there has been an increase in these events since 2012. Between 2012 and the 3rd Quarter of 2014 the number of foreclosure events increased by 3,222 (63%), where 2,367 (73%) events were notices of default, suggesting that the

Figure 17 – Annual Foreclosure Events




crisis will likely intensify in upcoming months or years. As of Q4 2014, of the 40 zip codes in the County, five (5) were categorized as very high and two (2) zip codes as high foreclosure hot spots. The County had no “severe” hot spots. While foreclosures affect homeowners Countywide, there are higher incidences located in low-moderate income, inner Beltway communities

Albeit the numbers of foreclosure events remain high, the recent decline in notices of sales is likely a positive change. This data possibly indicates that either selected households previously threatened with foreclosure have identified ways to maintain their homes or banks have delayed the re-selling of these properties.

Median Home Values Remain Low State Wide, but Have Increased Recently

As prices increased in neighboring jurisdictions, sales prices in Prince George’s County remained relatively flat. But in 2013, the County showed the second largest-year-over-year increase in median sale price among neighboring jurisdictions. In 2014, the median sales price in Prince George’s County was \$224,975, up from \$176,400 in 2011, a 27.5% increase.

Figure 18 – Median Sale Price Comparison



5.2 Number of Housing Units

Overview

According to 2007 - 2011 ACS data, there were 327,005 housing units in Prince George's County. The County's housing consists primarily of owner-occupied units at 193,551 (64.1%) and 108,540 (35.9%) renter households. The vacancy rate is significantly higher for rental than owner-occupied units; 7.7% versus 2.1%. The 7.7% rate translates into more than 8,000 units. The largest numbers of vacant housing units are located in TNI communities including Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (13.3% or 1001 units) and Coral-Hills Suitland (8.8% or 837 units). At 67%, the majority of units in the County are single-family homes (units consisting of detached and attached structures). The second highest category is multi-family developments of 5-19 units (23%), followed closely by multi-family developments of 20 or more units (7.5%). The majority of homeowner's reside in owner-occupied units containing 3 bedrooms or more (86%), while the majority of renter's reside in 1 bedroom (30%) and 2 bedroom (42%) multi-family units.

Table 34 - Housing Tenure

HOUSING TENURE	Number	Percent
Owner-occupied	193,551	64.1%
Renter-occupied	108,540	35.9%
Homeowner vacancy rate	4,065	2.1%
Rental vacancy rate	8,358	7.7%

Source: 2007-2011 ACS 5-Year Estimates

Table 35 - Property Type: All Residential Properties

Property Type	Number	Percent
1-unit detached structure	167,361	51%
1-unit, attached structure	52,185	16%
2-4 units	7,137	2%
5-19 units	74,113	23%
20 or more units	24,542	7.5%
Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc.	1,667	.5%
Total	327,005	100%

Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Table 36 - Unit Size by Tenure

	Owners		Renters	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No bedroom	111	0%	2,727	3%
1 bedroom	3,310	2%	31,176	30%
2 bedrooms	20,339	12%	43,735	42%
3 or more bedrooms	150,377	86%	25,322	25%
Total	174,137	100%	102,960	100%

Source: 2007-2011 ACS

The following funding sources are used to target specific income levels of housing units:

- **HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program** - The units assisted under the HOME Program must serve households at or below 60% of the area median income for rental new construction or rental projects; and at or below 80% for homebuyers.
- **Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program** – For affordable housing, CDBG funds will target developments in which at least 51% of the total units within the project must be occupied by low- and moderate-income households within the 0-80% AMI (limited to rehabilitation projects). CDBG funds used for public service, economic development, public infrastructure and planning and administration must benefit low- and moderate-income households within the 0-80% AMI.
- **Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program** – Seventy-five percent (75%) of new voucher admissions shall not exceed 30% AMI as established by HUD. The remaining 25% may be between 31-80% AMI.

Challenges in Preserving Affordable Housing

Based on the “Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice” prepared by Mullin & Lonergan²⁹, Prince George’s County lost approximately 47,000 affordable rental units (priced under \$750 per month) through price increase, demolition, conversion, etc. Between 2000 and 2010, the number of affordable units renting for less than \$500 per month decreased 52.4%. During the same period, the number of higher-rent units (\$1,000 per month or more) increased 42.8%. The Section 8 project based contract between the Housing Authority of Prince George’s County (HAPGC) and the Oaks at Park South will end on February 28, 2015. At that time, the HAPGC will lose 43 project based units, but will in turn gain 43 tenant based vouchers, yielding a zero net loss. The HAPGC does not anticipate a decrease in the public housing inventory.

Prince George’s County has 302,091 housing units and 277,097 households, indicating the availability of units to meet the demand. However, the County’s supply of affordable housing does not adequately meet the needs of its LMI households. As of 2014, the public housing and HCV waiting lists reflected over 1500 and 1300 applicants, respectively. As of this writing, both waiting lists are closed and no additional applications are being accepted by the HAPGC.

Need for Specific Types of Housing

Despite recent advances over the years, affordable housing continues to experience greater demand than supply. Several mitigating factors including low wages, rising land and building cost, play a major role in the lack of affordable housing. The Needs Assessment shows a gap for larger family units for

²⁹ Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, Urban County of Prince George’s County and the City of Bowie. Mullin & Lonergan Associates, Revised June 2012.

families, as well as a need for additional accessible units for the disabled. According to the National Council on Disability, in the United States, thousands of people with disabilities need basic home modifications to make their homes accessible³⁰. The greatest need was for grab bars or handrails (an estimated 788,000 households). Additionally, many households need basic features, making units "visitable," including ramps to access the building or home (612,000 households), elevator or lifts to access the unit (309,000 households), widened doorways and halls (297,000 households), and accessible bathrooms (566,000 households). Renters had a proportionally greater unmet need for all features when compared to homeowners as well as higher incidences of disability among senior renter households. Housing rehabilitation allows the elderly to successfully age in place. Additionally, the types of housing do not meet the needs of future generations. According to the County's 2035 General Plan, the age groups projected to experience the greatest growth – the Millennial (Gen Y) and Baby Boomer generations – are increasingly interested in transit accessible, multi-family units, not single family housing.

Table 37 - Generational Housing Needs

Generation	2010 Age	2010 Share of County Population	Present Housing Needs	Housing Needs in 10 Years
Eisenhower Generation	66 and older	8.5%	Senior housing Active Adult Living	Senior housing
Baby Boomers (Born 1945 to 1964)	46-65	25.2%	Mature family ownership Empty-nester downsize opportunity Senior housing	Empty-nester downsize opportunity Senior housing Active Adult Living
Generation X (Born 1965 to 1980)	30-45	22.8%	Young family ownership Mature family ownership	Mature family ownership Empty-nester downsize opportunity
Gen Y/ Echo Boomers (Born 1981 to 1995)	15-29	23.4%	Student housing Single or roommate rental Rental as couple or first home	Rental as a couple or first home Young family ownership

Source: Plan Prince George's 2035 General Plan

³⁰ 2010. National Council on Disability. The State of Housing in America in the 21st Century: A Disability Perspective.

5.3 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing

Overview

Housing affordability is an important factor in evaluating the housing market and quality of life, primarily because many housing problems are directly related to cost. HUD standards measure affordability by the number of households paying 30% of gross income towards housing costs, including utilities.

The Needs Assessment shows almost every household in the County, with incomes at 0%-80% AMI, is cost burdened. Cost burden is the most common housing problem within the County, with approximately half of all households (51% of renters and 48% of owners) paying more than 30% of their income for housing costs. Additionally, 19,859 LMI renters and 20,983 LMI homeowners experience severe cost burden, paying more than 50% of their income for housing costs. Between 2000 and 2010, the cost of housing significantly increased for renters and homeowners. The median home value increased 118% while the median contract rent increased 54%. During this time, median household income declined, especially among the LMI households, making it much more difficult for individuals to buy or rent a home. The tables below reflect the cost of housing for LMI families.

Cost of Housing

Table 38 - Cost of Housing

	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2011	Percent Change
Median Home Value	143,700	312,800	118%
Median Contract Rent	696	1,073	54%

Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2007-2011 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Table 39 - Rent Paid

Rent Paid	Number	Percent
Less than \$500	7,540	7.3%
\$500-999	36,015	35.0%
\$1,000-1,499	45,783	44.5%
\$1,500-1,999	10,117	9.8%
\$2,000 or more	3,505	3.4%
Total	102,960	100.0%

Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Housing Affordability

How do HOME rents / Fair Market Rent compare to Area Median Rent? How might this impact your strategy to produce or preserve affordable housing?

Fair Market monthly rents in Prince George's County are slightly higher than HUD High HOME Rents; however for 3-4 bedroom households, monthly rents are much higher than HUD High HOME Rents, by

\$300 dollars. For 1-2 bedroom units, HOME rents are closer to market rents, varying by \$50 dollars or less. The County leverages multiple funding sources to create and provide affordable housing to a mix of income levels in development projects. Layering funding sources from a variety of funders enables the County to create affordable housing in many rental markets at various income levels.

Table 40 - Housing Affordability

% Units affordable to Households earning	Renter	Owner
30% HAMFI	5,551	No Data
50% HAMFI	27,195	6,632
80% HAMFI	58,692	19,508
100% HAMFI	No Data	40,079
Total	91,438	66,219

Source: 2007=2011 CHAS

Monthly Rent

Table 41 - Monthly Rent

Monthly Rent (\$)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Fair Market Rent	1,176	1,239	1,469	1,966	2,470
High HOME Rent	1,118	1,199	1,441	1,656	1,828
Low HOME Rent	940	1,006	1,207	1,395	1,556


Source: HUD FY 2014 FMR and HOME Rents

Income and wages are not keeping pace with rising housing costs and overall cost of living

There are insufficient affordable housing options for households earning less than 30% AMI. Median household incomes in the County remained stagnant between 2010 and 2012. The County's median household income has not experienced the same growth rate as neighboring jurisdictions. Even though the median household income in the County is higher than many Maryland counties (\$72,052 for 2013), the current (2009 - 2013 ACS) census data show that as many as 80,142


(9.4%) of the population in the County have incomes below the poverty level. According to the 2007-2011 CHAS data, approximately 32,445 households earn less than 30% AMI, yet there are only 5,551 rental units available that are affordable to these households (data not available for owner units). In contrast, there are 117,578 units affordable for LMI households earning 80% or less of area median income (AMI), and there are 102,719 households within this income bracket. As the data show, households in greatest need of affordable housing are households earning 30% AMI or less and those earning between 30% - 50% of AMI.

Figure 19 – Median Household Income



During the peak of the recession, from 2008 - 2010, home prices declined sharply due to foreclosures; however, access to credit at this time was scarce for potential homeowners. Rents increased by more than 15% during this period, but median household income remained flat. Incomes dropped in 2012, but the housing market showed signs of recovery and home values increased slightly, yet rents rose again by almost 10%. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition³¹ a person would need to earn at least \$28.25 per hour to afford a two (2) bedroom apartment at the fair market rent (\$1469 per month). For minimum wages earners, who earn \$7.25 per hour, a person would need to work 3.9 full-time jobs to afford the fair market rent for a two (2) bedroom home.

Figure 20 – Fair Market Rents




As more homeowners lose their homes through foreclosure and become renters, the pool of households in need of affordable housing becomes greater. When the demand for rental housing increases, rents rise and become less affordable, especially to lower income households.

Summary

The County continues to tackle the impacts from the 2008 collapse of the housing market, which caused tens of thousands of foreclosures, drove down property values and brought market-rate construction to a halt. As a result, financing was more restrictive. Simultaneously, the demand for affordable rental housing increased but the supply did not expand at the same rate. Rental units priced between \$750 and \$999 per month decreased by 12% between 2009- 2013, as compared to 2005 - 2009. High priced rental units between \$1000 and \$2,000 or more per month has steadily increased from 2009 - 2013.

Figure 21 – Changes in Percentages of Renter Units for Gross Rent Categories



As discussed in the Needs Assessment, almost every household in the County with incomes at 0% - 80% AMI is cost burdened; where several are severely burdened, spending 50% or more of their income to pay for housing.

The maps below highlight the incidences of renter and owner cost burden, which is disproportionately higher in inner Beltway communities.

³¹ Out of Reach 2014: Maryland. National Low Income Housing Coalition.

Figure 23 – Percentage of Owners Cost Burden





Figure 22 – Percentage of Renters Cost Burden



5.4 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing

Overview

Twenty-five percent of the County's housing stock was built in 1959 or earlier and is more than 55 years old. The highest percentages of old housing units are located in TNI communities, including Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights, East Riverdale/Bladensburg, and Langley Park. Altogether, an estimated 16,427 units located in five TNI communities are 55 years or older. Almost 175,000 housing units in the County (62%) were constructed before 1980. The presence of lead based-paint (LBP) hazard is related to the age of the housing stock and specifically for those households with children residing in these properties.

Definitions

HUD defines housing "conditions" consistent with the housing problems included in the Needs Assessment section of this document. These conditions include overcrowding, cost burden, or a lack of complete plumbing or kitchen facilities. As evidenced below, 51% of renters and 42% of homeowners experience overcrowding, cost burden, or a lack of complete plumbing or kitchen facilities.

Condition of Units

Table 42 - Condition of Units

Condition of Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
With one selected Condition	71,721	41%	49,181	48%
With two selected Conditions	1,468	1%	2,869	3%
With three selected Conditions	73	0%	130	0%
With four selected Conditions	0	0%	40	0%
No selected Conditions	100,875	58%	50,740	49%
Total	174,137	100%	102,960	100%

Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Year Unit Built

Table 43 - Year Unit Built


Year Unit Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
2000 or later	20,916	12%	7,991	8%
1980-1999	53,260	31%	20,492	20%
1950-1979	80,183	46%	63,622	62%
Before 1950	19,778	11%	10,855	10%
Total	174,137	100%	102,960	100%

Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Need for Owner and Rental Rehabilitation

In Prince George’s County, 62% of rental units and 46% of owner occupied units are 36 years or older. According to 2012 ACS data, 47% of the County’s housing units were built before 1960. In TNI communities, this number is higher. Older housing units typically require significant maintenance and repairs and many of these repairs are costly to LMI households. In addition, older housing is usually occupied by seniors, many of whom are LMI households.

Figure 24 – Old Housing Stock



Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard

Table 44 - Risk of Lead-Based Paint by Year

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Number of Units Built Before 1980	99,961	57%	74,477	72%
Housing Units build before 1980 with children present	13,612	8%	5,347	5%

Source: 2007-2011 ACS (Total Units) 2007-2011 CHAS (Units with Children present)


Estimated Number of Housing Units Occupied by Low or Moderate Income Families with LBP Hazards

The building age is used to estimate the number of homes with lead-based paint (LBP), as it was prohibited for residential units after 1978. For the purposes of this Plan, units built before 1980 are used as a baseline for units containing LBP. The 2007-2011 ACS Five-Year Estimates illustrate that 65% of all households live in units built before 1980 and have potential exposure to LBP. As referenced in the Needs Assessment, 37% of households within Prince George’s County are low-to-moderate income, with incomes ranging from 0-80% AMI. Therefore, approximately 64,542 units are occupied by LMI households with a LBP risk.

Summary

Exposure to lead is still the most significant and widespread environmental hazard for children in Prince George’s County and the state of Maryland. Children are at the greatest risk from birth to age six, while their neurological systems are developing. The ingestion of lead paint dust by young children is particularly damaging, and can result in learning disabilities, hearing impairments, decreased brain development, seizures, mental retardation, coma, and possibly death. Table 44 reflects approximately 18,959 households residing in housing with risk of LBP and contains young children. Under Maryland law, children who reside, or have ever resided, in any of the at-risk zip codes must receive a blood lead test at twelve (12) months and twenty-four (24) months of age. Two (2) tests are required if the 1st test was done prior to twenty-four (24) months of age.

Figure 25 – Lead-Based Paint Risk by Zip Code



5.5 Public and Assisted Housing

Overview

The Housing Authority of Prince George’s County (HAPGC) owns and manages 376 units of conventional public housing, constructed in the mid-1970s with Federal financing. Of these units, 296 are reserved for elderly and families with disabilities, and 80 units are for families with children. The family units are located at Kimberly Gardens in Laurel and Marlborough Towne in District Heights. All HAPGC units meet HUD’s required Uniform Physical Condition Standards (UPCS).

Table 45 - Total Number of Units by Program Type

Program Type									
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Number of Units Vouchers Available	0	215	376	5,798	104	5,112	150	435	0
Number of Accessible Units	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition									

Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Describe the number and physical condition of public housing units in the jurisdiction, including those that are participating in an approved Public Housing Agency Plan:

To improve the quality of life for public housing residents, the HAPGC manages modernization and renovation projects. All public housing properties are included in an approved Public Housing Agency Plan. According to the most recent Green Physical Needs Assessment (GPNA), all public housing properties were rated as “Good Condition” based on renovations completed in recent years. The GPNA provides a comprehensive assessment of the existing physical condition of the public housing stock; and serves as a tool for forecasting cost and viability for the next 20 years. The GPNA report is also consistent with the Real Estate Assessment Center (REAC)

Table 46 - Name of Property and Total Number of Units by Bedroom Size

Development	0 Br	1 Br	2 Br	3 Br	4 Br	Total
1100 Owens Road, Oxon Hill	67	55	1	0	0	123
Marlborough Towne, District Heights	0	33	25	5	0	63
Kimberly Gardens, Laurel	0	0	14	26	10	50
Rollingcrest Village, Chillum	0	40	0	0	0	40
Cottage City Towers, Cottage City	56	43	1	0	0	100
Total	123	171	41	31	10	376

annual inspections conducted by HUD contractors. However, although the properties are rated in good condition, the HAPGC needs to revitalize the properties because of age and marketability challenges. Moreover, the HAPGC has too many efficiency units and not enough 1 to 2 bedroom units.

Under HUD’s REAC program, physical inspections are completed at each public housing site using criteria outlined in the Uniform Physical Condition Standards (UPCS). REAC evaluations include five areas inspected: the site, building exterior, building systems, common areas and dwelling units. Inspections conducted following this protocol yield objective scoring and performance assessments.

The last REAC inspection was conducted November 10, 2014 and Table 48 reflects a list of public housing properties recently achieved REAC scores.

Table 47 - Distribution of Public Housing Units

Number of Bedrooms	Number of Units	Percent of Units
Efficiency (0)	123	32.7%
1	171	45.5%
2	41	10.9%
3	31	8.2%
4	10	2.7%
Total Units	376	100%

Table 48 - Public Housing Condition

Public Housing Site	Average Inspection Score
Cottage City Towers	97
Owens Road	89
Marlborough Towne	84
Rollingcrest Villages	76
Kimberly Gardens	74
Composite	84

Restoration and Revitalization needs of public housing units

Considerable funding has been expended for public housing renovations involving building systems, building exteriors, site improvements (including accessibility), parking, and drainage. Standard renovations for all properties include bathrooms and kitchens renovations, replacement of flooring and painting. A summary of revitalization needs at each public housing development within the next few years are described in Table 49.

Table 49 - Summary of Revitalization Needs

Public Housing Development	Revitalization Needed:
Cottage City Towers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replace/Upgrade duplex elevators; ▪ Upgrade fire alarm system; ▪ Replace sewer lines underneath foundation; ▪ Repair asphalt drive; ▪ Renovate baths and kitchens; ▪ Replace flooring; and ▪ Paint units.
Owens Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replace/Upgrade duplex elevators; ▪ Waterproof basement; ▪ Upgrade fire alarm system; ▪ Repair exterior concrete walls; ▪ Renovate baths and kitchens; ▪ Replace flooring; and ▪ Clean exhaust ducts.
Marlborough Towne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replace select HVAC systems and hot water heaters; ▪ Renovate baths and kitchens; ▪ Replace flooring; and ▪ Paint units.
Rollingcrest Villages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replace exterior door with mail slots; ▪ Renovate baths and kitchens; ▪ Replace flooring; and ▪ Paint units.
Kimberly Gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Renovate baths and kitchens; ▪ Replace flooring, and paint.

Describe The HAPGC’s strategy for improving the living environment of low-to-moderate income families residing in public housing:

All residents are offered a well-managed living environment. The needs of both the resident and property are addressed in an expeditious manner, and residents are consistently informed and directed to all available resources that offer social services. Some of the HAPGC’s strategies are listed below.

Strategy 1: Maximize the number of affordable units available to the Public Housing Authority (PHA) within its current resources by:

- Bridging the affordability gap;
- Employing effective maintenance and management policies to minimize the number of public housing vacancies;
- Reducing turnover time for vacated public housing units;
- Reducing time to renovate public housing units;
- Undertaking measures to ensure access to affordable housing among families assisted by the PHA, regardless of unit size required; and
- Participating in the Consolidated Plan development process to ensure coordination with broader community strategies.

Strategy 2: Increase the number of affordable housing units by:

- Applying for additional Section 8 Vouchers should they become available; and
- Pursuing housing resources other than public housing or Section 8 tenant-based assistance.

Strategy 3: Target available assistance to families at or below 30 % of AMI by:

- Adopting rent policies to support and encourage work.

Strategy 4: Target available assistance to families at or below 50% of AMI by:

- Employing admissions preferences aimed at families who are working;
- Adopting rent policies to support and encourage work; and
- Employing admissions for families displaced by government action.

Strategy 5: Target available assistance to families with disabilities by:

- Carrying out the modifications needed in public housing based on the Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act Needs Assessment for Public Housing;
- Identify voucher eligible applicants should non-elderly and disabled vouchers become available from the Waiting List; and
- HAPGC is continuing its longstanding relationships with a variety of County agencies and programs representing “special needs” populations including the Mental Illness and Disabilities, Veterans Assistance Program, and Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing. HAPGC will continue to expand housing opportunities for these groups through referrals from advocacy groups and targeting of groups in existing assisted housing programs. Case management by advocates is an integral part of these housing opportunities. Advocates include the Department of Social Services, Veteran Affairs Medical Center and the Department of Family Services.

Strategy 6: Conduct activities to affirmatively further fair housing by:

- Complying with Fair Housing Plans in accordance with HUD.

5.6 Homeless Facilities and Services

Overview

The Prince George's County Continuum of Care (CoC) for homeless persons is coordinated through the County's Homeless Services Partnership (HSP). The HSP is responsible for needs assessments, gap analysis, service coordination, resource development, policy formulation, and system performance evaluation of all homeless services. Membership includes over 100 public and private agencies, faith-based organizations, service providers, mainstream programs, consumers and concerned citizens. The HSP establishes strategic priorities, assesses progress, and oversees implementation of the County's Ten-Year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness. The HSP is the local Homeless Advisory Board for the County Executive and the Prince George's County Department of Social Services (PGCDSS) serves as the lead administering agency.

The County has a network of hypothermic, emergency, transitional, and permanent supportive housing facilities designed to provide a coordinated and systemic response to persons identified as homeless. The County also has a centralized intake and assessment system, ensuring prioritization of the most vulnerable among this group. However, the HSP network is insufficient to meet the demands of persons in crisis (sheltering only 28% in any given year);³² therefore, a broader network, including non-traditional partnerships and leveraging opportunities, is essential to effectively expand the County's capacity.³³

The County's strategic plan was derived from national best practices and focuses on six (6) key strategies to reduce homelessness: 1) coordinated entry; 2) prevention assistance; 3) shelter diversion; 4) rapid re-housing; 5) permanent housing; and 6) improved data collection and performance measures. Of significance, accommodations were made for six (6) subpopulations with distinct needs requiring separate exploration, including: 1) homeless or at risk unaccompanied youth; 2) veterans, 3) chronically homeless; 4) mentally ill, substance abuse or dually diagnosed persons and/or disabled individuals; 5) domestic violence survivors; and 6) returning residents.

The strategies are designed to achieve reductions in the incidents of homelessness. Collectively, these strategies align County efforts with federal goals, shift system focus from "shelter" to "housing," prioritizes programming for special populations, enhance accountability, build on current success, and provide new flexibility and opportunity.

³² Prince Georges County, Homeless Management Information System, 2014

³³ Ten Year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness in Prince George's County 2012 - 2021

Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households

Table 50 - Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households

	Emergency Shelter Beds		Transitional Housing Beds	Permanent Supportive Housing Beds		Rapid Re-Housing
	Year Round Beds (Current & New)	Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds	Current & New	Current & New	Under Development	Under Development
Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	118	10	140	129	0	30
Households with Only Adults	44	40	48	24	0	0
Chronically Homeless Households	0	0	0	129	10	0
Veterans	0	0	15	0	0	0
Unaccompanied Youth	14	0	55	0	0	0
Total	176	50	258	282	10	30

Source: HMIS

Describe mainstream services, such as health, mental health, and employment services to the extent those services are used to complement services targeted to homeless persons

Prince Georges County utilizes a full complement of mainstream programs and benefits to provide support services for homeless persons. CoC policy requires evaluation of all new shelter entries within 72 hours to identify mainstream resources, culminating with a plan for new clients. Importantly, the CoC prioritizes and streamlines the process for shelter residents, enabling immediate access to a host of supportive service programs, including but not limited to public welfare programs (Temporary Cash Assistance (TCA), Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Medical Assistance (MA), Purchase of Care (POC), Emergency Assistance to Families with Children (EAFC) and other assistance programs.

Partnerships with the County's Health Department ensure homeless persons have access to health care. All of the emergency shelters in the County have weekly healthcare visits from area health center representatives. These visits provide TB tests, general health screenings, connections to healthcare, and information on preventative healthcare. The "chronically homeless, mentally ill, substance abusing, dually diagnosed and/or disabled individuals committee" of the HSP works to ensure the needs of the chronically homeless remain a priority. Of equal importance, there are employment partnerships established with non-profits, focusing on employment for the homeless.³⁴ Partnerships with the County's one-stop career centers, community colleges and local businesses enable homeless persons to obtain vocational education and employment opportunities. Representatives from these organizations are members of the HSP and are collaborating with the special populations' sub-committees to pursue funding to help create training and apprenticeship programs benefiting homeless job seekers.³⁵

³⁴ Metropolitan Washington Council of Government, Homeless In Metropolitan Washington: Results and Analysis from the 2014 Point-in-Time Count of Homeless Persons in the Metropolitan Washington Region, p 16.

Homeless persons are also provided access to non-traditional community support services. Examples include, but are not limited to: partnerships with the Greenbelt Community Nursing Program, Bowie State University, and the In-Home Aide Program.

List and describe services and facilities that meet the needs of homeless persons, particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth. If the services and facilities are listed on screen SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure or screen MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services, describe how these facilities and services specifically address the needs of these populations.

Centralized Intake and Assessment: The CoC operates a continuous hotline for calls related to housing instability and homelessness. Entrance to all County emergency shelters, as well as diversion and prevention measures, are accessed through this hotline. The central point of entry allows homeless persons to gain services and shelter without navigating different systems and application procedures. Residents are screened, assessed and linked to a prevention program or an appropriate emergency shelter based on gender, family composition, need, and bed availability. In January 2015, the County began expanding centralized intake to include coordinated entry protocols for prioritizing and customizing homeless services based on identified needs of the individual. These protocols create a prioritization code for all those currently in or entering the system. The CoC is also creating a registry of all chronically homeless persons supplement with a vulnerability index to prioritize those most in need of long-term subsidies and support.

Rapid Re-Housing: The County has limited resources available to provide rapid re-housing (RRH) assistance, a national best practice. The RRH services include case management, housing search/lease up assistance, start-up (i.e. first month's rent, security deposit, utility deposit), tenant landlord conflict resolution, budget counseling/credit repair, mediation, and referrals for critical support services. The CoC has strong partnerships with landlords for RRH families. The County recently received approval from HUD to reallocate 30 beds from a traditional transitional housing model to a rapid re-housing model. These resources will become available in the summer of 2015.

Emergency Shelters: There are five year-round projects that provide beds for 176 single persons and families experiencing homelessness in the County. Each shelter resident is provided with basic amenities, employment assistance, case management, health care, and housing placement assistance.

- Shepherds Cove – a congregate-style shelter providing 80 beds for women and their children and 20 beds for single women over the age of 18.
- Family Emergency Shelter – An apartment-based shelter providing 38 beds for intact families, male-headed households, and families with older male children.
- Prince George's House - a dormitory style shelter providing 24 beds for males over the age of 18.
- Promise Place – a dormitory-style shelter providing 10 beds for unaccompanied homeless youth and young adults ages 13-24 years.

³⁵ Prince Georges County Government. Executive Branch. *Community Benefit Agreement between Prince George's County and MGM National Harbour, LLC. PrinceGeorgesCountyMd.gov*. 17 June 2014. Web.

- Maryland Multicultural Youth Center’s Host Homes – a home-stay model shelter providing 4 beds for unaccompanied homeless youth and young adults ages 13-17 years.

Additionally, there is a 50-bed hypothermia shelter that operates November through March to protect vulnerable citizens during the harshest months of the year, and a 53 bed domestic violence shelter for women and children at imminent risk of harm.

Transitional Shelters: There are seven year-round transitional housing projects that provide beds for 258 single persons and families experiencing homelessness in the County. Each shelter resident is provided with comprehensive case management, supportive wrap around services, and assistance with employment and housing relocation. The Transitional Shelters’ programs are listed below:

- THP – a 123 bed apartment-based shelter for single persons, families, and unaccompanied young adults ages 18-24;
- Prince George’s House - a 12-bed dormitory style shelter for males over the age of 18;
- TRRP – a 15 bed apartment-based shelter for single persons and families;
- LARS TH – a 33 bed apartment-based shelter for families;
- NRCR – a 5 bed apartment-based shelter for single persons;
- Vesta TH – a 15 bed dormitory style shelter for single persons (veterans only); and
- St. Ann’s – a 55 bed shelter for female headed families and unaccompanied young women ages 18-24 in a combination of dormitory and apartment style units.

Permanent Supportive Housing: There are fifteen year-round permanent supportive housing (PSH) projects, providing beds for 282 “high risk” including 129 for families, 24 for single persons and 129 for the chronically homeless; an additional 10 beds for the chronically homeless are under development. In addition to permanent subsidized residence, PSH programs provide comprehensive support services, addressing multiple long-term needs of program participants through key partnerships with public mainstream programs, private non-profit agencies and community-based programs. All program efforts are geared toward ensuring participants enjoy the safest but least restrictive environment possible based on their individual vulnerability. A list of PSH resources follows:

- DHMH S+C 1 – 27 beds for chronically homeless families and single persons;
- DHMH S+C 2 – 39 beds for families and single persons, 35 of which are targeted to chronically homeless domestic violence victims and their families;
- VOA – 14 beds for families and single persons, 11 reserved for chronically homeless families.
- PEP Act I – 11 beds for chronically homeless single persons;
- PEP Act II – 12 beds for chronically homeless families and single persons;
- PEP Act III – 12 beds for chronically homeless single persons;
- HELP – 48 beds for families and single persons;
- LARS – 9 beds for chronically homeless single persons;
- RSI – 80 beds for families and single persons;
- UCAP PATH I -18 beds for families and single persons;
- UCAP PATH II – 6 beds for chronically homeless single persons;
- UCAP PATH III – 6 beds for chronically homeless single persons; and
- HOPE – 10 beds for chronically homeless singles, currently under development.

In addition to the shelter system described above, the CoC aggressively pursues other supportive services and housing programs to provide more permanent housing for homeless persons. These programs include, but are not limited to:

- Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF);
- Homeless Veterans' Reintegration program (HVRP);
- Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Program (VASH);
- Veterans Assistance Program (VET);
- Violence Against Women Act Program (VAWA);
- Housing for Families in Crisis Program (HFIC);
- Mental Illness and Disabilities Program (MIAD);
- Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCV);
- Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program (HCV-HP);
- Family Unification Program (FUP);
- Family Unification Program for Foster Care (FFC);
- Rental Allowance Program (RAP);
- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG);
- Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG); and
- Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)

The CoC has identified expansion of RRH funds (particularly intermediate and long-term subsidy programs) and development of new PSH units for the chronically homeless as top priorities.

5.7 Special Needs Facilities and Services

Overview

One of the County's priorities is to provide safe neighborhoods, a clean environment, access to physical activity, nutritious foods, and other resources contributing to a healthy lifestyle. This section describes the facilities and services to assist persons who are not homeless but require supportive housing and programs, specifically for persons returning from mental and physical health institutions.

Including the elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities (mental, physical, developmental), persons with alcohol or other drug addictions, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, public housing residents and any other categories the jurisdiction may specify, and describe their supportive housing needs

Supportive housing for the elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities, persons with alcohol or other drug addictions, and those living with HIV/AIDS are designed to allow individuals to live as independently as possible. Those suffering from substance abuse may require counseling or case management and short-term rehabilitation. More challenging and/or on-going conditions may require supportive services, including long-term assisted living, transportation and nursing care.

Describe programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing

Persons with Disabilities

Residential Rehabilitation Program (RRP)

The Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene reorganized the service delivery of behavioral health services. In response to this reorganization, the Prince George's County's Core Services Agency, which administers public mental health services, was transferred to the County's Health Department. The services provided through RRP are flexible and designed to the individual's rehabilitation needs. Services include: medication monitoring, linkage with medical services, building social support networks, transportation, in-home skills training, roommate matching, conflict resolution, house meetings, NA/AA meetings, substance abuse support groups and crisis intervention.

There are six organizations that provide housing and in-home support, including: Volunteers of America, Vesta, Inc., Rehabilitation Services, Inc., Psychotherapeutic Rehabilitation Services, Family Services, Inc., and Family Service Foundation. As of FY 2015, there are 398 beds with 322 beds designated for intensive care and 76 beds for general care.

Persons living with HIV/AIDS and their Families

The County’s goal is to use HOPWA funds to continue providing housing and emergency assistance, and linkage to supportive services for the existing 183 persons living with HIV/AIDS on an annual basis, and work collaboratively with other local and state agencies to secure other funding such as: HOME Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA); CDBG, Housing Choice Voucher Program; and State and local funds to address the unmet needs for approximately 182 new clients by FY 2020.

Table 51 - HOPWA Assistance Baseline Table

Type of HOPWA Assistance	Number of Units Designated or Available for People with HIV/AIDS and their families
TBRA	126
PH in facilities	N/A
STRMU	57
ST or TH facilities	N/A
PH Placements	N/A

The objective is to protect clients from discrimination, build self-confidence, encourage self-sufficiency, as well as prevent eviction and utility disconnection. Over the next five years, the County plans to use HOPWA funds and other available funds to:

- Provide tenant-based rental assistance to persons living with HIV/AIDS;
- Provide housing related short-term assistance to persons living with HIV/AIDS;
- Work with local health departments to obtain services through the Ryan White CARE Act and other funds;
- Enhance the capacity of service providers to link with other agencies and strengthen the effectiveness of their programs;
- Monitor activities to ensure efficient program operation and administration, coordination with other agencies and timely expenditure of HOPWA funds;
- Assist participants to move toward self-sufficiency by providing referrals to job training and rehabilitation programs;
- Provide financial empowerment workshops and counseling to increase credit worthiness; and
- Continue to provide a safe environment where clients and their families will not feel discriminated against.

Persons with Alcohol or Other Drug Addiction

Residential Services

Residential Services include four options depending on the patient's needs, including:

- Detoxification and Medically Monitored Intensive short-term (28-day) treatment;
- Medium Intensity-intermediate term (60 day) treatment;
- Medium/High Intensity long-term treatment (6-month); or
- Long term Therapeutic Community (6-9 months)

Outpatient Services

Outpatient Drug and Alcohol Services are available at two Health Department locations: the Cheverly Health Center and the D. Leonard Dyer Regional Health Center in Clinton, MD. Services at these facilities include evaluation, urinalysis testing, treatment planning, individual, family and group counseling, and referral to residential services; methadone maintenance is provided at the

Cheverly Health Center only.

Center for Children and Parents (CAP) Program

CAP operates an addictions and mental health program for pregnant women and women with children. CAP provides outpatient day treatment, child supervision for pre-school age children, transportation services, and access to other health services.

Elderly

Senior Assisted Living Group Home Subsidy Program

This program provides funding for low-income older adults who are 62 years old or older and need financial assistance to afford placement in an assisted living facility. The Group Home Subsidy Program enables individuals to continue to reside in the community. The assisted living facility is a combination of housing with supportive services offering congregate meals, housekeeping, personal services and 24-hour supervision. Through the service of several private vendor sites, for Fiscal Year 2015, there are over 440 beds throughout the County.

Assisted Living Facility

This is a facility-based resource that provides housing and supportive services, 24-hour supervision, personal and health-related services, or a combination of these services of residents who are unable or need assistance in performing daily living or instrumental activities of daily living. There are nine assisted living facilities in the County.

Senior Care Program

This program provides services for seniors, 65 years old or older, who may be at risk for nursing home placement. Through Prince George's County Department of Family Services, Aging Services Division, seniors can access publicly funded services or those offered by private vendors. Services may include personal care, chores, adult day care, financial help for medications, medical supplies, respite care, home delivered meals, emergency response system, transportation, and others.

Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 24 C.F.R. §91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. 24 C.F.R. §91.315(e)

Activities that will be undertaken by the jurisdiction to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 24 C.F.R. §91.215 (e) are as follows:

- Provide housing for 185 persons with HIV/AIDS;
- Provide HIV/AIDS operational services for 185 persons;
- Provide TBRA/Rapid Re-housing assistance for 61 homeless persons;
- Provide homeless prevention services to 230 persons;
- Provide financial assistance to 94 homebuyers; and
- Provide various public services to support seniors, persons with disabilities (mental, physical, and developmental), persons with alcohol or other drug addictions and public housing residents.

5.8 Barriers to Affordable Housing

Negative Effects of Public Policies on Affordable Housing and Residential Investment

Prince George's County affirmatively furthers fair housing as required by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended. The County's "Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing Choice" as adopted under County Council Resolution (CR-116-2013) is a review of impediments to fair housing choice in the public and private sectors. Impediments to fair housing choice consist of any actions, omissions, or decisions taken because of race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status or national origin. Policies, practices or procedures that appear neutral but operate to deny or adversely affect the provision of housing to persons of a particular race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status, and national origin may constitute such impediments.³⁶

The Analysis of Impediment to Fair Housing Choice study identified the following barriers to affordable housing:

The public policies of Prince George's County affect the cost of housing by:

- Discouraging high density, affordable or workforce oriented housing in mixed-use development

Historically, Prince George's County promoted high cost, low density residential development as a tax revenue enhancement strategy. As such, a policy that encouraged high cost, low density and high value development stimulated the Developing and Rural tiers, and disfavored high density, affordable and mixed-use development, which affected the Developed tier³⁷.

Prince George's County has lost approximately 47,000 affordable rental units (priced under \$750 monthly) through price increase, demolition, conversion, etc. The lack of affordable housing options disproportionately affects disabled individuals and minimum wage earners. Additionally, Black and Hispanic households have greater difficulty becoming homeowners due to wage stagnation and underperforming job sectors. Contributing to this phenomenon was the increase in high cost home values just after the housing market crash of 2008 with a corresponding 5.2% decrease in income level.

The public policies of Prince George's County that affect the incentives to develop, maintain, or improve affordable housing are as follows:

- TRIM: Tax Cap Ordinance. Tax Reform Initiative by Marylanders (TRIM) is an ordinance that caps property tax increases, and as a result decreases the ability of government to manage periods of strained revenue growth. This ultimately prevents the County from generating sufficient revenue to improve the school system.

³⁶ Prince George's County 2012 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice.

³⁷ The Developed Tier comprises an 86 square mile area located between the County's boundary with Washington, D.C. and the Capital Beltway. The area is comprised of mostly medium- and high-density developments (including ¾ of the Counties multi-family developments) and greater access to public transportation.

- Lack of Development of Affordable Housing Options
- Underdevelopment of Affordable Housing Near Public Transit

Within the private sector, mortgage loan denials and high-cost lending disproportionately affect minority applicants in Prince George’s County. Foreclosures events, totaling 4,265 occurring in 2012 represented 25% of the State of Maryland’s total. Of the forty zip codes in the County, five were categorized as very high and two zip codes as high foreclosure hot spots. The County had no “severe” hot spots. While foreclosures affect homeowners Countywide, there are higher incidences located in low-moderate income, inner Beltway communities.

- Prince George’s County Council approved County Council Bill (CB-21-2012), which established a Housing Investment Trust Fund, specifying the purposes and use of the Fund.
- Development barriers in some communities, including permit processing times, height restrictions, and community opposition (Not in My Back Yard or NIMBY).
- The Prince George’s County Human Relations Commission Lacks Enforcement Authority – The majority of fair housing complaints filed through HUD in Prince George’s County involved race and disability as the bases for discrimination. The Prince George’s County Human Relations Commission (HRC) lacks enforcement authority over alleged acts of discrimination and may only conduct an informal investigation of the facts and attempt to resolve them through mediation, or by referring the complaint to a State or federal agency for resolution. A highly publicized local process for responding to fair housing complaints would be a valuable commodity in the County.
- The County’s Section 504 Plan (Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act) fails to include a 2% set aside for Individuals with Sensory Disabilities.


Finally, the County has experienced difficulty in attracting business tax revenue, which could potentially provide funding to remove historic barriers to affordable housing.

5.9 Non-Housing Community Development Assets

Overview

Unemployment is a major economic development challenge in Prince George's County. Even though the rate of unemployment has declined recently, unemployment is still high compared to neighboring jurisdictions in the Washington Metro Area. From 2008 to 2013 the unemployment rate for the County rose from 4.4% to 6.7%. The unemployment rate is extremely high for ages 16 to 24 at 29.2%. The highest rates of unemployment occur mostly in the older established communities located inside the Beltway and bordering the District of Columbia.

Figure 26 – Countywide Trends & Unemployment Rate



Source: State of Maryland Dept. of Labor, Licensing and Regulation

According to 2012 Bureau of Labor Statistics data, the Retail and Construction sectors provided the most jobs in the County. Employment in the Healthcare and Public (Federal, State and Local government) sector grew at the highest rate from 2002-2012, by 19.7% and 12.7% respectively. In light of the ongoing transformation of the regional economy from a manufacturing to knowledge based economy, there is a critical need for the County to produce large numbers of skilled workers within these sectors as well as the hospitality and healthcare sector in order to secure high paying jobs for County residents. The data for occupations reflect an undersupply of skilled workers for these as well as other growing sectors.

The Prince George's County Economic Development Corporation (EDC) plays a leading and critical role in promoting economic development in the County by providing business services that help attract, retain, and expand businesses, create high-quality jobs, and expand the County's commercial tax base. The EDC will take responsibility for selected policies and strategies contained in this Plan.

Economic Development Market Analysis

Prince George's County has a strong, high-value economic base poised to capitalize on a series of competitive advantages. These advantages include: numerous federal agencies; proximity to the nation's capital; a robust regional economy; a transportation network that includes Fifteen Metro stations, three international airports, a network of railways, and access to interstates and highways; higher education institutions, including the University of Maryland, the region's top research university; a new regional medical center; a diverse workforce; a high level of minority and small business activity; land available for transit-oriented development; and a stock of competitively priced commercial and industrial real estate.

Two recently completed County studies, the 2013 Economic Development Strategic Plan³⁸ and the 2010 Prince George's County Industrial Needs and Employment Study³⁹ highlighted economic sectors with

³⁸ Economic Drivers and Catalysts: A targeted Economic Development Strategy for Prince George's County, Maryland, 2013

high growth potential. The 2013 Economic Development Strategic Plan identified four industry clusters with the capacity to create high-wage jobs and sustained economic growth. The industries include: the Federal Government; business services (defined as the range of activities that support the operations of companies and government agencies); healthcare and life sciences (see the discussion on the County's new regional medical under Where We Are Today and Opportunities and Challenges); information, communication and electronics, and advanced technology industries.

Table 52 – Business Activity

Business by Sector	Number of Workers	Number of Jobs	Share of Workers Percent	Share of Jobs Percent	Jobs less workers Percent
Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction	484	126	0	0	0
Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations	35,944	24,453	13	12	-1
Construction	16,054	22,982	6	11	6
Education and Health Care Services	57,709	29,235	20	14	-6
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	15,828	11,427	6	6	0
Information	9,075	4,089	3	2	-1
Manufacturing	6,014	7,902	2	4	2
Other Services	19,015	8,765	7	4	-2
Professional, Scientific, Management Services	42,877	23,216	15	11	-4
Public Administration	0	0	0	0	0
Retail Trade	36,051	34,531	13	17	4
Transportation and Warehousing	8,389	9,679	3	5	2
Wholesale Trade	8,508	10,640	3	5	2
Total	255,948	187,045	--	--	--

Source: 2007-2011 ACS (Workers), 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (Jobs)

Table 53 – Labor Force

Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force	457,766
Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over	416,117
Unemployment Rate	9.10 %
Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24	29.20 %
Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65	5.87 %

Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Table 54 - Occupations by Sector

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Management, business and financial	99,727
Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations	22,175
Service	46,699
Sales and office	105,231
Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair	39,781
Production, transportation and material moving	19,237

³⁹ Prince George's County Industrial Land Needs and Employment Study, Prepared for The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Prince George's County Planning Department, May 2010

Table 55 – Travel Time

Travel Time	Number	Percent
< 30 Minutes	151,993	38%
30-59 Minutes	171,059	43%
60 or More Minutes	74,918	19%
Total	397,970	100%

Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Education:

As mentioned earlier, a major economic development challenge in Prince George’s County is the large number of residents lacking high education and job skills. As the following tables show, the consequences include low wages and weak job security. From 2001 to 2011 for example, while the overall Washington, D.C.-Baltimore region gained over 250,000 jobs, a gain of 6.4 percent, Prince George’s County lost nearly 5,400 jobs, or 1.8 percent of total employment in the County⁴⁰.

Table 56 - Educational Attainment by Employment Status

Educational Attainment (Population 16 and Older)	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	41,543	5,434	11,899
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	90,914	8,763	19,925
Some college or Associate's degree	103,309	6,816	16,948
Bachelor's degree or higher	110,729	4,465	10,960

Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Table 57 - Educational Attainment by Age

Educational Attainment	Age				
	18–24 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–44 yrs	45–65 yrs	65+ yrs
Less than 9th grade	3,483	11,502	8,835	9,957	6,713
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	10,781	9,081	7,324	12,177	9,346
High school graduate, GED, or alternative	26,950	29,296	32,595	57,975	23,787
Some college, no degree	40,076	25,547	24,520	49,425	13,517
Associate's degree	2,800	7,100	7,574	14,048	2,736
Bachelor's degree	8,456	22,509	20,468	33,881	8,668
Graduate or professional degree	538	11,945	14,076	24,409	7,919

Source: 2007-2011 ACS

The close connection between educational attainment and earnings, shown in the table below, implies that to enable residents to earn high wages in order to afford housing and other necessities, policies and strategies will be required to help improve the education and job skills of thousands of County residents.

⁴⁰ Plan Prince George’s 2035, Approved General Plan, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commissions-Prince George’s County Planning Department, 2014

Table 58 - Educational Attainment: Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months
Less than high school graduate	24,113
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	36,349
Some college or Associate's degree	45,881
Bachelor's degree	60,169
Graduate or professional degree	74,484

Source: 2007-2011 ACS

Based on the Business Activity table above, what are the major employment sectors within your jurisdiction?

Table 52 shows the structure of the County's economy. The largest sectors in terms of the number of jobs include: retail trade; education and healthcare services; arts, entertainment, and accommodations; professional, scientific and management services; and construction. The data also show that the number of County residents qualified to work in these major employment sectors outweigh the number of jobs available in the County. This results in County residents commuting to other jurisdictions to work. The challenge is to grow these leading sectors locally in order to enhance wages, and also grow the local economy.

A local, well educated workforce will likely attract investors and employers in the industry clusters identified in the Economic Development Strategic Plan as targets for growing the County's economy. Growth in these sectors will ultimately reduce the dominance of low paying sectors such as retail and wholesale.

The 2013 Economic Development Strategic Plan identified four industry clusters with the capacity to create high-wage jobs and sustained economic growth as: the Federal Government; business services; healthcare and life sciences; and, information, communication and electronics (ICE) industries.

Business Services

This industry cluster involves a wide range of activities that support the operations of companies and Federal Government agencies such as strategic planning, marketing, back office management, building cleaning, and maintenance. These services may be provided by employees of the company or may be purchased from contractors.

Healthcare and Life Sciences

Prince George's County has shown strong growth in the healthcare and life sciences industry cluster in recent years, growing by 13.4% between 2007 and 2011—a period covering the recession and the first two years of recovery. This recent growth in the County outpaced the regional and national growth rates of 9.7% and 7.5% respectively.

Information, Communication and Electronics (ICE)

This cluster involves information technology, computer and communications equipment, and aerospace and defense-related research, development, and engineering. ICE represents the center of high-technology industries found within Prince George's County and across much of the region. ICE industries are a leading industry specialization in Prince George's County; the County has the highest industry concentration at 73% in comparison to the nation. The employment growth of the ICE industry cluster

has not been strong in Prince George's County. Over the past decade it has declined by 12.6%. Across the Washington, D.C.-Baltimore region, the ICE industry cluster is also an industry specialization, but recorded only a modest growth of 2.5% from 2001 to 2011.

For commercial uses, a similar integration of information, communications, and electronics technologies is occurring, and the critical need for cybersecurity in order to protect networks and information is growing.

Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of the business community:

Workforce

Prince George's County residents have lower educational attainment overall compared to neighboring jurisdictions. According to the 2007-2011 American Community Survey, 7% of residents 25 years and older (most of the workforce) have less than 9th grade education, compared to 4.7% in the Metro area. The percentages of residents in this age group that have Bachelors or Graduate/professional degrees are also lower in (17.5% and 12.2% respectively) the County than the Metro Area (25% and 22.5%). The college education gap is significantly high compared to Howard (PGC- 31% and 27.7%), Montgomery (PGC - 26.8% and 30%) and Fairfax (PGC - 30.6% and 27.6%).

Infrastructure

The County boasts the second highest number of Metrorail stations with fifteen (15) in the region, in addition to eight (8) Maryland Area Regional Commuter stations, and one (1) Amtrak intercity rail station. To date, the County has not capitalized on these valuable assets and actually lost employment around the Metrorail stations between 2004 and 2010. With targeted investment and phased prioritization, the County can reverse this trend. To reverse the trend, the County has designated five Metrorail stations as the highest priority for development and financial incentives. The Transit Oriented Development locations are: Largo Town Center, New Carrollton, Prince George's Plaza, Branch Avenue, and Suitland. Our transit stations have enormous potential to become dynamic, mixed-use transit-oriented communities and job centers generating critical tax revenue, attracting new employers, and retaining recent graduates and budding innovators, investors, and entrepreneurs.

In order to improve the County's aging transportation infrastructure, within the 2014-2019 approved capital improvement program, funds are allocated for infrastructure improvements and reconstruction in areas targeted for revitalization and \$3 million for the TNI program. Priority has been given to the area inside the beltway between MD 214 and the southern area.

Funding will be used to provide street improvements along County roadways and at key intersections to improve functionality, accessibility, safety and appearance while also addressing environmental issues. These improvements will include, but are not limited to, landscaping, installation of traffic signals, drainage structures, street lighting, bicycle lanes; sidewalks and other amenities.

In addition to the 2014-2019 Capital Improvement Program, the 2035 Approved General Plan identifies a need to support the development of the Innovation Corridor around the College Park/UM and Greenbelt Metro Stations and along US 1(Baltimore Avenue) and MD 193 (Greenbelt Road) by targeting infrastructure improvements to retain existing and attract new employers. New infrastructure may include advanced information and communication technology infrastructure, shared parking, bike

amenities and lanes, sidewalks, public facilities, and other amenities to support research and development entities and enhance access to public transportation.

Describe any major changes that may have an economic impact, such as planned local or regional public or private sector investments or initiatives that have affected or may affect job and business growth opportunities during the planning period. Describe any needs for workforce development, business support or infrastructure these changes may create.

Purple Line Transit System

The proposed 16-mile, \$2.4 billion Purple Line light rail transit system will have twenty-one (21) stations, eleven (11) of which are in Prince George's County. As a major new east-west connector between New Carrollton and Bethesda in Montgomery County, it will enhance mobility and reduce travel times for thousands of area residents. It will also serve as a critical economic driver by linking existing employment centers to emerging development areas and leverage public investment. The construction of The Purple Line Transit System is expected to be complete by 2020.

Regional Medical Center

Dimensions Healthcare System, which oversees County-owned medical facilities, will construct a new, 231-bed regional hospital and medical center just outside the Beltway at the Largo Town Center Metro stop. The \$655 million teaching hospital will replace the Prince George's Hospital Center, in Cheverly, with a full-service medical and trauma center operated by the University of Maryland Medical System.

MGM National Harbor

On December 20, 2013, Maryland gaming officials awarded to MGM National Harbor the new license to build and operate a destination resort casino in Prince George's County. The \$925 million resort will include: a casino with 3,600 slots, 140 table games including poker; a 300-suite 4.5 star quality hotel with luxury spa and rooftop pool; high-end branded retail; seven restaurants and a food court; a dedicated 1,200 seat theater venue; 35,000 square feet of meeting and event space; and a 5,000-space parking structure. The MGM National Harbor project site is located on the Beltway Parcel at National Harbor, accessible from I-495, I-95, I-295 and the Woodrow Wilson Bridge.

How do the skills and education of the current workforce correspond to employment opportunities in the jurisdiction?

As discussed in the 2011 Study of Occupational Shifts and Workforce Characteristics Report⁴¹, Prince George's County possesses a diverse workforce with a range of skills. Most importantly, there is a strong pipeline of talent being generated in Prince George's County and across higher skilled occupational areas, such as computer sciences, engineering, and business and financial operations. This strong pipeline reflects the extensiveness of post-secondary institutions found in the County, including the University of Maryland College Park (UMCP), Bowie State University, Capitol College, University of Maryland University College, and Prince George's Community College.

While this study expresses a strong pipeline of talent in the County and across higher skilled occupational areas, the County is still faced with challenges such as high unemployment rates, low educational attainment rates compared to neighboring jurisdictions, and 43% of County residents commuting 30 to 59 minutes for employment outside of the jurisdiction.

According to Table 53, the rate of unemployment in the County (9.1%) is higher than the region (4.6%) and all the neighboring jurisdictions. In all of the Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative (TNI) areas, the rates are higher than the County; respectively ranging from 11% in Suitland/Coral Hills to as high as 16.2% in Langley Park.

According to the 2007-2011 ACS, 7% of residents 25 years and older (most of the workforce) have less than 9th grade education, compared to 4.7% in the Metro area. The percentages of residents in this age group that have Bachelors or Graduate/professional degrees are also lower in the County (17.5% and 12.2% respectively) than the Metro Area (25% and 22.5%). The college education gap is significantly high compared to Howard County (PGC 31% and 27.7%), Montgomery County (PGC 26.8% and 30%) and Fairfax County (PGC 30.6% and 27.6%). In comparison to the County, the TNI communities have lower educational attainment. This is particularly so with Langley Park and East Riverdale/Bladensburg, where educational attainment at all levels is very low for all age groups.

With an educational gap that translates into a lack of necessary skill set requirements, the County is not prepared for the emerging industry clusters. It is particularly important for the County to create a skilled pipeline that can reach K-12 students, post-secondary students, and incumbent workers.

Sixty-one percent of talented, well-educated and experienced workers commute for jobs outside of the County. These commuters are more highly educated than residents working in the County, with 44% of out-of-state commuters (primarily to Washington, D.C. and Virginia) and 32% of commuters to other Maryland jurisdictions having attained a bachelor's degree or above, compared to 29% for all residents aged 25 and older. This is very important to note, as there is also a need for high-skilled jobs in the County.

⁴¹ A Study of Occupational Shifts and Workforce Characteristics, prepared by Battelle Technology Partnership Practice together with the Jacob France Institute at the University of Baltimore and Market-Economics, Inc., December 2011.

Describe any current workforce training initiatives, including those supported by Workforce Investment Boards, community colleges and other organizations. Describe how these efforts will support the jurisdiction's Consolidated Plan.

▪ **Prince George's County Youth Career Connect Program (PHC YCCP)**

PGC-YCCP allows for high schools and their partners to develop innovative and creative programs that will help prepare students for success in post-secondary education in a highly competitive global workforce. The program builds on an existing integrated academic and career-focused curriculum to develop the education and skills required for workers in information technology and healthcare through the public schools' existing Career Academies. The three high schools located within TNI areas including Bladensburg, Fairmont Heights, and Potomac implemented the PGC-YCCP (2014-2018).

▪ **Prince George's County Economic Development Corporation – Workforce Services Division (PGCEDC-WSD)**

This agency is responsible for policy development and workforce related activities related to administering services and programs related to the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998. The County is dedicated to equipping people with the resources and skills they need to be successful members of the workforce and referring qualified talent to area employers. Job Seekers and Employers access these services through the Prince George's One-Stop Career Centers that is operated by the PGCEDC-WSD.

▪ **MGM National Harbor's "Workforce Development Pipeline"** for the construction phase:

MGM, General contractor, sub-constructors, unions, EDC-Workforce Services Division partners to develop programming that creates pathways for local residents to gain the job readiness and/or occupational skills to secure employment with the project. All businesses and contractors under contract use the pipeline program as their first source for recruiting local residents.

▪ **Job-Driven National Emergency Grant (JD NEG) Program** (2014-2016)

This PGEDC sponsored program provides wrap around services such as on-the-job training, customized and occupational skills training, and other supportive services. In addition, JD NEG helps to expand existing programs available to County residents such as the Apprenticeship/Pre-apprenticeship Program and the Career Pathways Program. The Career Pathways Program benefits long-term unemployed individuals (unemployed in excess of 27 weeks) who have exhausted or are on the verge of exhausting their unemployment benefits and foreign-trained immigrant workers. JD NEG funds benefit County residents in five (5) emphasized State of Maryland targeted industry sectors that the County intends to serve which are (1) manufacturing, (2) construction, (3) transportation and warehousing, (4) professional, scientific and technical services, and (5) healthcare and social assistance.

▪ **UMD Center for Educational Partnership Building**

The University of Maryland and the Maryland Multicultural Youth Center (MMYC) established a partnership in 2006 to create the Center for Educational Partnership (CEP), located at the former Riverdale Hills Elementary School. CEP's main goals are to foster academic enrichment, parenting support, adult education, and recreational and cultural programs for the benefit of the surrounding community of Riverdale Park.

- **Prince George’s Community College** (credit and non-credit courses)
The Prince George’s Community College offers numerous noncredit and credit programs including business, finance, health services, foreign language, and management. These programs are in addition to the hundreds of programs that prepare students for the workforce or degree programs. The College operates Countywide in order to make the programs accessible and available to residents. Some of the campuses are:
 - University Town Center Campus – Hyattsville, MD
 - Westphalia Training Center – Offers Skilled Trade Training
 - Largo Campus

Does your jurisdiction participate in a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDs)? If so, what economic development initiatives are you undertaking that may be coordinated with the Consolidated Plan? If not, describe other local/regional plans or initiatives that impact economic growth.

- **Prince George’s County Economic Development Corporation (PGCEDC)**
PGCEDC works with businesses that are expanding, moving within the County, or relocating to the County from another jurisdiction. In doing so, the Corporation ascertains the needs of each business and structure assistance to meet those needs. PGCEDC offers the following services to area businesses: site identification, help navigating the permitting process, workforce screening, recruitment and training, introduction to procurement opportunities, and access to tax credit programs or other incentives.
- **Prince George’s Financial Services Corporation**
The Financial Service Corporation provides access to financing for small and minority businesses through eight (8) distinct loan products. The loans are a product of public-private partnerships between a consortium of participating banks, Prince George’s County and FSC First.
- **Economic Development Incentive Fund**
The \$50 Million dollar fund is dedicated to support \$7-13 million appropriations per year. It is a program designed to provide capital funding for qualifying businesses with the goal of creating business opportunities to ultimately expand the County’s commercial tax base, job retention and attraction, support for small and local businesses, promotion of development and redevelopment opportunities, transit-oriented development and growth of key industry sectors.
- **Department of Permitting, Inspections & Enforcement (DPIE)**
On July 1, 2013, Prince George’s County officially opened its newest department, DPIE. This 280-person agency combines under one roof the staff and functions that support the authorization and regulation of building, site, road, and utility permits and building licenses which drive the local economy and ensure the health and safety of County residents, businesses and visitors.

- **MGM National Harbor Project**

A billion dollar Las Vegas style casino is being built in National Harbor, a waterfront development located on the Potomac River near Washington DC. The construction of the resort casino in Prince George’s County will create thousands of construction jobs. When completed, more than 4,000 permanent jobs will be created and it is projected to generate millions in additional revenue for the County and State. The resort is expected to open in 2016.

MGM Resorts International and Prince George’s County signed a “Community Benefits Agreement” that ensures 50% of the jobs slated for the \$925 million MGM National Harbor Resort and Casino will go to local residents. The agreement also has provisions for a specific percentage of contracts to be awarded to area minority-owned businesses during the construction phase of the development.

- **Business Tax Credits for Job Creation**

1. **Job Creation Tax Credit**

The job creation tax credit pertains to certain businesses that create new qualified positions in Maryland before January 1, 2020. To qualify, the business facility must be certified as having created at least sixty (60) qualified positions or thirty (30) high-paying qualified positions, or twenty-five (25) qualified positions if the business facility established or expanded is in a Maryland Priority Funding Area.

2. **Work Opportunity Tax Credit**

A one-time federal tax credit is available to employers who hire new employees from a qualified population of low-income groups, including workers with disabilities. The credit amounts are:

Year #1: Up to \$2,400 per employee

Year #2: Up to \$1,500 per employee

3. **Employment Opportunity Tax Credit**

A two-year Maryland State tax credit is available for wages paid and childcare expenses incurred by employers for Maryland residents who are recipients of benefits through Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) now called Temporary Cash Assistance (TCA) program. The credit amounts are:

Year #1: 30% of 1st \$6,000 wages = \$1,800 plus up to \$600 Childcare or Transportation

Year #2: 20% of 1st \$6,000 wages = \$1,200 plus up to \$500 Childcare or Transportation

4. **Enterprise Zone Tax Credit**

A one-to-three year Maryland state tax credit is available to employers in designated Enterprise Zones who hire for newly created full-time jobs. A one-time credit for each new employee and a three-year credit for hiring an employee who is economically disadvantaged. The credit includes rehires that were laid off a year or more.

5. Maryland Disability Employment Tax Credit

A Maryland State tax credit allows employers to claim credit for employees with disabilities hired on or after October 1, 1997 but before June 30, 2007.

Year #1: 30% of 1st \$6,000 wages = \$1,800 plus up to \$600 Childcare or Transportation

Year #2: 20% of 1st \$6,000 wages = \$1,200 plus up to \$500 Childcare or Transportation

Summary

In the 2013 Economic Development Strategic Plan, it is stated that at the K-12 level, career academies are a proven way to connect high school students with specific industry skill needs. Prince George's County Public Schools (PGCPS) are currently redesigning high schools to focus on specific career related themes. This effort is part of the Secondary School Reform by PGCPS to ensure that 100% of its graduates are college and workforce ready. Career academies, according to the Manpower Development Research Corporation, which has been monitoring their growth and success, were first developed thirty-five (35) years ago with the aim of restructuring large high schools into small learning communities and creating pathways between high school, further education, and the workplace. Since then, the career academy approach has taken root in an estimated 2,500 high schools across the Nation. The Manpower Development Research Corporation has been rigorously evaluating career academies across the Nation since 1993. They have found: career academies produce sustained earnings gains that averaged 11% per year for academy group members compared to non-academy members; and career academies serve as viable pathways to post-secondary education.

5.10 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

Are there areas where households with multiple housing problems are concentrated?

Low to Moderate Income Concentration - HUD qualifies individuals and families making less than 80% of the AMI as very low, low, or moderate-income. Areas are considered to have a high concentration of very low, low, or moderate-income persons when more than 50% of the population in an area (based on census tracts) makes less than 80% of the AMI. High areas of LMI concentration include primarily inner Beltway communities.

The Low to moderate census tracts fall within all and/or parts of the following communities:

- Langley Park
- East Riverdale
- Bladensburg
- Greater Landover
- Seat Pleasant
- Suitland/Silver Hill

The following maps illustrate low-to-moderate concentrated areas in Prince George's County and the overlap of these areas with the TNI communities (*see TNI Communities section*):

Figure 27 – Very Low to Moderate Household Income





Figure 28 – TNI Sites




Areas of racial or ethnic minorities and low-income

The 2012 Analysis to Impediments of Fair Housing Choice defines an area of racial or ethnic minority concentration as census tracts with more than double the Washington, D.C. regional proportion of each minority group. In 2010, Black/African-American residents comprised 64% of all residents in the County, thus areas of concentration include census tracts with more than 52% of the region’s Black/African-American residents. All but 30 of the County’s 151 census tracts are areas of concentration of Black/African-American residents. In 2010, Hispanic residents comprised 14.9% of all residents. Concentrations of Hispanics would include census tracts where the percentage of Hispanics is above 26% of the regional rate. These areas included 14 census tracts in the County. It is important to note that areas of high ethnic and minority concentration also align with low income concentrated areas of the County (primarily Inner Beltway communities) as well as TNI communities.


The maps below show the areas of racial and ethnic minority concentration:

Figure 29 – Percentage of Blacks/African Americans



Source: Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, 2010

Figure 30 – Percentage of Hispanics



Market characteristics and community assets in low income concentrated areas

Inner Beltway and TNI neighborhoods have a predominately older housing stock and strong presence of rental housing. Both renter and owner-occupied units tend to be more affordable to lower-level income residents in these areas than in the County at-large.

Many of the TNI/Inner Beltway neighborhoods have community assets including public facilities such as libraries, parks, community recreation centers, and public safety facilities. These community assets enhance the quality of life of residents in these areas. There are several opportunities planned to improve the quality of life of residents in Inner Beltway and TNI communities. Future activities include increasing access to transportation with the development of the County's Purple Line, continued rehab of renter and owner occupied units, public infrastructure and beautification projects, and economic development to support new and small businesses.

Figure 31 – Community Assets – Library & Park Property





Figure 32 – Community Assets – Police & Fire Station



6. Strategic Plan

6.1 Overview

The federal entitlement programs (CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA) provide critical funding in support of housing and community development activities to benefit low-to-moderate income households with the goal of producing and preserving decent housing, sustaining suitable living environments, and expanding economic opportunities. The County's FY 2016 - 2020 Consolidated Plan serves as the basis for the allocation and leveraging of entitlement funds. The Plan utilizes qualitative and quantitative data based on a detailed needs assessment, market analysis, and examination of past performance to identify the County's highest housing and community development priorities for the next five years. The following goals define the County's priorities:

- Improve housing opportunities by creating and preserving affordable, accessible rental and homeowner housing in close proximity to transit, employment and public services;
- Enhance the County's economic stability and prosperity by increasing opportunities for job readiness and investing in economic development programs including non-profit organizations' capacity building;
- Strengthen neighborhoods by investing in the County's public facilities and infrastructure;
- Assist individuals and families to stabilize in permanent housing after experiencing a housing crisis or homelessness by providing transitional /supportive housing and wrap around social services;
- Invest in public services with maximum impact by providing new and/or increased access to programs that serve LMI families and special needs populations (i.e., elderly, veterans and disabled persons); and
- Meet the needs of persons with special needs (i.e., HIV/AIDS and their families) through the provision of housing, health and support services.

Priority Needs Methodology

The DHCD utilized an array of resources including research studies, U.S. Census statistics, national, state and local reports, and various data sources to develop a "data driven" set of priorities and goals. Priorities and specific goals identified in the strategic plan were developed by:

- Analyzing the needs of LMI families and individuals;
- Weighing the severity of the need among all populations and sub-groups;
- Analyzing current social, housing, and economic conditions;
- Assessing the financial resources anticipated over the next five years;
- Evaluating input from community stakeholders during focus group sessions, interviews with government agencies, resident surveys, Consolidated Plan work group meetings, and public hearings; and
- Examining past performance outcome indicators.

6.2 Geographic Priorities

Geographic Area

The County will invest its entitlement funds in high priority areas with concentrations of at least 51% LMI persons. Several of the County's LMI census areas are located in the Inner Beltway communities and the Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative (TNI) communities. These geographic areas should benefit from multiple revitalization activities occurring in a concentrated and coordinated manner.

The following maps illustrate geographically targeted investments for FY 2016 - 2020.

Figure 33 – Very Low to Moderate Household Income





Figure 34 – TNI Sites



General Allocation Priorities

Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the jurisdiction (or within the EMSA for HOPWA)

As stated, the Housing Authority of Prince George's County (HAPGC) is the Administrator for the HOPWA Program in Suburban Maryland, including Prince George's, Calvert, and Charles Counties. The HAPGC has contracted with the Greater Washington Urban League, Inc. (GWUL) and the Suburban Maryland Tri-County Community Action Committee to administer the Program.

Suburban Maryland jurisdictions operate HOPWA programs in collaboration with nonprofit organizations to assist clients with housing, mental health, substance abuse treatment, and other supportive services to enable participants to attain self-sufficiency.

All HOPWA agencies in Suburban Maryland participate in their respective County's *Continuum of Care (CoC) Plan*. The priorities and allocations of the Suburban Maryland region correlate with those of the Washington, D.C. Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area.

6.3 Priority Needs

Priority Needs

Based on a comprehensive analysis, the County has identified six goals, all of which are HIGH priority.

The following table presents an outline for priorities, needs and the associated goals to address the specified needs over the next five years.

Table 59 - Priority Needs Summary

Priority Need	Priority Level	Description	Population	Associated Goal
Expand Affordable and Accessible Housing Opportunities	HIGH	<p>Housing affordability is a major challenge in the County. From 2007-2011, a total of 132,594 households in the County experienced housing cost burdens (paying more than 30% of their income) comprising as many as 44.6% of homeowners and 52.2% of renter households.</p> <p>From 2007-2011, 62,411 households representing 22.5% of households in the County have extremely low or very low incomes, ranging from 0-50% of AMI.</p> <p>According to the National Council on Disability, thousands of people with disabilities nationwide need basic home modifications to make their homes accessible.</p> <p>The Housing Choice Voucher program served 4,732 low and extremely-low income households in 2014. The average income was \$18,004. There are approximately 1,300 families on the HCV Waiting List.</p> <p>As of 2013, 77,000 people in Prince George’s County have a disability, including a disproportionately high percentage of seniors. According to the County’s 2035 General Plan, seniors will drive future housing demand.</p>	<p>Extremely Low Income Low Income Moderate Income Large Families Small Families Families with Children Elderly Chronic Homeless Individuals Homeless Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Homeless Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions</p>	<p>Improve housing opportunities by creating and preserving affordable, accessible, rental and homeowner housing in close proximity to transit, employment and public services.</p>

Priority Need	Priority Level	Description	Population	Associated Goal
Economic Development and Public Services	HIGH	<p>A key economic development challenge in Prince George’s County is low average wages and slow wage growth. From 2007-2011, the average wage increased by 20.7%, while the average wages of surrounding counties rose by 21.2% or higher. The State of Maryland reported an overall increase of 24.4%.</p> <p>The unemployment rate in the County is 6.7% (2013 ACS). The highest rates of unemployment occur mostly inside the Beltway.</p> <p>Prince George’s County residents have lower educational attainment overall compared to neighboring jurisdictions. This impacts residents’ ability to compete for high skilled jobs in the region’s fastest growing sectors including Healthcare and Life Sciences, Information Technology and Business Services.</p> <p>County public agencies, as well as local non-profit organizations provide workforce education, job skills and other training and services to promote employability of area residents. Programs and services are also being implemented to grow small businesses – which are key drivers of the economy. Many non-profits lack the skills and capacity needed to adequately support the community and improve the quality of life of County residents.</p>	<p>Extremely Low Income Low Income Moderate Income Large Families Small Families Families with Children Elderly Chronic Homeless Individuals Homeless Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Homeless Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions</p>	<p>Enhance the County’s economic stability and prosperity by increasing opportunities for job readiness and investing in economic development programs including capacity building in non-profit organizations.</p>

Priority Need	Priority Level	Description	Population	Associated Goal
Public Services	HIGH	<p>From 2007-2011, a total of 102,719 households fell within the extremely low (32,445/31.5%), low (37,479/36.5%) and moderate (32,795/32%) income households.</p> <p>Several thousand (62,411 or 22.5%) low and very low income households include vulnerable people, such as the elderly and children.</p> <p>Results from DHCD's community forum indicated a need for youth and job training programs.</p>	<p>Extremely Low Income Low Income Moderate Income Large Families Small Families Families with Children Elderly Chronic Homeless Individuals Homeless Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Homeless Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions</p>	<p>Invest in public services that maximize impact by providing new and/or increased access to programs that serve low-moderate income families and individuals as well as special needs populations.</p>

Priority Need	Priority Level	Description	Population	Associated Goal
Public Facilities and Infrastructure	HIGH	<p>Public facilities are critical to maintaining a high quality of life for County residents and creating opportunities for personal enrichment, professional development, economic growth, and healthy living.</p> <p>The County maintains 1,875 miles of streets/roadways, and local municipalities maintain 543 miles of streets/roadways within the County. Many are in various states of dis-repair due to age, and require maintenance.</p>	<p>Extremely Low Income Low Income Moderate Income Large Families Small Families Families with Children Elderly Chronic Homeless Individuals Homeless Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Homeless Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions</p>	<p>Strengthen neighborhoods by investing in the County's critical public facility and infrastructure needs.</p>

Priority Need	Priority Level	Description	Population	Associated Goal
Homelessness	HIGH	<p>According to 2009-2013 ACS data, in Prince George’s County, over 83,000 persons or 9.4% of the total population – are living in poverty (one in five households live on less than \$35,000 and one in three live on less than \$50,000).</p> <p>Strong supporting indicators of housing instability include utilization of public benefits. In 2014, there were 28,573 households receiving unemployment benefits, 54,116 households receiving food assistance (SNAP), 64,377 receiving medical assistance, 2,619 receiving cash assistance, and 1,707 receiving day care assistance each month.</p> <p>Prince George’s County has 61,842 veterans, the highest number of veterans in the State of Maryland. Low income and disabled veterans experience higher incidences of homelessness.</p>	<p>Homeless Chronic Homeless Homeless Families with Children Homeless Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS</p>	<p>Assist individuals and families to stabilize in permanent housing after experiencing a housing crisis or homelessness by providing transitional /supportive housing and wrap around social services.</p>

Priority Need	Priority Level	Description	Population	Associated Goal
Affordable Housing/ Building Preservation	HIGH	<p>As many as 80,460 (25%) housing units in the County are over 55 years. Older housing units typically need extensive maintenance and repairs, which may include code enforcement activities, which can be costly to LMI individuals.</p> <p>Prince George’s County has lost approximately 47,000 affordable rental units (priced under \$750/month) through price increase, demolition, foreclosure, conversion, etc.)</p> <p>In 2014, the County had 6,212 reported HIV/AIDS cases. Persons with HIV/AIDS often encounter housing barriers including limited income due to medical condition, discrimination and affordability. It is projected that the need for housing and related supportive services will continue to increase as the life span of persons living with HIV/AIDS continues to improve.</p>	<p>Extremely Low Income Low Income Moderate Income Large Families Small Families Families with Children Elderly Chronic Homeless Individuals Homeless Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse Homeless Veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Persons with Alcohol or Other Addictions</p>	<p>Improve housing opportunities by creating and preserving affordable, accessible, rental and homeowner housing in close proximity to transit, employment and public services.</p> <p>Meet the needs of special needs persons (i.e., HIV/AIDS) and their families through the provision of housing, health and support services.</p>

Prince George’s County is committed to allocating funds that serve the needs of LMI residents. Households with incomes less than 50% of AMI and households with extremely low incomes (less than 30% of AMI), are priorities. With input from residents, County agencies and community stakeholders, the County has also identified special needs populations as among those who face the greatest challenges and therefore identified as a high priority including:

- Children and Youth;
- Low Income Families and Individuals;
- Homeless and those at risk of homelessness;
- Elderly;
- Veterans;
- Disabled persons; and
- Persons with HIV/AIDS and their families.

6.4 Influence of Market Conditions

Influence of Market Conditions

The characteristics of the housing market - housing tenure, housing condition, and cost of housing, influenced the County's decisions regarding allocation priorities among the various types of housing assistance including:

- Rental assistance;
- Production of new units;
- Rehabilitation of new units; and
- Acquisition of existing units (including the preservation of affordable housing units).

Allocation priorities are also based on the severity of housing problems, needs of renters and owners by income level, persons at-risk of homelessness and homeless persons.

The following table describes how the characteristics of the housing market will influence the County's decisions regarding allocation priorities of federal funds for the following affordable housing types:

Table 60 - Influence of Market Conditions

Affordable Housing Type	Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type
Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)	In previous years, the County has not allocated federal funds for permanent tenant-based rental assistance. Due to reductions in federal funding for affordable housing, all resources are utilized for construction of new units and preserving rental and owner occupied housing units. The Housing Market Analysis shows cost burden is the primary pre-indicator of homeless risk, specifically among LMI households paying more than 50% of their income on housing costs. Subject to the availability of funds, the County may use TBRA for special needs housing, including preservation and supportive housing for homeless individuals/families.
TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs	Approximately 126 persons with HIV/AIDS and their families received tenant-based rental assistance and 57 received housing related short-term assistance (short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance) in FY 2014. It is projected that the need for housing will continue to increase as the life span of persons living with HIV/AIDS continues to improve. The Needs Assessment and Housing Market Analysis evidenced special needs populations. The elderly and disabled are likely to have very low incomes and experience housing problems such as high cost burden.
New Unit Production	Housing affordability is a major challenge in the County. The Needs Assessment evidenced 132,594 households in the County experienced housing cost burden (paying more than 30% of their income for housing) comprising as many as 52.2% of renter households. The Housing Choice Voucher program served 4,732 low and extremely-low income households in 2014 with an average income of \$18,004. There are approximately 1,300 families on the HCV Waiting List. The County's priority is to create and preserve affordable, accessible housing for LMI households.
Rehabilitation	Based on the Housing Market Analysis, as many as 80,460 (25%) housing units in the County are over 55 years old. The age and condition of housing stock are factors adversely impacting both renter and owner rehabilitation housing needs. The County's Housing Rehabilitation Assistance Program is a cost-effective means of preserving existing affordable units.

Affordable Housing Type	Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type
Acquisition, including preservation	<p>The Housing Market Analysis evidenced that the County lost approximately 47,000 affordable rental units (priced under \$750/month) through price increases, demolition, foreclosure or conversion between 2000 - 2010. The County supports the expansion of non-profit Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs), whose programs help create homeownership opportunities. In addition, the County's non-profit HUD certified housing counseling agencies offer programs to reduce foreclosures.</p>

6.5 Anticipated Resources

The following table identifies the entitlement allocations and anticipated program income anticipated to address priority needs, goals and specific objectives identified in this Plan (*Please see Appendix 7.8 for Program Income Methodology*):

Table 61- Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources :\$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public-federal	Acquisition	\$4,307,176	\$237,116	-	\$4,544,292	\$18,177,168	The expected amount available for all years is based on a three-year average of prior federal allocations.
		Administration and Planning						
		Affordable Housing						
		Economic Development						
		Public Improvements						
		Public Services						
HOME	public-federal	Acquisition	\$1,433,959	\$556,735	-	\$1,467,775	\$5,871,100	The expected amount available for all years is based on a three-year average of prior federal allocations. HUD is currently reviewing the County's Voluntary
		Homebuyer Assistance	*Pending Voluntary Grant					
		Homeowner Rehabilitation	Reduction Plan: (\$522,919)					
		Multi-family Rental Rehabilitation						

								Grant Reduction Plan resulting from findings cited in the FY 2012 HOME HUD OIG Report 2012-PH-1001. HOME funds may be reduced by 33% for each of the next five years.
ESG	public-federal	Rapid Re-housing Rental Assistance Transitional Housing	\$389,196	-	-	\$389,196	\$1,556,784	The expected amount available for all years is based on a three-year average of prior federal allocations.
HOPWA	public-federal	Permanent housing TBRA Supportive Services Transitional Housing	\$2,014,129	-	-	\$2,014,129	\$8,056,516	The expected amount available for all years is based on a three-year average of prior federal.

Leverage from additional resources (private, state and local funds) including matching requirements:

HOME Investment Partnerships Program (25% Match Requirement) - The County uses multi-family bond proceeds, State funds, and waivers and/or deferment of state and local taxes, charges or fees, as contributions to housing total development costs pursuant to matching requirements.

Emergency Solutions Grant Program (100% Match Requirement) - The ESG program requires the County to provide a match of not less than 100% of the ESG funds. Other funds include Local (General Funds),

State (Emergency & Transitional Housing Services), Department of Family Services Special Funds, and private funds.

Non entitlement resources include:

- Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC): The federal Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program (LIHTC) is the principal funding source for the construction and rehabilitation of affordable rental homes. The County currently projects a total of 246 units will be built utilizing this federal source in 2016, totaling approximately \$20,508,691; and 182 units in 2017 totaling approximately \$22,652,164. Based on the average of these two years, the County projects an additional 642 units utilizing approximately \$64,741,282 in LIHTC funding over the three - year span of 2018 - 2020.
- Section 8/HCV: The Housing Authority of Prince George's County administers the Section 8/Housing Choice Voucher Program for the County which provides rent subsidies to 4,700 low income households. The County anticipates allocating \$74,171,051 in FY 2016 and \$296,684,204 for the remainder of the Consolidated Plan period.
- Public Housing: The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development provides funding to support management of the County's public housing sites: Owens Road (123 units); Marlborough Towne (63 units); Kimberly Gardens (50 units); and Cottage City (100 units). The County anticipates allocating \$1,428,211 in FY 2016 and \$5,712,844 for the remainder of the Consolidated Plan period.
- Triple Play Program: The Triple Play Program will leverage \$6 million to draw over \$100 million in State funding to provide down payment and closing cost assistance to new homebuyers in the County. The Program began in FY 2015 and projections anticipate spending in the amount of \$2 million for FY 2016 and 2017. It is anticipated that the funding will be exhausted in FY 2017.

Table 62 - Non-Entitlement Leveraged Funds

Leverages			
	FY 2016	FY 2017 - 2020	Type of Funding
Local Funds	\$ 3,354,400	\$ 13,417,600	Reflects FY 15 Approved Budget Plan for DHCD administrative division: DHCD Administration; RDA Administration; CPD Administrative General Funds
State Funds	\$ 22,508,691	\$ 89,393,446	LIHTC. Assumes \$2 million in FY 16 and FY 17 for NMS. Assumes NMS funding will be exhausted in FY 17
Other Federal Funds	\$ 75,599,262	\$ 302,397,048	Formula Grants: HCV and Public Housing
Other Resources	\$ 793,851	\$ 3,175,404	Program Income for CDBG & HOME
TOTAL	\$ 102,256,204	\$ 408,383,498	

Note: The table does not include in-kind resources

Other CDBG Resources: NRSA and Section 108

The DHCD may utilize two additional HUD programs to improve the communities of LMI persons during this five-year period. First, the DHCD may conduct an assessment to evaluate and establish the Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area (NRSA) Program. The NRSA Program seeks to designate CDBG funds to a geographical area for the purpose of concentrating resources and undertaking activities that will make communities sustainable through the provision of decent affordable housing and increased economic opportunities. Currently, the County does not have a NRSA designation for any specific community. The County’s Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative (TNI) communities are potential target areas for NRSA designation. The NRSA must meet certain regulatory criteria (as stated in 24 C.F.R 570.208(a)(1)(vii), as authorized by 24 C.F.R. 570.208(d)(5)(i) of the CDBG regulations.

Second, the DHCD is currently exploring the application of the Section 108 Program which is the loan guarantee component of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program. Section 108 provides communities with a source of financing for economic development, housing rehabilitation, public facilities, and large-scale physical development projects. Local governments borrowing funds guaranteed by HUD through the Section 108 program must pledge current and future CDBG allocations as security for the loan.

DHCD has identified two potential Section 108 Loan activities that, as required, meet CDBG national objectives and will be used to support projects located in the Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative (TNI) communities. They include: 1) establishment of a commercial business loan fund; and 2) the preservation of affordable housing and the creation of mixed-income and mixed-use housing developments. Below is a brief synopsis of both activities:

1. Commercial Business Loan Fund

The County will lend the proceeds of the Section 108 Guaranteed Loan to the Prince George’s Financial Service’s Corporation (FSC First), through a sub-recipient agreement, to establish a commercial business loan fund. The fund will make individual loans to small businesses principally headquartered in the County’s Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative (TNI) areas, assisting them in carrying out economic development projects including but not limited to façade improvement and building renovations. The fund will increase leveraging opportunities

and encourage private investment for the revitalization of distressed neighborhoods. The Section 108 Loan Guarantee will be repaid from the loan repayments which may also provide, subject to program design, funding to support a Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) for future commercial loans.

2. Preserve Affordable Housing/Develop Mixed-Income Housing

The County seeks to use the Section 108 Guaranteed Loan for the preservation (acquisition and rehabilitation) of affordable housing and the creation of mixed-income and mixed-use housing development in the County's Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative (TNI) areas. The development projects may contain a combination of residential units for low-to-moderate income persons, market rate units and ground floor commercial space for lease to retailers as well as small, TNI area businesses. Priority will be given to those projects that leverage a variety of private, federal, state and local funds for the primary purpose to stabilize depressed neighborhoods. All projects must be capable of supporting debt service repayments.

The Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program requires the County to meet all program regulations as outlined under 24 C.F.R. §570.700 through 24 C.F.R. §570.711.

6.6 Institutional Delivery Structure

Explain the institutional structure through which the jurisdiction will carry out its consolidated plan including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions.

The Prince George’s County Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) is the administrator of the entitlement funds allocated to the jurisdiction. The DHCD established a competitive process for the award of CDBG and HOME entitlement funds based on a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA). The NOFA is issued annually for the CDBG Program. The DHCD accepts HOME Program applications on a rolling basis. Upon receipt of applications, a Proposal Advisory Group (PAG) evaluates each application to determine eligibility. Under the CDBG Program, applicants must provide a detailed project description, project budget, and implementation schedule. Recommendations for project funding are forwarded to the County Executive and County Council for approval. All Prince George’s County projects are described in the Annual Action Plan, and reported in the Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER).⁴²

The Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009 (HEARTH Act) amended the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, known as the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program, is administered by the Department of Social Services (DSS). As stated, the DSS oversees the Continuum of Care (CoC) for the homeless and coordinates the County’s Homeless Services Partnership Program (HSP).

Table 63 below, reflects the entities, government offices and non-profit organizations which comprise the institutional delivery system for the County’s CDBG Program.

Table 63 – Institutional Delivery

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
Department of Community and Housing Development	Government	Affordable Housing Economic Development Homelessness Non-Homeless Special Needs Planning Public Facilities Public Services	Countywide
Department of Social Services Homeless Services Partnership (HSP)	Government Sub-recipient	Homelessness	Countywide
Housing Authority of Prince George’s County	Government	Affordable Housing	Countywide

⁴² Prince George’s County Department of Housing and Community Development Policies and Procedures Manual – Community and Planning Development Programs.

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
Housing Initiative Partnership	Sub-recipient	Affordable Housing Public Services	Countywide
Independence Now, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Affordable Housing	Countywide
Prince George's County Redevelopment Authority	Sub-recipient	Affordable Housing	Countywide
United Communities Against Poverty, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Affordable Housing Public Services	Countywide
Casa de Maryland, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Services Economic Development	Langley Park
City of District Heights	Municipality	Infrastructure	District Heights
Gateway Community Development Corporation	Sub-recipient	Economic Development	Brentwood
Hyattsville Community Development Corporation	Sub-recipient	Economic Development	Hyattsville
City of New Carrollton	Municipality	Infrastructure	New Carrollton
The Training Source, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Economic Development	Countywide
University of Maryland - Branch Ave in Bloom	Sub-recipient	Economic Development	Countywide
Human Services Coalition of Prince George's County	Sub-recipient	Planning	Countywide
Neighborhood Design Center	Sub-recipient	Planning	Countywide
Addiction Recovery	Sub-recipient	Public Facilities	Countywide
Town of Bladensburg	Municipality	Infrastructure	Bladensburg
Town of Capitol Heights	Municipality	Infrastructure	Capitol Heights
City of Greenbelt	Municipality	Public Facilities	Greenbelt
City of Seat Pleasant	Municipality	Infrastructure	Seat Pleasant
The Tabernacle of Laurel, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Facilities	Laurel
Greater Baden Medical Services, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Facilities	Countywide
The Arc of Prince George's County	Sub-recipient	Public Facilities	Countywide
VESTA, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Facilities	Countywide
Baltimore Neighborhoods, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide
Capital Scholars, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
Court Appointed Special Advocates	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide
Community Builders, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide
Community Crisis Center	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide
Community Crisis Services, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide
First Generation College Bound, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide
Greater Washington Urban League	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide
Housing Options & Planning Enterprises, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide
Laurel Advocacy and Referral Services, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide
Prince George's Child Resource Center, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide
Prince George's County Department of Social Services	Government	Public Services	Countywide
Sowing Empowerment and Economic Development, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide
St. Ann's Center for Children, Youth and Families	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide
Take Charge Juvenile Diversion Program, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide
Top Banana Home Delivered Groceries, Inc.	Sub-recipient	Public Services	Countywide

Assessment of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System

The institutional structure for this Consolidated Plan is predicated upon compliance with the County's citizen participation process, requiring public input and notification. Local approval of the Plan is subject to the County Executive's Office review and submission to the County Council for final approval. As a participating jurisdiction under HUD's entitlement programs, the County has a history of coordinating with government offices, municipalities, agencies, and nonprofit organizations, comprising its institutional delivery system. The DHCD believes the institutional system does not have major gaps in service delivery; instead, it continues to seek opportunities to enhance and strengthen existing partnerships.

Availability of services targeted to homeless persons and persons with HIV and mainstream services

Table 64 - Homeless Prevention Services Summary

Homelessness Prevention Services	Available in the Community	Targeted to Homeless	Targeted to People with HIV
Homelessness Prevention Services			
Counseling/Advocacy	X	X	X
Legal Assistance	X	X	
Mortgage Assistance	X		X
Rental Assistance	X	X	X
Utilities Assistance	X		X
Street Outreach Services			
Law Enforcement	X		
Mobile Clinics	X	X	X
Other Street Outreach Services	X	X	X
Supportive Services			
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	X	X	
Child Care	X		
Education	X		
Employment and Employment Training	X	X	X
Healthcare	X	X	X
HIV/AIDS	X	X	X
Life Skills	X	X	
Mental Health Counseling	X	X	
Transportation	X		
Other			
Youth Services	X	X	X

Describe how the service delivery system including, but not limited to, the services listed above meet the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth)

As defined under both the Needs Assessment and Market Analysis sections, the DHCD is the sub-grantee and coordinator for the Housing Opportunities for Persons with Aids (HOPWA) Program and works collaboratively with nonprofit sub-recipients. The District of Columbia Department of Health (DOH) HIV/AIDS Hepatitis/STD/TB Administration (HAHSTA) is the Regional Grantee on behalf of the Washington, D.C. Eligible Metropolitan Area (EMA). The Washington, D.C. EMA is comprised of the District of Columbia and neighboring counties: Suburban and Rural Maryland, Northern Virginia, and

Rural West Virginia.⁴³ The Housing Authority of Prince George's County is the HIV/AIDS Administrator for Suburban Maryland. This region includes Prince George's County, Calvert County and Charles County.⁴⁴ HOPWA provides funding to community-based organizations and support a continuum of dedicated housing units designed to assist people with HIV/AIDS access housing.

The Prince George's County Continuum of Care (CoC) for homeless persons is coordinated through the County's Homeless Services Partnership (HSP). A detailed narrative pertaining to the program and service delivery system for homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) can be found under **(Section 5.6 Homeless Facilities and Services.)**

Describe the strengths and gaps of the service delivery system for special needs populations and persons experiencing homelessness, including, but not limited to, the services listed above

The County has a network of hypothermic, emergency, transitional, and permanent supportive housing facilities designed to provide a coordinated and systemic response to homeless persons. A centralized intake and assessment system has been established, ensuring prioritization of the most vulnerable among this group. However, this system, as stated, is insufficient to meet the demands of persons in crisis. Additionally, the County established a broader network of non-traditional partnerships to expand its capacity to service this population.

Based on the Needs Assessment Focus Groups and Community Forums, the following is a list of service delivery gaps for this population:

- Need for additional homeless shelters;
- Insufficient affordable housing and rental subsidies;
- Lack of assistance to locate and find accessible affordable housing;
- Inadequate housing options for families and persons with special needs; and
- Transportation for youth services.

Provide a summary of the strategy for overcoming gaps in the institutional structure and service delivery system for carrying out a strategy to address priority needs

The DHCD seeks to enhance its collaboration with government agencies, non-profit housing developers, private social welfare organizations, and municipalities. The DHCD will encourage consistent and timely communications, information sharing, and execute required program monitoring, ensuring that the resources committed to programs achieve maximum outcomes. Further, the County's strategic Ten Year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness, derived from national best practices, is based on a

⁴³<http://doh.dc.gov/page/hiv-services-district-columbia>

⁴⁴

<http://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/DHCD/FederallyFundedPrograms/HOPWA/Pages/default.aspx>

comprehensive system to reduce homelessness. As stated, the system includes six key strategic components: coordinated entry; prevention assistance; shelter diversion; rapid re-housing; permanent housing; and improved data collection and performance measures. Complimenting these strategies, accommodations have been designed for six (6) subpopulations that have distinct needs requiring separate exploration, including: homeless or at-risk unaccompanied youth; Veterans; chronically homeless; mentally ill persons; substance abusing or dually diagnosed persons and/or disabled individuals; domestic violence survivors; and returning residents.

These strategies are designed to reduce the incidents of homelessness. They collectively form a plan, aligning the County's services with federal goals, representing a fundamental shift from "shelter" to "housing", prioritize programming for special populations, enhance system accountability, build on current success, and provide new flexibility and opportunity. This effectiveness of the system is evaluated consistently to address and make adjustments in service delivery, as appropriate.

6.7 Goals Summary

The following table highlights the County's FY 2016 - 2020 program goals and outcomes. The methodology used included: (1) review and analysis of past performance outcome indicators (FY 2011 - 2014 CAPER and Prince George's County's Charter for Change OMB Report), and (2) anticipated funding resources (*See Appendix 7.9 for Goals Methodology*).

Table 65 - Goals Summary

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Increase supply of new, affordable rental housing	FY16	FY20	Affordable Housing	LMI concentrated areas Countywide	Expand Affordable, Accessible Housing Opportunities	HOME: \$1,184,352	Rental units constructed: 75 ⁴⁵ new rental units
2	Preserve existing affordable rental housing	FY16	FY20	Affordable Housing	LMI concentrated areas Countywide	Affordable Housing Preservation	HOME: \$1,184,352 CDBG: \$6,245,405	Rental units rehabilitated: 1305 units
3	Provide new and/or improved public services	FY16	FY20	Non-Housing Community Development	LMI concentrated areas Countywide	Public Services	CDBG: \$3,015,023	Public service activities other than LMI housing benefit: 84,575 persons assisted
4	Provide job training and economic development assistance	FY16	FY20	Non-Housing Community Development	LMI concentrated areas Countywide	Economic Development and Public Services	CDBG: \$2,799,664	Jobs created/retained: 795 jobs Businesses assisted: 635 businesses
5	Rehabilitation of owner-occupied housing	FY16	FY20	Affordable Housing	LMI concentrated areas Countywide	Affordable Housing Preservation	HOME: \$546,624 CDBG: \$6,245,405	Homeowner housing rehabilitated: 250 units
6	Increase access to	FY16	FY20	Affordable Housing	LMI concentrated	Expand Affordable,	HOME: \$1,275,456	Direct financial assistance to

⁴⁵ Currently, the DHCD pipeline includes the production of approximately 75 newly constructed HOME funded rental units. The HOME program provides gap financing which will leverage an additional 305 units of rental housing for a total of 380. The total unit mix will be comprised of HOME program, tax credit and market rate units.

	affordable owner housing				areas Countywide	Accessible Housing Opportunities		homebuyers: 470 households
7	Improve and maintain public facilities and infrastructure	FY16	FY20	Non-Housing Community Development	LMI concentrated areas Countywide	Public Facilities and Infrastructure	CDBG: \$5,599,328	Public facility or infrastructure activities other than LMI housing benefit: 183,830 persons assisted
Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
8	Provide housing and supportive services to homeless and at-risk homeless	FY16	FY20	Homeless	LMI concentrated areas Countywide	Homelessness	ESG: \$1,945,980	Homeless prevention: 1150 persons assisted TBRA/Rapid Re-housing: 305 households assisted
9	Provide HIV/AIDS housing, healthcare, and support services	FY16	FY20	Non-Homeless Special Needs	LMI concentrated areas Countywide	Affordable Housing Preservation Public Services	HOPWA: \$10,070,645	Housing for people with HIV/AIDS: 925 units HIV/AIDS Housing Operations: 925 households

Estimate the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families to whom the jurisdiction will provide affordable housing as defined by HOME 91.315(b)(2)

HOME funds are estimated to provide affordable housing options to LMI households utilizing the following strategies:

- Multi-family - The County anticipates HOME funds will assist in the production of 126 multi-family affordable housing units in FY 2016. Of the 126, approximately 22 units will be designated as HOME units with 5 targeting very-low income families, and 18 units targeting low-income families.
- Senior Housing - The County anticipates HOME funds will assist in the production of 120 senior affordable housing units in FY 2016. Of the 120, approximately 17 units will be designated as HOME units, targeting 4 very-low income families, and 13 units targeting low-income families.
- My HOME – Approximately 30 first-time homebuyers will be offered down payment loans and closing costs assistance grants in FY 2016.

- CHDO Set-Aside – HOME funds will be used to provide financing to produce, rehabilitate, and/or preserve affordable housing to assist approximately 10 LMI households.

As discussed in the previous anticipated resources section, for fiscal years 2016 - 2020, the County anticipates the execution of a Voluntary Grant Reduction plan with HUD, resulting in the reduction of HOME funds by one-third (33%).

6.8 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement

Need to Increase the Number of Accessible Units (if Required by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act Voluntary Compliance Agreement)

The Housing Authority of Prince George's County (HAPGC) recently addressed all compliance findings, as identified by HUD, however, the need to increase the number of accessible units was not required. To satisfy Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act Voluntary Compliance Agreement, the HAPGC executed the following actions in 2014:

- Installed fire doors;
- Maintained ramps for accessibility and performed routine inspections;
- Performed a self-evaluation of current policies and practices, and executed corrective steps to remedy any discrimination, as appropriate;
- Subject to approval of its Reasonable Accommodation Policy, posted a copy of the policy and provided notice to tenants;
- Provided a copy of complaint and grievance procedures to tenants, subject to approval;
- Provided training to all employees with direct contact with tenants, including maintenance staff, regarding the federal Fair Housing Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act; and
- Displayed fair housing posters in all locations where business is conducted.

Activities to Increase Resident Involvement

The HAPGC executes the following actions to increase resident involvement:

Resident Boards & Councils

- Board meetings are periodically held at public housing properties as a mechanism for increasing resident involvement.
- Monthly Resident Advisory Board and Resident Council meetings are held by the residents.

Resident Services

- Resident Services staff team members work to provide a comprehensive network of supportive services through collaboration with County agencies and community-based organizations. Services are targeted for at-risk seniors and individuals with disabilities at four (4) public housing properties.
- Operating as Family Resource Academies, the HAPGC has converted community spaces into effective enrichment activities, primarily geared to school-age children. Major projects include: computer classes with trained certified instructors, youth councils, and structured leisure and recreational activities.

Is the public housing agency designated as troubled, under 24 C.F.R. part 902?

The HAPGC is designated as a standard performer. A plan to remove the 'troubled' designation is not applicable.

6.9 Barriers to Affordable Housing

Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing

As stated, the County is committed to executing actions to affirmatively further fair housing. The list below identifies programs and policies to address the barriers to affordable housing in Prince George's County:

- Provision of homeownership programs;
- Passage of Ban the Box Legislation;
- Increasing the minimum wage;
- Formation of the Department of Permitting and Inspection Enforcement (DPIE) as a new agency;
- Encouraging mixed-use development zones;⁴⁶
- Encouraging mixed-use development around public transportation;
- Conducting investigation of municipalities prior to receipt of entitlement funds;
- Granting authority to the Prince George's County Human Relations Commission to apply for status as a Fair Housing Assistance Program Agency with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD);
- Providing tax credits, financial assistance, zoning, and other tools to promote the development of higher-density housing in transit-oriented, mixed-use communities;
- Promoting and supporting public-private partnerships, nonprofit housing providers, expanding existing housing programs, and pursuing state and federal funding to rehabilitate and maintain the existing affordable housing stock; and
- Attracting high value commercial development of properties such as MGM Casino at the National Harbor, and the Westphalia and Konterra mixed-use development projects currently under construction.

Prince George's County has made significant strides in its policies towards promoting homeownership. The County has assisted nearly 1,300 homebuyers purchase homes in the County. In 2014, the County provided 267 loans to first-time homebuyers, through the Homebuyer's Program, which generated more than \$2,133,300 in property, recordation, and transfer taxes. Additionally, the County entered into a unique partnership with the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development and the Maryland Attorney General's Office to assist families to purchase a home in the County by offering the Maryland Mortgage Program⁴⁷ (MMP Triple Play Initiative), a \$100 million dollar initiative which could help an estimated 500 families own a home. Through the initiative, all eligible Maryland Mortgage Program borrowers purchasing in Prince George's County receive a .25 percent discount on the existing low rates of the regular Maryland Mortgage Program and \$10,000 down payment assistance in the form

⁴⁶ Prince George's County General Plan 2035

⁴⁷ As of May 5, 2015, the MMP has utilized all funds. Currently, DHCD is collaborating with the State of Maryland to identify a new source of funds for this program.

of an interest-free, deferred loan, good for the life of the loan. The State will waive its fee on the Maryland Home Credit, allowing homebuyers to claim a federal income tax credit of up to \$2,000 for as long as the Maryland Mortgage Program loan is outstanding.⁴⁸

In 2014, the County passed CB-078-2014 (known as “Ban the Box”), which makes it illegal for employers to inquire into an applicant’s criminal background or arrest records until after a conditional offer of employment has been extended. The ordinance seeks to expand job opportunities for the unusually high number of County residents with negative criminal histories, most of which are minor offenses. Also, in an effort to promote affordable housing, the County passed legislation to require employers to incrementally increase the minimum wage from \$7.25 per hour to \$11.50 per hour by 2017.

To consolidate and reduce the time and cost associated with the permitting and inspection process for developers, the County formed DPIE (the Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement). Currently, County leaders are encouraging mixed-use and mixed-income development, incentivizing developers to build quality high-density housing in commercial projects. Plans are underway to negotiate with the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) and other landowners for development to occur around public transportation nodes and subway sections. Housing in walkable, mixed-use communities, near public transportation, is one method to make housing more affordable for families; it reduces transportation costs and provides access to amenities and retail.

The Human Relations Commission (Commission) is seeking status as a Fair Housing Assistance Program Agency with the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This designation enables the Commission to assist individuals with housing discrimination in their efforts to seek federal protection. The County has its own housing discrimination code enforced by the Commission; however, it includes lower damage awards than if the Commission was a Fair Housing Assistance Program (FHAP).

The County has also sought to increase its business tax base by attracting large-scale commercial and mixed-use project development for the National Harbor, such as building the MGM Casino at the National Harbor. It is anticipated that the project will generate over 2,700⁴⁹ stable, well-paying jobs, \$11,119,577.00 annually in property tax revenue,⁵⁰ and millions annually for education⁵¹ and County infrastructure improvements, among other benefits.

⁴⁸ Prince George’s County Department of Housing and Community Development
<http://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/dhcd/Pages/default.aspx>

⁴⁹ According to “The Prince George’s County, Maryland Fiscal Impact Analysis of Proposed Gaming Projects”, Appendix 1-MGM National Harbor Overall Analysis Assumptions (December 18, 2013), the estimated operating jobs will be 2,726, of the available 5,729 Prince George’s County residents.

⁵⁰ Id. at Appendix 2-MGM National Harbor Estimated Real Estate and Personal Property Tax Revenue.

⁵¹ Id. at 13. There is an education fund, financed by the gaming tax which will generate approximately \$217,756,710.00 in the first year of the project for the State of Maryland. It is anticipated that Prince George’s County will generate approximately \$29,893,041.00 in gaming tax funds. A percentage or portion of funds from these revenues will go towards education in Prince George’s County, but the numbers have yet to be quantified.

6.10 Homelessness Strategy

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

Prince George's County's Ten-Year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness was developed with input from a diverse group of public and private stakeholders with technical assistance from the National Alliance to End Homelessness. The Plan is a comprehensive homeless services system overhaul for the County based on national best practices. The underlying premise of the Plan commits the County to:

- Prevent homelessness whenever possible;
- Ensure easy access to community-wide, culturally competent, safe and effective housing and homeless services;
- Ensure people transition from homelessness as quickly as possible;
- Connect people to communities and the resources needed to thrive; and
- Build and sustain the political commitment and community support needed to end homelessness.

A discussion of the County's homelessness strategies follows:

Street Outreach: The County currently engages, through street outreach efforts, its homeless - the annual Point in Time (PIT) Count, the Veterans Stand Down and Homeless Resource Day (VSDHRD), the SSI/SSDI Outreach, Access and Recovery (SOAR) team, crisis response teams, faith ministries, Warm Nights (the County's hypothermic church based shelter), soup kitchens, and other individual outreach to known encampments. While these efforts help homeless service providers to develop relationships with the homeless, the CoC currently lacks sufficient funding for this effort.

Centralized intake and assessment / Homeless Hotline: The County's coordinated entry is managed through the Homeless Hotline. It provides additional opportunities to identify homeless persons or persons at imminent risk of becoming homeless. This process, available 24/7/365, is based on a standardized intake and assessment process for accessing homeless assistance and housing services.

The CoC has identified expansion of this system as one of its key strategic goals and is currently engaged in the implementation of a coordinated assessment component that will provide the County with a single standardized process for all diversion/prevention activities, shelter, transitional housing, rapid re-housing, permanent supportive housing, and other related services. This new process provides an in-depth and individualized analysis of each homeless household and establishes a uniform manner for the CoC to evaluate and identify individual service needs. Finally, the CoC is developing a plan for a multi-service homeless solutions facility – Freedom Center. The Center will provide one-stop access to resources for individuals and families experiencing homelessness.

Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

The County currently operates 226 regular emergency shelter beds (118 for families, 44 for individuals, 14 for unaccompanied youth, and 50 overflow for individuals and families during the hypothermic season), 53 domestic violence survivor emergency shelter beds (all for families), and 258 transitional shelter beds (140 for families, 48 for individuals, 15 for veterans and 55 for unaccompanied youth). As

stated, while this network is strong, it is insufficient to meet the daily demands of persons in crisis. There are several efforts underway to reframe this segment of the County's response system to add bed space and more effectively meet the changing dynamics of the County's current homeless population. These efforts include, but are not limited to: (1) Funding in the County's capital improvement budget for replacement and redesign of two older emergency facilities, as well as a new building for homeless youth which provides the CoC with a unique opportunity to design emergency shelters that are highly flexible, aligned with the 10-Year Plan, and eliminate design barriers currently inhibiting certain services and/or population mixes inherent in the older facilities; (2) Expansion of the hypothermic shelter system to include a year-round, overnight shelter program; and (3) A strategic focus on lower cost and often more effective alternatives to traditional shelter, including prevention, diversion, rapid re-housing, and housing first strategies, as well as housing solutions targeted to special populations presenting unique challenges to the Continuum.

The CoC has identified four strategic priorities to help actualize the transformation of the emergency and transitional components of its shelter response system, all of which are essential to long term success: (1) centralized triage to facilitate timely assessment and placement in the quickest route to permanency (this would include development of the Freedom Center combined with a year round, overnight shelter operation); (2) significantly increased funding for prevention and rapid re-housing that provide decreasing subsidies on a medium to long-term basis (up to 24 months), and creation of strong, trusting relationships with landlords willing to provide second chance leases that are so vital to households whose debt history is either non-existent or severely compromised; (3) system-wide retraining of the emergency shelter workforce in an Emergency Shelter Function (ESF 6) model of intervention and integration of new staff with skill sets in negotiation, housing location, and LL/tenant relations; and (4) redesign of the emergency shelters and conversion of traditional transitional housing programs to Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) models where the CoC deems appropriate.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again.

The County's Plan contains a range of options to reduce the time a household remains homeless, and to expedite their transition to permanent housing and independence, and prevent recidivism.

This part of the County's Plan focuses on two key strategies: (1) Rapid Re-Housing (RRH), and (2) Permanent Housing (PH). Additionally, accommodations were made for five subpopulations identified by the CoC as presenting unique challenges under these two strategies: (1) unaccompanied youth, (2) veterans, (3) chronically homeless, mentally ill, substance abusing or dually diagnosed persons and/or disabled individuals; (4) domestic violence survivors; and (5) returning residents. The CoC created subcommittees charged with designing and implementing additional sustainable strategies to address the unique barriers to permanent housing for their particular sub-population.

Rapid Re-Housing (RRH): In FY 2014, the County's RRH funding serviced the needs of less than 2% of all households.

Keys to the success of this approach include, but are not limited to: a well-developed housing barrier assessment process, good relationships with landlords, the presence of staff skilled in negotiation, housing location, case management, and the availability of funds for short-to-medium rental and utility subsidies, as well as other related housing costs.

Permanent Housing: The longer a household remains in a state of homelessness, the less likely they are to prevent the cycle from re-occurring and the greater their risk for recidivism. Therefore, timely and appropriate intervention is critical. While all housing solutions are important, the County's Plan focuses on two priority areas of permanent housing: (1) subsidized housing, and (2) permanent supportive housing (PSH) - both of which are designed to address the complex needs of those identified as least likely to be successful without a long-term sustainable housing solution and for whom multiple RRH interventions have failed.

Special Populations: Permanent Housing for these populations presents a unique set of barriers that further complicate services to persons who are homeless and require additional strategies that are customized to remove these challenges and facilitate transition to permanency.

Unaccompanied youth and young adults: The County has identified unaccompanied young people ages 13-24 as deserving of separate attention and development of a single integrated system of care. The County has developed the Homeless Youth Work Group (a sub-committee of the CoC) to lead its efforts for servicing this population. Selected activities include: development of a Strategic Plan, conducted 3 annual housing instability counts, created 14 beds of emergency shelter, created 65 beds of transitional housing, participated on a statewide task force to study housing and supportive services for unaccompanied homeless youth and made recommendations for action by the Maryland General Assembly and State executive agencies⁵², and helped pass related legislation to service this population.

Chronically homeless, mentally ill, substance abusing, dually diagnosed and/or disabled individuals: Studies show that although chronically homeless people represent a small share of the overall homeless population, their effect on the homeless system and the community is considerable. Emergency shelters are not designed to address the extensive needs of people with serious mental illness or other disabilities. The County's strategic efforts to provide permanent housing for this subpopulation include: development of a registry of all homeless individuals who are chronic and/or experiencing a behavioral health crisis that prevents them from maintaining housing stability without intense intervention and support; Countywide implementation of the vulnerability index and multidisciplinary review panel to determine placement prioritization; and expanded housing options including Housing First PSH, Safe Haven and a drop-in center.

Veterans: As stated, Prince George's County has the largest number of veterans in Maryland and yet, few access the homeless services system. The County has established collaborative relationships with

⁵² Report of the SB764/HB823 Task Force to Study Housing and Supportive Services for Unaccompanied Homeless Youth, Governor's Office for Children, November 1, 2013.

the Veteran's Affairs, community colleges, workforce organizations, housing developers and service providers to take advantage of upcoming housing and related services for veterans.

Re-Entry: Approximately 4,000 inmates are released from the Department of Corrections each year. When this occurs without a structured reentry plan, it generates additional demands on communities and service systems. The County's plan calls for a collaboration of criminal justice agencies, community organizations and service providers to promote successful re-integration of returning citizens confronting homelessness.

Domestic Violence Survivors: There is a significant lack of emergency shelter beds for domestic violence survivors, in general, and a complete lack of specialized shelter for survivors. The County's Plan includes strategies designed to address challenges of domestic violence survivors and ensure all persons, as needed, have a safe, secure place to reside.

Help low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from a publicly funded institution or system of care, or who are receiving assistance from public and private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education or youth needs

The first defense against homelessness is prevention and/or diversion, both of which are highlighted as priorities in the County's Strategic Plan. It is much more cost effective for many households to maintain their housing rather than the County facilitating entry into the homeless emergency system and re-housing the family. The County has a very strong system for prevention and intervention, but does not have the funding required to end homelessness.

Shelter diversion: The goal of this strategy is to help at-risk households seeking shelter to identify alternative housing options (avoiding entry into a shelter), and to offer support services that will help them stabilize until a permanent housing opportunity becomes available. Shelter diversion is handled through the coordinated intake process and is used in cases where it is a safe and practical alternative to shelter.

Prevention: Prevention assistance, usually in the form of immediate and short-term rental and/or utility assistance, provides a means of preserving permanent housing situations and saving households from entering the homeless assistance system. Prevention and diversion programs are of critical importance to keeping people from becoming homeless in the face of a personal crisis. The County's Plan includes creation of a publicly and privately funded and coordinated intervention system focused on preventing homelessness and maximizing the effectiveness of this limited pool of resources.

Prince George's County envisions a comprehensive housing crisis response system through which homelessness can be prevented, and as required, homelessness can be quickly ended. The plan is designed to identify and align homeless support systems to meet the distinct needs of people at risk of, or experiencing homelessness, make additional affordable housing resources available either through development and/or subsidy programs, realign existing resources with prevention and rapid re-housing initiatives, and target permanent supportive housing for those deemed most vulnerable.

6.11 Lead-Based Paint Hazards

Actions to address LBP hazards and increase access to housing without LBP hazards

Currently, there is no statewide requirement for universal blood lead testing of children in the State of Maryland. However, in accordance with Maryland's "Targeting Plan for Areas At-Risk for Childhood Lead Poisoning," children are required to have a blood lead test at one and two years of age, subject to any of the following criteria: (1) Live in an identified "at-risk" zip code, (2) Participate in Maryland's "MEDICAID" Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic and Treatment (EPSDT) Program, and (3) Have a positive response to the "Risk Assessment Questionnaire" conducted at regular medical checkups on children up to six years of age.

Additionally, the County's Health Department participates with Maryland's State Elimination Plan, which calls for zero new cases of blood lead levels of ≥ 10 ug/dL⁵³. The plan focuses on primary prevention while maintaining well established secondary and tertiary prevention efforts in the State.

Primary prevention requires owners of pre-1950 rental dwelling units (Affected Properties) to reduce the potential for child exposure to lead paint hazards by performing specific lead risk reduction treatments prior to each change in tenancy. As a result, there is a continued reduction in children identified with blood lead levels in compliant "Affected Properties" that have met the required risk reduction standards required at the change of tenancy.

The second element of the State Elimination Plan is to identify children who may be at risk of lead exposure. Children ages one and two, because of their mouthing behavior, are most likely to be exposed to lead. The State of Maryland requires testing children at the ages of one and two.

The last element, tertiary prevention, involves well-established case management guidelines and environmental investigation follow-up protocols for children with elevated blood lead levels.


⁵³ The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) defines a blood lead of 10 micrograms (ug) per deciliter of blood (dL) as a level of concern. The threshold of 10 ug/dL was established because scientists studying large populations observed adverse health effects, including problems with learning and behavior, in groups of children with blood lead elevations at or above this level. For children with persistent blood lead levels above 10 ug/dL, CDC recommends further testing along with steps to reduce ongoing lead exposure.

How the actions are listed above related to the extent of lead poisoning and hazards?

Children living in “at-risk” areas, or areas with a high proportion of pre-1950 housing units, are more likely to be exposed to lead than children living in other areas. The State of Maryland has a targeted plan that identifies “At-Risk” areas; in Prince George’s County, the targeted zip codes identified in the map are shaded in brown.

How are the actions listed above integrated into housing policies and procedures?

Figure 35 – Lead-Based Paint Risk by Zip Code



In 2012, the Maryland General Assembly passed House Bill 644. This Bill requires owners of rental properties built before 1978, when the use of lead paint was prohibited, to register their properties and take steps toward reducing the risk of lead poisoning beginning January 2015. The legislation also allows Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) to seek delegation to administer a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency rule that regulates training of contractors, renovations, repairs, and painting in rental and occupied homes built before 1978. The regulations also apply to pre-1978 facilities with young children.

As an entitlement jurisdiction, the County must enforce 24 C.F.R. Part 35 and Section 401(b) of the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act for all federally funded acquisition, rehabilitation, maintenance and construction activities. Landlords in Prince George’s County must comply with Maryland’s Reduction of Lead Risk in Housing law, which requires owners of rental properties built before 1950 to register the units with the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE), distribute specific educational materials, and meet specific lead paint risk reduction standards at certain triggering events.

Applicants for federal funding assistance, tenants and prospective purchasers of property built before 1978 are notified of the following, before rehabilitation, purchase or rental of federally-assisted housing:

- That the property may contain lead-based paint;
- The hazards of lead-based paint;

- The symptoms and treatment of lead-based paint poisoning;
- The precautions to be taken to avoid lead-based paint poisoning (including maintenance and removal techniques for removing such hazards);
- The advisability and availability of blood lead level screening for children under six-years old; and
- In the event lead-based paint is found on the property, appropriate abatement measures must be undertaken and are an eligible use of federal funds.

Programs and Services to Address Lead Based Paint Hazards

- The County operates a Housing Rehabilitation Assistance Program (HRAP) administered by a third party entity to provide funding to repair health and safety hazards in the homes of low- and moderate-income homeowners. The HRAP offers deferred loans of up to \$60,000 to qualified homebuyers.
- CDBG funds may be used to support code enforcement activities (both residential and commercial), as implemented by a subrecipient. These activities seek to monitor and maintain properties in deteriorated areas including TNI communities and low-to-moderate income neighborhoods.
- The Prince George's County Health Department provides several services to residents as part of the Lead and Healthy Homes Program, including:
 - Nursing case management for children with high lead levels in their blood and testing for uninsured children;
 - Environmental assessments of residences for the presence of lead, in response to confirmed medical reports of elevated blood levels in children and adults;
 - Referrals to the Maryland Occupational Safety and Health (MOSH) Program, as necessary, when adult lead exposure is suspected in the workplace;
 - Educational programs concerning potential lead exposure and safe lead paint abatement techniques;
 - Telephone consultations on asthma triggers, mold and other indoor air contaminants; and
 - Telephone consultations regarding lead in drinking water.

6.12 Anti-Poverty Strategy

Jurisdiction Goals, Programs and Policies for Reducing the Number of Poverty-Level Families

How are the Jurisdiction poverty reducing goals, programs, and policies coordinated with this affordable housing plan?

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Statistical Policy Directive 14 and the Census Bureau uses a set of money-income thresholds based on family size and composition to determine poverty. If a family's total income is less than the family's threshold, that family and every individual in it is considered in poverty. The official poverty thresholds do not vary geographically; they are updated for inflation using the Consumer Price Index (CPI-U). The official poverty definition uses money income before taxes and does not include capital gains or non-cash benefits (such as public housing, Medicaid, and food stamps).

Over nine percent (9.4%) of Prince George's County's population have incomes below the poverty level, which affects almost 70,000 people. With the exception of the District of Columbia where more than 101,000 of the population (18.2%) have incomes below poverty, the incidents of poverty is severe in the County compared to our other neighbors.⁵⁴ To address poverty and help families and individuals move toward self-sufficiency, the County works with local service providers to pursue resources and innovative partnerships to support the development of affordable housing, homelessness prevention and emergency food and shelter. The County administers programs that aim to mitigate poverty and its associated problems. Among others, these programs include public housing for seniors, a Section-8 Housing Voucher Program, and rental assistance through Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funding.

Prince George's County Council adopted legislation, CB-112-2012, to amend the provisions of the County's Five-Year Consolidated Housing and Community Development and Annual Action Plans by adding requirements pertaining to Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended (**Please see Appendix 7.10 – CB-112-2012 and Appendix 7.11 – CB-067-2014**). As a result, the Five-Year Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan shall include a Section 3 Action Plan that addresses policies and procedures for all HUD covered activities such as: 1) programs that may include multiple contracts, contracts with parts of HUD funding of public or residential construction projects; 2) services and professional service activities generated by construction, such as roads, sewers, sidewalks, community centers, etc; and 3) all public housing authority covered activities such as maintenance, development, modernization, and operations.

Prince George's County has a strong commitment to adhere to Section 3 requirements and is currently working to implement a range of activities designed to facilitate compliance with all covered activities. The DHCD shall submit amendments to strengthen its Section 3 policies and Section 3 Action Plan for County Council consideration in accordance with the schedule in Appendix 7.12. For its CDBG program, DHCD includes Section 3 information in all of its covered bid documents and holds mandatory pre-

54

<http://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/SocialServices/Services/CommunityServices/EmergencyShelter/Pages/default.aspx>

construction meetings to review Section 3 requirements with subrecipients. Training and technical assistance is provided on an as-needed basis to interested contractors. Technical assistance includes showing contractors how to determine whether subcontractors have existing relationships which may be Section 3 eligible and assisting contractors to obtain certification. Pending the final adoption of HUD's Section 3 proposed rule change (24 C.F.R. § 135)⁵⁵, the County will incorporate new rules into its Section 3 Action Plan, as appropriate.

The County also seeks to strengthen its current Section 3 policies with the addition of a Section 3 certification registry program, to review and certify contractors for a one-year period. The DHCD also seeks opportunities to partner with County agencies and stakeholders including Prince George's Community College, the Housing Authority of Prince George's County, Office of Central Services' Supplier Diversity Division, and the County Chamber of Commerce. Additionally, DHCD seeks to partner with the Prince George's County Economic Development Corporation's (EDC) Workforce Services Division to assist contractors identify eligible Section 3 residents for covered projects. EDC's Workforce Services Division functions as the County's Workforce Exchange and provides training and referral services, including the State Maryland Workforce Exchange system, an on-line registration system.

The intergovernmental resources include the Department of Housing and Community Development (DCHD) that serves as the grantee of federal funds (CDBG, ESG and HOME); and the Housing Authority of Prince George's County (HAPGC), where funds are utilized for housing, economic development and public service activities that meet the needs of LMI persons and/or households and LMI concentrated geographic areas.

In addition to the DHCD and HAPGC, the Department of Social Services (DSS) has direct contact with LMI persons and households seeking assistance and provides temporary cash assistance, food supplement programs, medical assistance and emergency assistance (shelter, rental and utilities assistance), which is funded in part through state, local, and CDBG and ESG funds. DSS ensures a coordinated Continuum of Care system and a 24-hour Homeless Hotline which is toll free in the State of Maryland. DSS has also sought to reduce the poverty level by promoting workshops such as the Prince George's County Veterans Stand Down & Homelessness Resource Day to inform the local veterans regarding available resources. Ultimately, this program is part of DSS's mission to provide opportunities for residents of the County to become independent, responsible and stable members of the community, which is accomplished by identifying the barriers to independence and then providing resources for individuals affected by them.⁵⁶

The Department of Family Services (DFS) provides programs to strengthen families and individuals, to enhance their quality of life. The Department is comprised of three administrations that serve the aging, mentally-ill, disabled, children, youth, families, and veterans in need of support and resources. DFS's

⁵⁵ March 27, 2015, HUD's Section 3 Proposed Rule 24 C.F.R. § 135 - <https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/03/27/2015-06544/creating-economic-opportunities-for-low--and-very-low-income-persons-and-eligible-businesses-through>

⁵⁶ <http://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/SocialServices/Services/CommunityServices/EmergencyShelter/Pages/default.aspx>

focus on reducing the poverty-level of families includes programs such as the Healthy Families Prince George's, a voluntary program that provides support to first-time mothers under the age of 25, and to the children's fathers. Services include prenatal support, and intensive home visiting and mentoring services. Healthy Families Prince George's is designed to improve birth outcomes, promote healthy child development and enhance family functioning through the provision of supportive services that synchronize existing prenatal, pediatric and mental health service delivery and assist the child and parents to realize their potential. Healthy Families Prince George's works with parents until the child reaches the age of five (5). In support of the Healthy Families Prince George's Program, Adam's House provides medical assessment, treatment, job training, parenting classes and other support to fathers. This program helps strengthen the family structure and provide a better long term prognosis for the success of these families traditionally affected most by poverty.⁵⁷

The Prince George' County Health Department – Health Improvement Plan 2011 to 2014 and *Beyond A Blueprint For a Healthier County* reaches into year 2020 by listing priorities to build a comprehensive, integrated community-oriented health care system that meets the needs of all County residents. The County Health Improvement Plan includes policies and strategies which provide a planning framework for improving the health status of County residents and promotes a high level of communication among a diverse constituency involved in health-related activities. In order to gain greater access to care, the Health Department partnered with Greater Baden Medical Services (GBMS), a federally qualified health center (FQHC) with its headquarters in the County, to provide comprehensive primary care medical services in locations of LMI areas. To date, GBMS has provided care to approximately 5,200 uninsured patients. This program is particularly useful towards eradicating poverty-level families because a number of County residents are forced into poverty due to an inability to pay medical bills or an inability to work due to medical disability of a family member. The County seeks to provide more resources to families like this by removing the barrier of lack of access to health care and promote independence and economic opportunity. The Health Improvement Plan also lists County-specific health priorities; by 2015, (1) enhance the health information technology infrastructure of Prince George's County in order to increase reimbursements for care, (2) improve patient care, and (3) address disparities; and by 2020, (4) build a comprehensive integrated community-oriented health care system that meets the needs of all County residents.⁵⁸

The Prince George's County Human Relations Commission (The Commission), through education and affirmatively furthering fair housing, engages and educates the public through outreach efforts. The Commission's work includes hosting or participating in Housing Fairs and Fair Housing Seminars for mortgage and foreclosure counselors, attending community sponsored events and collaborating with organizations like CASA de Maryland (CASA), a non-profit organization whose mission is to improve the quality of life and legal justice for Latinos and low-income families through education, training and advocacy services. The Commission's goal through effective, quick investigation and adjudication of discrimination complaints is to eliminate all discrimination, particularly in employment, housing, and education, all of which are the area's that, if left unimpacted, actually exacerbate and spur poverty among vulnerable populations and ethnic minority groups seeking to raise their income. Individuals

⁵⁷ <http://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/family/Pages/default.aspx>

⁵⁸ <http://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/Health/About/Pages/Our%20Vision,%20Mission%20and%20Strategic%20Plan.aspx>

protected under the County's civil rights ordinance are aided in addressing some of the issues of poverty prior to them taking root with the families and in neighborhoods within Prince George's County.⁵⁹

United Communities Against Poverty, Inc. (UCAP) is the U.S. Department of Health and Humans Services approved community action agency in Prince George's County whose primary mission is to address poverty. The County continues to support and provide federal funds to UCAP for programs designed to address the needs of low-to-moderate income persons.

The combined efforts of all the above listed programs work to eliminate poverty through increasing the affordability of housing, increasing the wherewithal of residents to afford more house in relation to their income, stemming neighborhood decline and blight, thus helping residents grow value in their owned or rented real estate assets, and by protecting vulnerable populations and minority communities from predatory financial lending practices and discrimination. These programs meet the various needs of individuals and families as they progress toward financial self-sufficiency.

⁵⁹<http://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/humanrelations/Pages/default.aspx>
<http://www.princegeorgescountymd.gov/sites/DHCD/Resources/PlansAndReports/Pages/default.aspx>

6.13 Monitoring

Describe the standards and procedures that the jurisdiction will use to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan, to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements

Monitoring is an integral management control requirement and a Government Accountability Office (GAO) standard. It is a continuous process that assesses the quality of a program participant's performance over a period of time. Monitoring provides information about program participants that is critical for making informed decisions regarding program effectiveness and management efficiency. It also helps in identifying fraud, waste, and abuse.

Prince George's County's Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development is implemented through County departments and agencies, municipalities, private nonprofit organizations and for-profit entities using Federal, State, County and private financing. The following describes the complex undertaking, policies and procedures, and performance monitoring of operating agencies and their compliance with the federal laws and CPD program regulations.

Monitoring Objectives

The County's Monitoring and Compliance objectives are to ensure:

- Compliance with Federal statutory and regulatory requirements for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program, HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program, the Housing Opportunity Program for People with HIV/AIDS (HOPWA) and the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program;
- Consolidated Plan funds are used for the purposes for which they were made available; and
- General administrative and financial management capabilities by providing a mixture of training, orientation and technical assistance to grantees.

Monitoring Standards

Standards governing activities listed in the *Consolidated Plan* shall be those set forth in HUD's monitoring guidebooks for each covered program (CDBG, HOME, HOPWA and ESG). Basic monitoring addresses:

- National objectives/eligibility;
- Program progress;
- Overall management systems;
- Personal property management;
- Sub-recipients and third party contractors;
- Financial management/audits;
- Allowable costs/cost principles;
- Program income/program disbursements;
- Records maintenance and activity status reporting;
- Davis-Bacon Wage Rates;
- Reversion of assets;

- Real property inventory and reporting;
- Matching, level of effort and earmarking requirements;
- Anti-discrimination, affirmative action, and equal employment opportunity;
- Religious and political activity;
- Conflict of interest;
- Procurement standards and methods;
- Environmental compliance;
- Lead-Based paint abatement;
- Confidentiality; and
- Terms applicable to assistance over time.

Specific emphasis is placed on assurance of compliance with certifications submitted with the *Consolidated Plan* to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Affirmatively furthering fair housing;
- Acquisition, anti-displacement and relocation assistance;
- Drug-free workplace;
- Section 3;
- Excessive force;
- Anti-lobbying; and
- Program-specific certifications for CDBG, HOME, HOPWA and ESG.

Sub-recipient Monitoring Procedures

The County's approach to Sub-recipient monitoring involves several areas of focus through a scheduling process as follows:

1. Orientation, Training, and Technical Assistance

Orientation: A sub-recipient orientation workshop is held prior to the commencement of each program year, and after adoption of each Annual Action Plan to provide sub-recipients with an overview of the County's expectations for their performance in carrying out activities under contract. The workshop includes a briefing on basic rules and requirements, panel presentations by sub-recipient peers on issues and solutions, and separate roundtable discussions for review of more specific programmatic requirements under CDBG, HOME, and ESG. The intent is to ensure full awareness and understanding of performance expectations.

Training: Training of sub-recipients is conducted throughout the program year and addresses technical matters such as eligible costs and compliance with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) circulars. Its purpose is to enhance sub-recipient performance, encourage capacity building, and increase sub-recipient effectiveness and efficiency in delivering benefits to the community.

Technical Assistance: Technical assistance is offered to sub-recipients to correct a specific weakness identified through monitoring a funded activity, or through review of required

reports.

Further risk assessments will be conducted early in the program year to assist sub-recipients in detecting potential problems before they occur, and offer workable solutions. Technical assistance is also made available in response to sub-recipient requests.

2. Program and Records Management

The maintenance of the documentation on sub-recipient performance in implementing activities under contract is the cornerstone of the County's *Consolidated Plan* monitoring efforts. File documentation is specified in contract provisions. The following describes the type of documentation maintained in the project files:

Project Files: Separate six-sided files are maintained on each funded activity per program year and program. These files include:

- Approved applications for CDBG, HOME, HOPWA or ESG funding;
- Award notifications, grant agreements, and contracts executed between the County and its sub-recipients, and between sub-recipients and their contractors;
- Correspondence between the County and its sub-recipients concerning questions about eligible costs, substantial changes in the uses of CDBG, HOME, HOPWA or ESG funds. Such correspondence may address amendments, eligible costs, and qualifying basis;
- Financial and audit reports;
- Reports requested from sub-recipients concerning activities undertaken with CDBG, HOME, HOPWA and ESG funds;
- Copies of requests for payment or reimbursement submitted by sub-recipients or their contractors; and
- Any records pertaining to monitoring reviews and follow-up.

Program Management: A tracking system, using a data base compatible with HUD's IDIS software will be used to record the current status of each activity as it moves through the contract development and approval process, as well as all financial transactions up to project closeout. The tracking system also permits retrieval of beneficiary characteristics including numbers of persons served, race and ethnicity, socio-economic data, and others as appropriate and required by HUD for reporting purposes.

3. On-Site Comprehensive Monitoring

An on-site monitoring schedule is developed annually upon HUD's formal release of the County's entitlement funds associated with each program (CDBG, HOME, HOPWA and ESG).

A risk assessment is conducted at the outset to identify sub-recipients for onsite monitoring which are most likely to encounter problems in complying with program requirements. A risk assessment is a methodology used to identify and analyze the relative risk that program participants pose to the Department.

Priority in selections will be afforded as follows:

- Sub-recipients new to the covered Federal programs, who may not be familiar with their compliance and performance requirements;
- Sub-recipients experiencing turnover in key staff positions performing functions relating to funded activities;
- Sub-recipients with previous compliance or performance problems, where follow-up monitoring is expected;
- Sub-recipients with high-risk activities, such as economic development projects requiring extensive reporting and file management; and
- Sub-recipients presenting evidence that funds allocated are not being obligated or expended in a timely or appropriate fashion consistent with Federal performance guidelines.

4. Compliance and Monitoring Procedures for DHCD Programs

The Monitoring and Compliance Unit monitors all programs for Prince George's County. The purpose of the onsite monitoring visit is to ensure program activities are carried out in compliance with applicable federal laws and DHCD program regulations. Areas reviewed include meeting national objectives, financial management systems, and general program administration. The monitoring unit also reviews compliance with Fair Housing and Equal Employment Opportunity, Section 504/ADA Labor standards, and Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1974.

Program monitoring involves reviewing the scope of services and onsite records to ensure compliance with eligible activities meeting a national objective and that program beneficiaries meet low to moderate income criteria. The monitoring team reviews the level of accomplishment, remaining balance of funds and monthly activity reports to ensure the activity is progressing timely. The team reviews onsite project records and interviews staff to determine if the activity is progressing as described in the operating agreement.

Financial monitoring consists of reviewing accounting policies and procedures, systems for internal control, and reimbursement requests for allowable costs. Financial monitoring also involves maintaining complete and accurate files on each activity. DHCD staff reviews the recordkeeping systems to determine if each activity is eligible, the program beneficiaries are low to moderate income, and project files support the data provided in the monthly activity reports. When problems are identified in a monitoring report, an action plan is requested to cure the concerns and/or findings.

7. Appendices

Appendix 7.1 – Exhibit 1 - Agencies, Groups, and Organizations who Participated

Exhibit 1 – Agencies, Groups, and Organizations who Participated

No.	Agency/Group/ Organization	Agency/Group/Organization Type	What section of the plan was addressed by Consultation?	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?
1	The ARC of Prince George's County	Services – Persons with Disabilities	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	A representative attended the Quality of Life Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County.
2	Casa de Maryland	Services – Employment	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	A representative attended the Economic Development Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County.
3	Citizens Action Committee of Bladensburg	Civic Leaders	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended a Community Forum held to discuss the needs of the Prince George's County community.
4	City of College Park	Other Government – Local	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended a Community Forum held to discuss the needs of the Prince George's County community.
5	Prince George's Community College	Other – Community College	Other – Economic Development Assessment	Prepared workforce development data.
6	Prince George's County Council	Other Government – County	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended a Community Forum held to discuss the needs of the Prince George's County community.
7	Prince George's County Residents	Other – Citizens	Housing Needs Assessment	Concerned citizens attended a Community Forum and expressed the needs within the income communities and recommendations on how to expend our limited resources to get more for the community.
8	County Stat	Other Government – County	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	Work Group partners identified the needs, goals, and objectives, which established the framework for the Consolidated Plan. The needs identified, along with demographic, housing and income data, were assembled in format to apprise the residents, workers, and stakeholders in the County.

No.	Agency/Group/ Organization	Agency/Group/Organization Type	What section of the plan was addressed by Consultation?	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?
9	District Heights Family and Youth Services	Services – Children	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	A representative attended the Quality of Life Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County.
10	Prince George’s County Economic Development Corporation	Other Government - County	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	A representative attended the Economic Development Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County.
11	Department of the Environment	Other Government - County	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	Work Group partners identified the needs, goals, and objectives, which established the framework for the Consolidated Plan. The needs identified, along with demographic, housing and income data, were assembled in format to apprise the residents, workers, and stakeholders in the County.
12	Family Crisis Center	Services – Victims of Domestic Violence	Housing Needs Assessment	Conference call consultation was held to discuss the needs of the non-homeless population – Victims of Domestic Violence.
13	Department of Family Services – ADA Coordinator	Other Government – County Services – Persons with Disability	Non-homeless Special Needs	Conference call consultation was held to discuss the needs of the non-homeless population – persons with Disability.
14	Department of Family Services – Aging Services Division	Other Government – County Services- Elderly Persons	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	Conference call consultation was held to discuss the needs of the non-homeless population – Elderly.
15	Prince George’s County Fire Department	Other Government – County	Non-Homeless Special Needs	Work Group partners identified the needs, goals, and objectives, which established the framework for the Consolidated Plan. The needs identified, along with demographic, housing and income data, were assembled in format to apprise the residents, workers, and stakeholders in the County.
16	First Generation College Bound, Inc.	Services – Children Services – Education	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	A representative attended the Quality of Life Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County.
17	FSC First	Services – Employment	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	A representative attended the Economic Development Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County.
18	Greater Baden Medical Service	Services – Health	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	A representative attended the Quality of Life Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County.
19	Greater Washington Urban League, Inc.	Services- Persons with HIV/AIDS	HOPWA Strategy	Conference call consultation was held to discuss the needs of the non-homeless population – persons with HIV/AIDS.

No.	Agency/Group/ Organization	Agency/Group/Organization Type	What section of the plan was addressed by Consultation?	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?
20	City of Greenbelt	Other Government – Local	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended a Community Forum held to discuss the needs of the Prince George’s County community.
21	Prince George’s County Health Department – Division of Environmental Health	Services- Children Services - Health Health Agency Child Welfare Agency	Housing Needs Assessment	Conference call consultation was held to discuss lead-based paint hazard and housing stock.
22	Homeless Services Partnership (HSP)	Continuum of Care	Homeless Needs – Chronically homeless, Homeless Needs – Families with children, Homelessness Needs – Veterans, Homelessness Needs – Unaccompanied youth, and Homelessness Strategy	Face-to-face consultation was held to discuss the needs of the homeless population and provide input on the development of the Plan.
23	Housing Authority of Prince George’s County	Other Government - County	Housing Needs Assessment, Non-Homeless Special Needs and Market Analysis	A representative attended a Community Forum held to discuss the needs of the Prince George’s County community. A face-to-face consultation was held to discuss the needs of the Public Housing Authority residents.
24	Housing Initiative Partnership, Inc.	Housing	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended the Affordable Housing Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County.
25	Housing Options and Planning Enterprises, Inc.	Housing	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended the Affordable Housing Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County.
26	Human Relations Commission	Housing Services – Fair Housing	Housing Needs Assessment, Market Analysis, and Anti-poverty Strategy	Face-to-face consultation was held to discuss the needs of the affordable housing, fair housing and anti-poverty to provide input on the development of the Plan.
27	Human Services Coalition	Other – Capacity Building	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	A representative attended the Quality of Life Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County.

No.	Agency/Group/ Organization	Agency/Group/Organization Type	What section of the plan was addressed by Consultation?	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?
28	Hyattsville Community Development Corporation	Services – Employment	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	A representative attended the Economic Development Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County.
29	Hyattsville Life and Times	Other – Community Newspaper	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended a Community Forum held to discuss the needs of the Prince George’s County community.
30	Independence Now, Inc.	Services – Persons with Disabilities	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended the Affordable Housing Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County. The need for accessible affordable housing was expressed.
31	Landover Civic Association	Civic Leaders	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended a Community Forum held to discuss the needs of the Prince George’s County community.
32	Laurel Advocacy and Referral Services	Housing	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended the Affordable Housing Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County.
33	Maryland Legal Aid	Housing Services – Children Services – Elderly Persons Services – Employment Regional Organization	Housing Needs Assessment and Non-Homeless Special Needs	A representative attended a Community Forum held to discuss the needs of the Prince George’s County community.
34	Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission	Other Government - County	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	Prepared demographic data for housing needs and market analysis. A representative attended a Community Forum held to discuss the needs of the Prince George’s County community.
35	City of Mount Rainier	Other – Local	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended a Community Forum held to discuss the needs of the Prince George’s County community.
36	Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement	Other Government – County	Non-Housing Community Development Strategy	Work Group partners identified the needs, goals, and objectives, which established the framework for the Consolidated Plan. The needs identified, along with demographic, housing and income data, were assembled in format to apprise the residents, workers, and stakeholders in the County.
37	People for Change Coalition	Services – Employment	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	A representative attended the Economic Development Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County. Expressed a need for Re-entry services and affordable housing.

No.	Agency/Group/ Organization	Agency/Group/Organization Type	What section of the plan was addressed by Consultation?	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?
38	Prince George's County Police Department	Other Government – County	Non-Housing Community Development Strategy	Work Group partners identified the needs, goals, and objectives, which established the framework for the Consolidated Plan. The needs identified, along with demographic, housing and income data, were assembled in format to apprise the residents, workers, and stakeholders in the County.
39	Prince George's County Public Schools	Other Government – County	Non-Housing Community Development Strategy	Work Group partners identified the needs, goals, and objectives, which established the framework for the Consolidated Plan. The needs identified, along with demographic, housing and income data, were assembled in format to apprise the residents, workers, and stakeholders in the County.
40	Department of Public Works and Transportation	Other Government – County	Non-Housing Community Development Strategy	Work Group partners identified the needs, goals, and objectives, which established the framework for the Consolidated Plan. The needs identified, along with demographic, housing and income data, were assembled in format to apprise the residents, workers, and stakeholders in the County.
41	Re-Entry Roundtable for Prince George's County	Civic Leaders	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended a Community Forum held to discuss the needs of the Prince George's County community. Expressed a need for services and affordable housing for the Re-Entry population.
42	Reid Community Development Corporation	Services – Employment	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended a Community Forum held to discuss the needs of the Prince George's County community.
43	St. Ann's Center for Children, Youth and Families	Services – Children	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended a Community Forum held to discuss the needs of the Prince George's County community.
44	Department of Social Services	Other Government- County Housing Continuum of Care Services - Children Services – Homeless Services – Victims of Domestic Violence	Homeless Needs – Chronically homeless, Homeless Needs – Families with children, Homelessness Needs – Veterans, Homelessness Needs – Unaccompanied youth, and Homelessness Strategy	Face-to-face consultation was held to discuss the needs of the homeless population and provide input on the development of the Plan.

No.	Agency/Group/ Organization	Agency/Group/Organization Type	What section of the plan was addressed by Consultation?	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?
45	The Training Source, Inc.	Services – Employment	Housing Needs Assessment and Market Analysis	A representative attended the Economic Development Needs Assessment focus group and provided input in identifying and prioritizing the needs of the County.
46	University of Maryland	Other – Public Research University	Housing Needs Assessment	A representative attended a Community Forum held to discuss the needs of the Prince George’s County community.

Appendix 7.2 – Exhibit 2 - Other Local/Regional/Federal Planning Efforts

Exhibit 2 - Other local/regional/federal planning efforts

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Continuum of Care	Department of Social Services	There is a need to address the homeless and provide homeless services to prevent others from becoming homeless. The <i>Consolidated Plan</i> supports the goals outlined in the 10-Year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness.
Plan Prince George’s 2035	Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission	Plan Prince George’s 2035 set the tone for policies and strategic plans for the changing population, affordable housing, economic development, transportation, etc. The <i>Consolidated Plan</i> will address most of the challenges.
Public Housing Authority 5-Year Plan and Annual Plan	Housing Authority of Prince George’s County	The <i>Consolidated Plan</i> supports the Public Housing Authority’s goals of promoting self-sufficiency, ensuring equal opportunity, affirmatively furthering fair housing and creating a greater balance of housing types.
Economic Development Strategic Plan	Prince George’s County Economic Development Corporation	There is a need for job training, workforce development, economic growth and capacity building which is aligned with the Strategic Plan.
City of Bowie, MD Consolidated Plan for Community Development	City of Bowie, Maryland	The Plan is consistent with the trends and projections for the neighboring entitlement jurisdiction.
Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing choice	Department of Housing & Community Development and Prince George’s County, Maryland Human Relations Commission	The Plan is consistent with the findings outlined in the document.
Housing the Region’s future Workforce - Policy Challenges for Local Jurisdictions	George Mason University Center for Regional Analysis	The Plan is consistent with the trends and projections outlined in the document.
Prince George’s County Council Foreclosure Task Force Report & Recommendations (2013)	Prince George’s County, Maryland County Council	The Plan is consistent with the trends and projections outlined in the document.
Homelessness in Metropolitan Washington: Results and Analysis from the 2014 Point-in-Time Count of Homeless Persons in the Metropolitan Washington Region	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments	The Plan is consistent with the trends and projections outlined in the document.

2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC) State of Maryland Impact Analysis: 2006-2020	Maryland Department of Business and Economic Development	The Plan is consistent with the trends and projections outlined in the document for housing supply and demand, educational attainment, etc.
--	--	---

Appendix 7.3 – Exhibit 3 - Citizen Participation Outreach

Exhibit 3 - Citizen Participation Outreach

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/ attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (if applicable)
1	Internet Outreach	Countywide	An online survey was posted on Prince George's County Department of Housing's website.	Survey results did not yield a significant representation of the County's sample size.	N/A	N/A
2	Newspaper Ad - Enquirer Gazette	Countywide	A Public Notice was placed in this newspaper which circulates Countywide.	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Newspaper Ad - Prince George's Post	Countywide	A Public Notice was placed in this newspaper which circulates Countywide.	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Newspaper Ad - The Sentinel	Countywide	A Public Notice was placed in this newspaper which circulates Countywide.	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	Public Meeting #1	Countywide	Meeting held 1/27/15 from 6 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. 15 individuals attended.	A summary of comments will be included in the appendix of the final Consolidated Plan.	All comments were accepted.	N/A
6	Public Meeting #2	Countywide	Meeting held 1/30/15 from 6 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. 11 individuals attended.	A summary of comments will be included in the appendix of the final Consolidated Plan.	All comments were accepted.	N/A
7	Public Hearing	Countywide	The public hearing is scheduled for April 14, 2015.	Summary of comments will be included in the appendix of the final Consolidated Plan.		N/A

Appendix 7.4 – Exhibit 4 - Housing Problems Table

Exhibit 4 - Housing Problems Table

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	255	65	199	125	644	59	10	30	39	138
Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	379	524	390	235	1,528	34	29	78	85	226
Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	937	1,357	970	463	3,727	128	307	350	446	1,231
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	14,645	4,726	488	175	20,034	7,530	8,237	5,216	3,507	24,490
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	2,002	12,458	6,212	2,439	23,111	1,330	3,655	5,542	7,987	18,514
Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)	1,091	0	0	0	1,091	950	0	0	0	950

Appendix 7.5 – Homeless At-Risk and Special Needs Population Continued

Homeless At-Risk and Special Needs Population

Economics: According to 2009-2013 US Census Bureau statistics, a significant number of Prince George’s County residents – over 80,000 persons or 9.4 percent of the total population – are living in poverty (one in five households live on less than \$35,000 annually and one in three live on less than \$50,000 annually). Over 54,000 of these are experiencing at least one of the following severe housing problems (living in substandard housing, living in severely overcrowded housing, having a housing cost burden greater than 50% of income, or zero/negative income) and 97% are experiencing multiple problems. Poverty is most pronounced for those under 18 (11.2 percent) and seniors 65 and over (7.1 percent).⁶⁰ ⁶¹ Based on the Bureau of Labor Unemployment Data by County for 2013 averages, Prince George’s County had the largest number of unemployed persons in the State of Maryland at 32,306, representing 6.8% of its total workforce. The number of unemployed in Prince George’s County represented 15.7% of the unemployed in the state of Maryland, exceeding the numbers in other large population jurisdictions, including Baltimore County (15.1%), Montgomery County (13.2%), and Baltimore City (13.0%).

Utilization of mainstream benefit programs, utility assistance, community-based aid programs, and food pantries are all strong supporting indicators of housing instability as they often make the difference between being able to pay or not pay rent. In 2014, there were 28,573 households receiving unemployment benefits,⁶² 54,116 households receiving food assistance (SNAP), 64,377 receiving medical assistance, 2,619 receiving cash assistance, and 1,707 receiving day care assistance each month.⁶³ In addition, 8,140 requests were made for assistance with past due rent, first month’s rent, security deposits, mortgage payments and eviction prevention; 14,609 requests for utility assistance, and over 200,000 requests for food commodities through pantries and summer programs,⁶⁴ all of which underscore the fragile nature of this population.

Persons in these very low to extremely low-income households often live from paycheck to paycheck and cannot afford both their housing and other basic necessities, such as food and clothing. They frequently do not have the resources or savings necessary to weather a financial emergency such as job loss, unexpected medical bills, or family illness, and continue to cover housing costs. Thus, they are at a greater increased risk for homelessness.

Education: The 2012 American Community Survey showed that of the 678,027 Prince George’s County residents age 18 and older, 14.2% (96,118) were high school dropouts, not enrolled in school or for

⁶⁰ U.S. Census Bureau: State and County Quick Facts. Data derived from Population Estimates, American Community Survey, Census of Population and Housing, State and County Housing Unit Estimates, County Business Patterns, Non-employer Statistics, Economic Census, Survey of Business Owners, Building Permits.

⁶¹ 2007-2011 CHAS

⁶² DLLR, Division of Workforce Development and Adult Learning, Civilian Labor Force, Employment & Unemployment by Place of Residence

⁶³ Prince Georges County Dept. of Social Services, Average monthly caseload for 2014

⁶⁴ Prince George’s County Department of Social Services, internal data

other reasons had not graduated from high school, and an additional 27% (183,320) had only a high school diploma or equivalent. This limited access to employment by the majority to low wage jobs significantly impacts their overall economic status and opportunities for long term self-sufficiency and sustainability. Data show that only 23% of homeless adult singles and 21% of homeless families have a working adult.⁶⁵ The lack of education, poor vocational skills, low-wage employment and unemployment are risk factors for homelessness that need to be addressed.

Behavioral Health: A substantial number of Prince George’s County residents are individuals with special health needs. This includes but is not limited to individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (i.e., autism, cerebral palsy, Down Syndrome), individuals who develop or acquire disabilities after the age of 21 (i.e., multiple sclerosis, traumatic brain injury), individuals with mental illnesses, and veterans with health conditions including physical, mental, and emotional injuries and disabilities acquired as a result of their service in Iraq, Afghanistan, the Persian Gulf War and other wars/conflicts. Sixteen percent (16%) of Prince Georges County residents over the age of five (129,832 persons)⁶⁶ have at least one disability and while disability is not, in and of itself, an indicator of risk of homelessness, for very low to extremely low-income households, it can create additional financial challenges including uncovered medical expenses and/or lost wages. The Crisis Response System provided crisis services to 7,539 County residents and dispatched the Mobile Crisis Teams 1,620 times in 2012 (the last year for which annual data was available). Over 10,000 individuals are served in the Public Mental Health System each year, and the County’s Suicide Prevention program served 24,380 callers just this past year.⁶⁷ Finally, there are approximately 1,850 Prince George’s County residents with intellectual and developmental disabilities receiving State funded services from the Developmental Disabilities Administration (DDA) and more than 1,000 are currently on the waiting list.

This data is even more troubling inside the homeless system of care, where the percentages of persons with one or more health and/or mental health concern are disproportionately high and underscore the need for additional coordinated interventions that work. In FY 2014 alone, 59% of all singles and 18% of all families served by emergency shelter systems presented with a physical or behavioral health related condition.⁶⁸

Family Dynamics: Families are the fastest growing segment of the homeless population nationwide and Prince Georges County is no exception, increasing by 19% from 2013 to 2014 alone.⁶⁹ Family homelessness is often caused by the combined effects of limited affordable housing, unemployment, limited access to resources and support, health and mental health challenges, the challenges of raising children as a single parent, and experiences of violence. They are usually headed by a single woman who is, on average, in her late 20s with two children, one or both under the age of six. Among mothers with children experiencing homelessness, more than 80% had previously experienced domestic violence. Even those who are employed, find themselves challenged by the wage gap; earning an average of 77 cents for every dollar paid to their male counterparts. This gap in earnings translates into

⁶⁵ Metropolitan Washington Council of Government, Homeless In Metropolitan Washington: Results and Analysis from the 2014 Point-in-Time Count of Homeless Persons in the Metropolitan Washington Region, p 16

⁶⁶ Ibid

⁶⁷ Maryland Association of Core Service Agencies, Core Service Agency Program Highlights, 2013

⁶⁸ Prince George’s County Homeless Information Management System, Continuum of Care Annual Progress Report

⁶⁹ Prince Georges County Point in Time Enumeration 2013 and 2014

\$11,608 less per year in median earnings⁷⁰ for these families, driving them further into poverty. For homeless women with children, this risk is compounded by social vulnerabilities such as history of domestic violence and family conflict, limited or poor-functioning support networks, history of trauma and loss, and poor parental skills.

Unfortunately, families at risk of homelessness often experience challenges in more than one of these categories. Once homeless, households tend to cycle in and out of emergency shelters, in-patient treatment programs, jails, temporary housing where they are doubled-up with family and friends and dependent on the goodwill of those individuals to remain housed, and/or literally on the streets. As with many other jurisdictions in the region, the County continues to experience profound economic, housing, and unemployment challenges which make breaking this cycle particularly difficult among those at the highest risk. Many homeowners/renters have lost their housing either through foreclosures or evictions and are now competing against each other in the rental market. Unemployment remains high among the target population and wages and public assistance benefits have remained stagnant or declined in relation to escalating costs for energy, food, transportation and housing. Identifying and providing adequate financial assistance to prevent and/or eliminate homelessness among these diverse groups continues to be a major challenge and reinforce the need for expanded homeless prevention and rapid re-housing efforts in the County.

Many federal, state and local agencies are now retooling their systems of care to include a much stronger focus on diversion and rapid re-housing techniques and programs. These initiatives are an integral part of the County's Ten Year Plan to prevent and end homelessness and are critical to the delivery of cost effective programming with a clear and proven track record of success.

⁷⁰ NWLC calculations from U. S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2013 Annual Social and Economic Supplement (CPS, 2013 ASEC).

Appendix 7.6 – Exhibit 5 – Crowding Information – 2/2

Exhibit 5 – Crowding Information 2/2

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	Total
Households with Children Present								

*At this time, data is not available for households with children present at the AMI levels for renters and owners.

Appendix 7.7 – Exhibit 6 – Vacant Units

Exhibit 6 – Vacant Units

	Suitable for Rehabilitation	Not Suitable for Rehabilitation	Total
Vacant Units			3,500
Abandoned Vacant Units			
REO Properties			
Abandoned REO Properties			

*At this time, data is not available to address vacant units within Prince George’s County

Appendix 7.8 – Program Income Methodology

Methodology for Program Income by Program:

The anticipated program income expected to be available to address the priority needs and specific objectives identified in the strategic plan:

1. CDBG program income in the amount of \$237,116.00 is based on the amount received from the prior fiscal year from all sources (i.e. Single Family Rehab, Commercial, Multi-family and Lead Identification Field Testing (LIFT)).

CDBG Program Income	
Single Family Rehab	\$132,629.00
Commercial and Multi-Family	\$20,941.00
Lead Identification Field Testing (LIFT)	\$83,546.00
Total All Sources	\$237,116.00

2. HOME program income in the amount of \$556,735.00 is based on the average amount received over the prior three fiscal years (FY 11, 12, and 13).

HOME Program Income	
HOME	\$556,735.00
Total	\$556,735.00

Appendix 7.9 – Goals Methodology

UoM	new rental construction units	rental rehab units		SF rehab units		businesses assisted	jobs created	Public Facilities & Infrastructure/ persons assisted	Public services/ persons assisted	Direct financial assistance to homebuyers/ households assisted	Housing for people with HIV/AIDS added	Homeless prevention	TBRA/rapid-rehousing	
Funding Source	HOME	HOME	CDBG	CDBG	HOME	CDBG	CDBG	CDBG	CDBG	HOME	HOPWA	ESG	HOME	ESG
2011	60	0	17	56	0	171	96	38403	25346	58	225	336	50	0
2012	0	511	392	28	0	38	291	67335	10680	189	200	440	0	0
2013	0	0	30	21	2	0	1	14107	20860	92	173	43	0	15
2014	0	98	0	56	10*	298	250	27220	10775	40	142	102	0	184
average	15	152	109	40	10	127	159	36766	16915	94	185	230	12	49
Total projected FY16-20*	75	1305		250		635	795	183,830	84,575	470	925	1150		305
source used	Charter for Change													
	CAPER													
*average x 5														
*HIP/CHDO set aside														

Appendix 7.10 – CB-112-2012

**COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND
2012 Legislative Session**

Bill No.	CB-112-2012
Chapter No.	94
Proposed and Presented by	Council Member Franklin
Introduced by	Council Member Franklin
Co-Sponsors	
Date of Introduction	October 23, 2012

BILL

AN ACT concerning

Five-Year Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan

For the purpose of amending the provisions of the County's Five-Year Consolidated Housing and Community Development and Annual Action Plans by adding requirements under Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as amended; and generally relating to housing and community development in the County.

BY repealing and reenacting:

SUBTITLE 15A. CONSOLIDATED HOUSING
AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

Sections 15A-103, 15A-104, 15A-105 and 15A-106

The Prince George's County Code

(2007 Edition, 2010 Supplement).

SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED by the County Council of Prince George's County, Maryland, that Section 15A-103, 15A-104, 15A-105 and 15A-106 of the Prince George's County Code be and the same is hereby repealed and reenacted:

SUBTITLE 15A. CONSOLIDATED HOUSING
AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

* * * * *

Sec. 15A-103. Five-Year Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan, [and] Annual Action Plan and Section 3 Action Plan.

(a) Pursuant to applicable Federal regulations the County Executive shall prepare on behalf of Prince George's County and submit to the County Council for approval:

(1) A Five-Year Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan, commencing in July 1995 and each fifth year thereafter; and

(2) An annual Action Plan and Statement of Community Development Objectives and Projected Use of Funds, which shall constitute the County's Housing and Community Development Program and activities to address the needs of the homeless, and applications for securing federal funds under the terms of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990, and the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1988.

(3) A Section 3 Action Plan, to implement Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 as amended, (12 U.S.C. 1701u and implementing regulations at 24 CFR 135), which shall establish the strategies and goals to be followed to ensure that the objectives of Section 3 are met in the use of applicable federal funds in the County, including the objectives of promoting local economic development, neighborhood economic development, local hiring and employment, local procurement opportunities and individual self-sufficiency. The purpose of Section 3 is to ensure that employment and other economic opportunities generated by certain HUD financial assistance shall, to the greatest extent feasible, and consistent with existing Federal, State and local laws and regulations, be directed to very low, low and moderate income persons living in Prince George's County, particularly those who are (1) recipient of government assistance for housing, and (2) to business concerns which provide economic opportunities to very low and low income persons. The mission of Section 3 is to utilize existing federal programs to maximize economic for very low, low and moderate income persons. A Section 3 Action Plan when properly crafted at the grantee level can help address unemployment, underemployment, and economic poverty. Section 3 as national policy addresses issues such as housing affordability, employment status, and individual earnings. Section 3 requirements apply to HUD grantees and applies to all contractors and subcontractors performing work in connection with projects and activities funded by federal community development assistance covered by Section 3. The enactment of a Section 3 Action Plan is not a requirement

of Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, but is a tool to assist jurisdictions in facilitating its implementation.

Sec. 15A-104. Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan -- content.

(a) The Five-Year Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan shall include, but is not limited to, the following:

(1) A comprehensive assessment of housing and community development needs within appropriate subareas of the County (such as neighborhoods, census tracts, or other convenient statistical areas), including consideration of such factors as the distribution of residents with limited incomes (as defined by Federal regulations), over-crowded housing conditions, and substandard housing units, as well as areas of racial and ethnic concentration; and

(2) A comprehensive strategy for meeting the neighborhood revitalization, housing, and economic development needs including:

(A) A housing and homeless needs assessment that addresses the needs of households ~~that are~~ of low and moderate income, and homeless households and individuals with special needs;

(B) A housing market analysis that describes the number and type of housing units available to persons of limited income, as well as the homeless and special needs populations;

(C) Strategic plans for adequate housing, homeless households, persons with special needs, persons living in public housing;

(D) Strategic plans for community development including criteria for establishing priority needs and rationale for selecting priority projects in the areas of public facilities improvements, economic development, and public service activities; and

(E) The priorities for the use of federal entitlement funds under such programs as Community Development Block Grant, HOME Investment Partnerships, Emergency Solutions Grant, Housing Opportunities for Persons with Aids, Neighborhood Stabilization Grant Program, and HUD Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program.

(3) An identification, by name and geographical boundaries, of the areas recommended for concentrated improvement efforts, together with statements of justification for each of the areas recommended for improvement;

- (4) Legible maps that shall show such information as:
 - (A) The distribution of low and moderate income households;
 - (B) Extent and location of households experiencing housing cost burdens;
 - (C) The location of all [proposed block grant funded] federal community development assistance projects and other federally-funded projects which show a coordinated use of federal funds;
 - (D) Geographic targeting of federal funds in neighborhood strategy areas.

(b) Beginning in 2015 the Five-Year Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan shall include a Section 3 Action Plan that addresses policies and procedures for all HUD covered activities such as: (1) programs that may include multiple contracts, contracts with parts of HUD funding of public or residential construction projects; (2) services and professional services activities generated by construction, such as roads, sewers, sidewalks, community centers, etc; and (3) all public housing authority covered activities such as maintenance, development, modernization, and operations.

Sec. 15A-105, Annual Housing and Community Development Action Plan -- content.

(a) The annual Housing and Community Development Action Plan shall be generally consistent with the Strategic Plans contained in the Five-Year Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan and the Annual Statement of Community Development Objectives and shall include:

- (1) A detailed description of recommended housing and community development activities proposed for implementation during the succeeding program year;
- (2) The estimated cost of each project proposed in the subject program year, and the total cost to bring the project to completion if it is a multiyear project, together with an identification of the sources of such funds;
- (3) The geographical boundaries, locations, and targeting where applicable;
- (4) Identification of the agency or combination of agencies responsible for administering and/or implementing the recommended activities;
- (5) Identification of priority housing activities and federal resources to address the needs of low and moderate income households, as well as special needs populations;
- (6) Identification of priority activities in areas that address underserved housing needs which include, but are not limited to: maintaining adequate housing; removing barriers to

adequate housing; evaluating and reducing lead-based paint hazards; reducing the number of poverty level families; developing institutional structures; enhancing coordination between public and private housing, and social services agencies; and fostering public housing improvements and resident initiatives; and

(7) Submission of a combined application for use of federal entitlement funds for programs such as Community Development Block Grant, HOME Investment Partnerships, and Emergency Shelter Grant, Neighborhood Stabilization Grant Program, and HUD Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program.

Sec. 15A-106. Review and approval of the Five-Year Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan and Annual Action Plan.

(a) The County Executive shall forward each ~~proposed~~ Five-Year Consolidated Housing and Community Development Objectives Plan, the Section 3 Action Plan, and each Annual Action Plan and Statement of Community Development Objectives to the County Council on or before March 15. Upon receipt, the County Council shall cause to be published, in the county newspapers of record, notice of one or more public hearings to be held on the proposed Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan and each Annual Action and Section 3 Action Plan. After the public hearing(s), the County Council may amend any part of the Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan or Annual Action Plan and the Section 3 Action Plan and shall act by resolution on each Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan, each Annual Action Plan and the Section 3 Action Plan not later than sixty (60) calendar days after receipt thereof. Following approval, the County Council shall forward each approved Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan and each approved Annual Action Plan and the Section 3 Action Plan to the County Executive who shall furnish copies thereof to all agencies of government having responsibility for administering and/or implementing activities identified therein. In submitting the annual expense budget, capital budget, and capital program to the County Council for the succeeding fiscal year following the date of approval of each Annual Action Plan, the County Executive shall state to what extent said documents implement each approved annual plan and shall identify related budgetary and capital program items.

(b) Upon approval of each five-year plan, each Annual Action Plan and the Section 3 Action Plan, the County Executive shall transmit them to the designated federal and state agencies for review and approval together with other necessary documentation and certifications.

* * * * *

SECTION 3. BE IT FURTHER ENACTED that the provisions of this Act are hereby declared to be severable; and, in the event that any section, subsection, paragraph, subparagraph, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Act is declared invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect the remaining words, phrases, clauses, sentences, subparagraphs, paragraphs, subsections, or sections of this Act, since the same would have been enacted without the incorporation in this Act of any such invalid or unconstitutional word, phrase, clause, sentence, subparagraph, subsection, or section.

SECTION 4. BE IT FURTHER ENACTED that this Act shall take effect forty-five (45) calendar days after it becomes law.

Adopted this 20th day of November, 2012.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE
GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND

BY: _____
Andrea C. Harrison
Chair

ATTEST:

Redis C. Floyd
Clerk of the Council

APPROVED:

DATE: _____ BY: _____
Rushern L. Baker, III
County Executive

KEY:

Underscoring indicates language added to existing law.

[Brackets] indicate language deleted from existing law.

Asterisks *** indicate intervening existing Code provisions that remain unchanged

Appendix 7.11 – CB-067-2014

**COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND
2014 Legislative Session**

Bill No.	CB-67-2014
Chapter No.	64
Proposed and Presented by	Council Members Franklin, Davis, and Turner
Introduced by	Council Members Franklin, Davis, Turner and Harrison
Co-Sponsors	
Date of Introduction	October 7, 2014

BILL

AN ACT concerning

Local Economic Opportunity

For the purpose of enhancing the County's economic development by expanding the applicability of procurement assistance for County-based minority businesses, County-based businesses, and minority businesses; establishing a "County-located business" certification; and prescribing requirements and assistance for certified County-located businesses.

BY repealing and reenacting with amendments:

SUBTITLE 10A. PURCHASING.

Sections 10A-101, 10A-114, 10A-115, 10A-136, 10A-160, and 10A-164,
The Prince George's County Code
(2011 Edition; 2013 Supplement).

BY adding:

SUBTITLE 10A. PURCHASING.

Sections 10A-173, 10A-174, and 10A-175,
The Prince George's County Code
(2011 Edition; 2013 Supplement).

SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED by the County Council of Prince George's County, Maryland, that Section 10A-101, 10A-114, 10A-115, 10A-136, 10A-160, and 10A-164 of the Prince George's County Code be and the same are hereby repealed and reenacted with the following amendments:

DIVISION 1. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES.

Sec. 10A-101. Definitions.

(a) The words defined in this Section shall have the meanings set forth below whenever they appear in this Subtitle unless the context in which they are used clearly requires a different meaning or a different definition is prescribed for a particular provision.

* * * * *

(4.3) Certified County-based minority business enterprise participation means the percentage of total contract dollars paid to County-based businesses certified as minority business enterprises by the Supplier Development and Diversity Division.

(4.4) Certified County-located business participation means the percentage of total contract dollars paid to businesses certified as County-located businesses.

(4.5) Certified minority business enterprise participation means the percentage of total contract dollars paid to businesses certified as minority business enterprises by the Supplier Development and Diversity Division.

(4.6)[(4.3)] Certified sheltered workshop means an agency that is:

- (A) Organized under the laws of the United States or the State of Maryland;
- (B) Certified as a sheltered workshop by the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor;
- (C) Accredited by the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Maryland Department of Education;
- (D) Operated in the interest of individuals who have a mental or physical disability, including blindness, that constitutes a substantial handicap to employment and prevents the individual from engaging in normal competitive employment; and
- (E) The net income of which does not inure wholly or partially to the benefit of any shareholder or other non-disabled individual.

* * * * *

(13.2) County-based minority business enterprise means a business that is both:

- (A) a minority business enterprise as certified by the Supplier Development and Diversity Division; and**
- (B) a County-based business.**

~~(13.3)~~[(13.2)] **County-based small business** means a business that meets the requirements of Section 10A-161(b) and whose application for certification as a County-based small business is approved by the Purchasing Agent.

~~(13.4)~~ **County-located business** means a business, subject to certification by the Prince George's County Office of Central Services in accordance with Section 10A-174, that:

(A) has a County Office, but is not a County-based business; and

(B) either:

(i) has at least five (5) FTE ("full-time equivalent") employees in the County Office for the full duration of the County Office's lease; or

(ii) has at least three (3) FTE employees in the County Office, with at least two (2) of the FTE employees being County Residents, for the full duration of the County Office's lease; or

(iii) if such business has an ownership interest in the building containing the County Office, has at least three (3) FTE employees in the County Office for the full duration of the business's ownership interest in the building.

~~(13.5)~~[(13.3)] **County or The County** means Prince George's County, Maryland.

~~(13.6)~~[(13.4)] **County agency** means any department, office, division, administrative unit, or agency of the Prince George's County government or any other entity created or authorized to be created, whether expressed or implied, by the Charter or the Code, including any council, board, bureau, commission, institution, tribunal, government corporation, public authority, or other instrumentality thereof or thereunder.

(14) **County funds** means any monies received by the County or appropriated or approved by the Council or to which the County may at any time have legal or equitable title.

~~(14.1)~~ **County Office** means a place of operation of a business physically located within the County that:

(a) has a lease in which the business is obligated for at least three (3) years; or

(b) has a lease in which the business is obligated for at least one (1) year and the place of operation is at least three thousand (3,000) square feet in size; or

(c) has an ownership interest in such place of operation.

~~(14.2)~~[(14.1)] **County resident** means a person whose domicile is located in Prince George's County, Maryland, as determined by standards set forth by the Purchasing Agent, and who either:

(A) Filed a Maryland state income tax return that establishes a Prince George's County domicile for the most recent full calendar year;

(B) Is claimed as a dependent on a Maryland state income tax return that establishes a Prince George's County domicile for the most recent full calendar year filed by the person's parent, legal guardian, or spouse; or

(C) Was not required to file a federal or Maryland state income tax return for the most recent calendar year because the person was not legally liable for income tax pursuant to Section 10-809, Tax-General Article, Annotated Code of Maryland, but was legally domiciled in Prince George's County for the most recent full calendar year, and signs an attestation under oath to this effect on a form provided by the Purchasing Agent.

The County Executive, the County Executive's designee, and the Purchasing Agent are authorized to verify a person's County residency status pursuant to this definition in relation to Division 7 of this Subtitle.

* * * * *

DIVISION 2. AWARD OF CONTRACTS.

Sec. 10A-114. Contract negotiation.

* * * * *

(b) Any contract authorized under this Section shall be awarded (including at renewal or extension) with at least forty percent (40%) certified County-based business participation, unless the Purchasing Agent exercises the waiver determination and procedure set forth in Section 10A-161(b). Contracts authorized under this Section are subject to the same provisions of Section 10A-164 applicable to contracts subject to County-based business participation requirements under Section 10A-161.

* * * * *

Sec. 10A-115. Small purchases.

* * * * *

(d) For contracts that use a simplified purchase procedure prescribed in Subsection (a), the Purchasing Agent or the Purchasing Agent's designee shall reserve such contracts for County-

based businesses, provided, that the Purchasing Agent or the Purchasing Agent's designee shall not be required to reserve the contract if the Purchasing Agent or the Purchasing Agent's designee determines in writing that

* * * * *

(2) a County-based business cannot offer a reasonable price for the contract. In this Section, "reasonable price" means within twelve percent (12%) above the best price on the open market. Prior to this determination being made, the lowest bidding County-based business shall be given the opportunity to win the procurement by offering a bid or proposal price less than twelve percent (12%) higher than the best price on the open market identified by the Purchasing Agent or the Purchasing Agent's designee. In determining bid or proposal price in this Section, applicable bid or price preferences authorized under this Subtitle shall be applied.

* * * * *

DIVISION 6. SPECIAL PROVISIONS.

SUBDIVISION 1. MINORITY BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM

Sec. 10A-136. Assistance to minority business enterprises; certification and decertification.

* * * * *

(c) In determining the lowest responsible and responsive bidder, [for contracts valued at One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) or less,] the Purchasing Agent shall adjust the bid or proposal price(s) submitted by a County-based [M]inority [B]usiness [E]nterprise or a minority business enterprise as certified by the Supplier Development and Diversity Division, for the purposes of evaluation and award only, by reducing the bid price(s) of such firm by the application of bonus factors according to the following schedule:

BID OF LOWEST RESPONSIVE BIDDER	MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE	PRINCE GEORGE'S BASED MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE BONUS FACTOR
Factored by:	.05	.15

[(d) For contracts valued greater than One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000), the Purchasing Agent shall adjust the bid price submitted by a County-based Minority Business Enterprise or a Minority Business Enterprise for the purpose of evaluation and award only by reducing the bid price(s) of such firm by the application of an Evaluation Bonus according to the following schedule:]

	[MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE]	[PRINCE GEORGE'S BASED MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE BONUS FACTOR]
[Bid Price Subtracted by:]	[\$50,000.00]	[\$150,000.00]

(d) For bids or proposals that are not made entirely by County-based minority business enterprises or minority business enterprises as certified by the Supplier Development and Diversity Division, the Purchasing Agent shall reduce the bid price(s) submitted, for evaluation and award purposes only, at an increasing bonus factor of one and a half percent (1.5%) for every ten percent (10%) increment of certified County-based minority business enterprise participation and one half of one percent (0.5%) for every ten percent (10%) increment of certified minority business enterprise participation. Bids or proposals with one hundred percent (100%) of certified County-based minority business enterprise participation shall receive the maximum fifteen percent (15%) bid price reduction (bonus factor) and bids or proposals with one hundred percent (100%) of certified minority business enterprise participation shall receive the maximum five percent (5%) bid price reduction (bonus factor). Bids or proposals awarded a price reduction or bonus factor for certified County-based minority business enterprise participation or certified minority business enterprise participation are subject to the same provisions in Section 10A-164 applicable to bids or proposals that receive preferences for certified County-based business participation.

(e) Bids or proposals are entitled to receive the greater of the preference points or percentages allowed for a business under either this Section, [or] Section 10A-160, or Section 10A-173, as applicable. The preferences allowed under this Section, [and] Section 10A-160, and Section 10A-173 shall not be applied cumulatively for the same business.

* * * * *

DIVISION 7. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

SUBDIVISION 1. COUNTY-BASED BUSINESS ASSISTANCE.

Sec. 10A-160. County-based business preferences.

(a) On any procurement for which a County agency or the County government secures competitive bids or proposals, including, but not limited to, competitive bids secured pursuant to Section 10A-112, [or] competitive proposals pursuant to Section 10A-113, or small purchases pursuant to Section 10A-115, the Purchasing Agent shall:

(1) Apply a bid or proposal preference of ten percent (10%) to any County-based business that submits an approved certification as set forth in Section 10A-163(a) and fifteen (15%) percent to any County-based small business that submits an approved certification as set forth in Section 10A-163(b).

(2) For bids or proposals that are not made entirely by County-based businesses, apply a bid or proposal preference at an increasing rate of one percent (1%) for every ten percent (10%) increment of certified County-based business participation. Bids or proposals with one hundred percent (100%) certified County-based business participation shall receive the maximum ten percent (10%) bid preference.

(3) For bids or proposals that are not made entirely by County-based small businesses, apply a bid or proposal preference at an increasing rate of one and a half percent (1.5%) for every ten percent (10%) increment of certified County-based small business participation. Bids or proposals with one hundred percent (100%) certified County-based small business participation shall receive the maximum fifteen percent (15%) bid preference.

(4) Award [B]bids or proposals [are entitled to receive] the greater of the preference points or percentages allowed for a business under either this Section or Section 10A-136, as applicable. The preferences allowed under this Section and Section 10A-136 shall not be applied cumulatively for the same business.

* * * * *

Sec. 10A-164. Enforcement of County-based business assistance.

* * * * *

(d) The Purchasing Agent shall make compliance with this Subdivision a condition of any contract or agreement for a procurement funded by a County agency or the County government or any such contract or agreement shall be void. [This requirement does not apply to procurements awarded pursuant to Section 10A-114.]

* * * * *

SECTION 2. BE IT ENACTED by the County Council of Prince George's County, Maryland, that Sections 10A-173, 10A-174, and 10A-175 of the Prince George's County Code be and the same are hereby added:

DIVISION 7. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

SUBDIVISION 3. COUNTY-LOCATED BUSINESS ASSISTANCE.

Sec. 10A-173. County-located business preferences.

(a) On any procurement for which a County agency or the County government secures competitive bids or proposals, including, but not limited to, competitive bids secured pursuant to Section 10A-112, competitive proposals pursuant to Section 10A-113, or small purchases pursuant to Section 10A-115, the Purchasing Agent shall:

(1) Apply a bid or proposal preference of seven percent (7%) to any County-located business that submits an approved certification as set forth in Section 10A-174.

(2) For bids or proposals that are not made entirely by County-located businesses, apply a bid or proposal preference at an increasing rate of seven tenths of one percent (0.7%) for every ten percent (10%) increment of certified County-located business participation. Bids or proposals with one hundred percent (100%) certified County-located business participation shall receive the maximum seven percent (7%) bid preference.

(3) Award bids or proposals the greater of the preference points or percentages allowed for a business under either this Section or Section 10A-136, as applicable. The preferences allowed under this Section and Section 10A-136 shall not be applied cumulatively for the same business.

(b) The Purchasing Agent may determine not to apply a bid or proposal preference under this Section if the Purchasing Agent certifies that such a preference would result in the loss of federal or state funds, subject to the approval of the County Executive. The Purchasing Agent shall transmit a copy of any such determination to the County Council no later than thirty (30) calendar days following the date of the procurement award.

(c) The requirements of this Section shall apply to the procurement of vendors retained by a County agency or the County government to assist in the financing and sale of County government debt. The requirements of this Section shall also apply to the procurement of brokerage firms, investment banking firms, investment management firms, consultants, and other vendors retained to manage or invest funds controlled or administered by a County agency or the County government. The application of this Subsection is subject to the requirements and restrictions of federal and state law.

(d) A business may opt to not receive a County-located business preference under this Section.

(e) For the purposes of this Division, the term “competitive bids or proposals” means any bids or proposals for procurement funded or administered by a County agency or the County government except for procurement awards made pursuant to Section 10A-114.

(f) Bids or proposals awarded preferences for certified County-located business participation are subject to the same provisions in Section 10A-164 applicable to bids or proposals that receive preferences for certified County-based business participation.

Sec. 10A-174 – County-located business certification requirements.

(a) A business that seeks to be certified as a County-located business shall make application to the Purchasing Agent on a form provided by the Purchasing Agent. Such an application shall not be approved by the Purchasing Agent unless the business

(1) Submits documentation requested by the Purchasing Agent verifying that the business meets the definition of a County-located business as prescribed in Section 10A-101(13.3), including

(A) Leasing or ownership documents,

(B) Payroll information,

(C) Property and income tax information,

(D) Information regarding office dimensions, and

(E) Any other documentation or information requested by the Purchasing Agent to verify compliance with the definition of County-located business set forth in Section 10A-101(13.3);

(2) Files a written certificate that the business is not delinquent in the payment of any County taxes, charges, fees, rents or claims; and

(3) Files documentation showing that during the preceding twelve (12) months the business has continuously maintained a valid business license or permit.

(b) Once an application for certification is approved under this Section by the Purchasing Agent, a copy of the approved application shall be expeditiously transmitted to the County Auditor.

(c) Nonprofit entities that satisfy the applicable requirements of this Section are eligible to be certified as County-located businesses.

(d) A business that is certified as a County-located business shall meet the requirements of certification under this Section continuously after the date the business’s application for

certification is approved by the Purchasing Agent or the business's certification shall be void. In such instances, the business must re-apply pursuant to the requirements of this Section to be certified as a County-located business.

Sec. 10A-175. Regulations authorized.

The County Executive may promulgate regulations to govern the implementation of this Subdivision, provided that such regulations are consistent with the provisions of this Subdivision. Any such regulations must be approved by the County Council.

SECTION 3. BE IT FURTHER ENACTED that the provisions of this Act are hereby declared to be severable; and, in the event that any section, subsection, paragraph, subparagraph, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Act is declared invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect the remaining words, phrases, clauses, sentences, subparagraphs, paragraphs, subsections, or sections of this Act, since the same would have been enacted without the incorporation in this Act of any such invalid or unconstitutional word, phrase, clause, sentence, subparagraph, subsection, or section.

SECTION 4. BE IT FURTHER ENACTED that this Act shall take effect forty-five (45) calendar days after it becomes law.

Adopted this 12th day of November, 2014.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE
GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND

BY: _____
Mel Franklin
Chairman

ATTEST:

Redis C. Floyd
Clerk of the Council

APPROVED:

DATE: _____ BY: _____
Rushern L. Baker, III
County Executive

KEY:

Underscoring indicates language added to existing law.

[Brackets] indicate language deleted from existing law.

Asterisks *** indicate intervening existing Code provisions that remain unchanged.

Appendix 7.12 – Exhibit 7 – Section 3 Implementation Timeline

Exhibit 7 – Section 3 Implementation Timeline

Date	Task Number	Tasks
May 2015	1	DHCD will meet with HAPGC and RDA to ascertain their Section 3 compliance status with respect to public housing funds, or the CDBG, HOME, NSP and RAD programs.
	2	DHCD will contact partner agencies including the Office of Central Services and Economic Development Corporation’s Workforce Development Program to review current efforts and identify opportunities for collaboration pertaining to a Section 3 Action Plan.
June 2015	3	DHCD will conduct outreach to resident organizations, local unions, minority and women-owned businesses, Chamber of Commerce, Prince George's Community College, community development corporations, and employment and training organizations to discuss the utilization of the Section 3 program goals, preferences, and employment and contracting opportunities.
July 2015	4	Research and identify recommendations for lead agency and collaborative partners.
	5	Prepare draft Section 3 Action Plan.
August 2015	6	Prepare Section 3 Action Plan legislative package for submittal to Prince George's County Executive's Office and the Prince George's County Council.

Appendix 7.13 – TNI Analysis of 6 Targeted Areas

Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative (TNI)

Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative Areas (TNI): Moving Forward

Overview

The Transforming Neighborhoods Initiative (TNI) is a County transformation initiative to achieve the County's vision of a thriving economy, great schools, safe neighborhoods and high quality healthcare by targeting cross-governmental resources to neighborhoods that have significant needs. The purpose of TNI is to:

- Improve the quality of life in the six targeted areas;
- Address the key issues that negatively impact Public Safety, Education and Economic Development;
- Focus resources from the County government and our partners (State, private sector, non-profit sector, etc.);
- Institutionalize strategies to continue to transform the six targeted areas; and
- Continue the commitment to these neighborhoods as long as there is a need.

The transformation initiative was implemented in April 2012.

The conceptual basis for the TNI is that many of the challenges facing the County are systemic, inter-related, and therefore; severely inhibits opportunities for residents of the target areas and Countywide. Consequently, this conceptual model provides for focused resources and greater coordination and collaboration between County agencies on key indicators that greatly impact the County's performance and perceptions from our regional peers. TNI focus area priorities include code enforcement, crime-quality of life, street and infrastructure, community development, youth development and programming, human services, life safety and fire preventions, and economic development. Success is measured by improvements in the following nine key indicators:

- Violent Crime
- 3rd grade reading and math scores
- 5th grade reading and math scores
- Income levels
- Residents on public assistance
- Property Crime
- School absentee rates
- Section 8 housing concentration
- Pedestrian deaths and injuries
- Foreclosure rates


The initiative was implemented in six target areas that exhibit significant needs with respect to the key indicators list above:

- Suitland/Coral Hills (SCH)
- East Riverdale/Bladensburg (ERB)
- Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (GOH)
- Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (HHMH)
- Kentland/Palmer Park (KPP)
- Langley Park (LP)

Population and Poverty

Based on the ACS 2007 – 2011 data, the population in the TNI communities totaled approximately 110,100. This represents 12.8 % of the County’s total population of 858,539 residents. The ACS data reflects the resident populations in the East Riverdale – Bladensburg and Suitland/Coral Hills TNI communities have the highest concentration of residents at 29% and 20%, respectively.

Figure 2 - TNI Population and Poverty Levels




Populations below poverty level – Over 8.0% of the population in Prince George’s County have incomes below the poverty level. This translates to almost 70,000 people Countywide. With the exception of the District of Columbia, where more than 101,000 of the population (18.2%) have incomes below the poverty level, the incidence of poverty is severe in the County when compared to our neighboring jurisdictions.

The condition is more severe in the TNI communities within the County. Kentland/Palmer Park, East Riverdale/Bladensburg, and Langley Park have even higher percentages of residents below the poverty level. According to 2007 – 2011 ACS data, TNI communities have higher concentrations of people living below the poverty level than the Countywide ratio (8.2%); where the highest incidences are located in five of the six TNI communities, namely Langley Park (26.5%), Kentland/Palmer Park (13.6%), East Riverdale/Bladensburg (10.7%), Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (9.4%), and Suitland/Coral Hills (8.5%).

People with Disabilities –Approximately 8.0%, of the County’s residents, a total of 67,685, have disabilities relating to hearing difficulty, vision, cognitive difficulty, self-care, and ambulatory difficulty. According to the 2007-2011 ACS data, TNI communities that have a high concentration of people with disabilities include East Riverdale/Bladensburg (2,085) and Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (1,797). This concentration is over the Countywide percentage of 7.9%.

Figure 3 - Incidences of Disabilities in TNI



ACS data reflects the disability rate in the County is higher for the elderly. The TNI population 65 years and over with disabilities total 2,097 and resides primarily in East Riverdale/Bladensburg (2,123), Suitland/Coral Hills (1,637), and Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (1,451). In all, the rate of disabilities is lower for the TNI communities, likely because residents are mostly younger.

According to 2007 – 2011 ACS data, people with disabilities between 18 to 64 years of age totaled 73,503. People with disabilities in this age group are concentrated in East Riverdale/Bladensburg (18,763), Suitland/Coral Hills (13,559), and Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (11,824).

People with disabilities, especially those with self-care, ambulatory, and independent living difficulties require specialized and often subsidized housing. Programs are required to increase the supply of affordable and suitably designed housing; as well as, provide support services for caretakers of people with disabilities.

Poverty and Disability Among Veterans

According to 2009 – 2011 ACS data, a total of 2,168 veterans over the age of 18 years of age in the County had incomes below the poverty level during the period. The highest percentages are recorded in the age groups of 55 to 64 years and 65 years and over; where 712 (4.8%) and 640 (3.6%), respectively, faced poverty over a recent 12 month period. In addition, a total of 826 of the veterans with incomes below the poverty level also have disabilities. Therefore, special programs are required to provide for housing and other support needs of veterans.


Table 1 - TNI Population and Poverty Levels

Veterans' Profiles	Veterans	Below Poverty	Disabled
18 to 34 Years	5,216	199	111
35 to 54 Years	22,762	617	108
55 to 64 Years	14,864	712	277
65 year and Over	17,728	640	330

Age

According to 2007 – 2011 ACS data, the County's **median age is 34.8 years of age**. The median is below the Washington Metro Area. Based on ACS demographic data, over 378,100, or 45%, of TNI residents are between the ages of 25 and 54 years.

Figure 4 - TNI Population and Poverty Levels



Pre-school Age Residents Under 5 years of age – All TNI communities have a concentration of pre-school age children above the Washington Metro Area (6.8%) and Countywide (6.9%) percentages, except for Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (5.1%) and Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (1.3%). The TNI communities that have the highest concentration of pre-school age children are East Riverdale/Bladensburg (9.6%) and Langley Park (9.0%).

Primary and Secondary School Residents Between 5 and 19 years of age - The 2007 – 2011 ACS data indicates that primary and secondary school-age residents are the most dominant in the Washington Metro Area (19.8%) and Countywide (20.9%). In comparison, primary and secondary school-age residents in TNI communities are below the regional and Countywide percentages. The ACS data indicates that TNI communities with the highest concentration of this age group are East Riverdale/Bladensburg (3.4%) and Suitland/Coral Hills (2.9%).

Adult Workers Between 20 and 64 years of age – The 2007 – 2011 ACS data indicates that adult workers between 20 and 64 years of age that reside in the TNI communities are well below the Countywide and regional percentages. East Riverdale/Bladensburg (5.1%) and Suitland/Coral Hills (2.6%) have the highest concentrations of residents in this age group.


Residents Over 65 years of age – The 2007 – 2011 ACS data reflects a concentration of TNI residents in this age group above the Countywide ratio of 7.9% in East Riverdale/Bladensburg (10.7%), Langley Park (10.2%), and Suitland/Coral Hills (8.1%). In contrast, TNI communities with concentration below that Countywide ratio are Kentland/Palmer Park (7.6%), Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (6.4%), and Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (5.6%).

Ethnicity

According to 2007 – 2011 ACS data, the County’s ethnic diversity includes Blacks/African Americans (63.6%), Whites (15.4%), Hispanic or Latinos (14.5%), Asians (4.1%), and American Indian and Alaska Native (less than 1.0%). In comparison, the ACS data reflects a higher concentration of minorities in the TNI communities than the Countywide percentage rates.

Blacks/African Americans represent the highest ethnicity in all TNI communities, except for East Riverdale/Bladensburg and Langley Park. The ACS data reflects concentrations of Blacks/African Americans higher than the County’s percentage rate of 63.6% in Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (92.3%), Suitland/Coral Hills (91.7%), Glassmanor/Oxon Hills (87.7%), and Kentland/Palmer Park (84.2%).

Figure 5 - Ethnic Diversity in TNI Communities



Whites (alone) reflect the lowest concentration of ethnicity in the TNI target areas. However, the ACS data indicates that white residents represent a high concentration in Langley Park (9.4%), as well as, East Riverdale/Bladensburg (4.9%).

Hispanic or Latino (of any race) represent the second highest ethnicity in all TNI communities, except for Suitland/Coral Hills. The ACS data reflects concentration of Hispanics higher than the County's percentage rate of 14.5% in East Riverdale/Bladensburg (55.9%) and Langley Park (50.1%).


Asians represent over 4 % of the County's population. The ACS data reflects concentrations of Asians in Langley Park (5.3%) and Kentland/Palmer Park (4.4%) consistent with the Countywide and Washington Metro Area estimates.

American Indian and Alaska Native represent the lowest ethnicity in the County. However, the ACS data reflects higher than the Countywide percentage rate in Langley Park (24.6%), East Riverdale/Bladensburg (18.4%), and Suitland/Coral Hills (5.9%).

Educational Attainment


Educational attainment is critical because it is an important way to increase incomes and create jobs to ensure that the County's labor force meets the educational and skill requirements of current and future employers. Prince George's residents have lower educational attainment overall compared to neighboring jurisdictions. Seven percent of County residents 25 years and older (most of the workforce) have less than a 9th grade education compared to 4.7% of the same age group in the Washington Metro Area. Likewise, the percentages of residents 25 year and older with Bachelors or Graduate (professional) degrees is, also, lower (17.5% and 12.2%, respectively) in the County than the Washington Metro Area (25% and 22.5%). The 2007 – 2011 ACS data indicates that the educational attainments of TNI residents are significantly below the Countywide estimates. East Riverdale/Bladensburg and Langley Park TNI communities have a disproportionate number of residents having less than a 9th grade education.

Figure 6 - Educational Attainment - TNI Population 18-24 Years



Population 18 to 24 years – The ACS data reflects an educational attainment in the age group is below the Countywide percentage of 15.1%. According to 2007 – 2011 ACS data, concentration of residents with less than a high school education are located in Langley Park (63.1%), East Riverdale/Bladensburg (28.8%), Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (21.2%), and Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (20.3%). Additionally, TNI residents with a Bachelor’s degree or higher is below the Countywide percentage rate of 9.8%. The ACS data reflects the lowest concentration of college graduates in Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (2.6%), Suitland/Coral Hills (4.7%) and Kentland/Palmer Park (4.5%).

Figure 7 - Educational Attainment - TNI Population 25 Years & Over



Population 25 years and Over - According to 2007 – 2011 ACS data, reflects that TNI residents are consistent with Countywide high school graduation rates of 85.8%. However, the ACS data indicates that TNI residents 25 years and older in Langley Park (32.8%) have achieved significantly below the Countywide education benchmarks. Likewise, TNI residents with a Bachelor’s degree or higher is below the Countywide percentage rate of (17.5%). The ACS data reflects the lowest concentration of college graduates in Langley Park (6.1%) and East Riverdale/Bladensburg (8.6%).

Household Income

According to 2007 – 2011 ACS data, the County’s median household income is \$73,447 per year; whereas the Washington Metro Area median income totals \$88,486 per year. The ACS data also indicates that all TNI median household incomes are significantly below the Countywide estimates, where Langley Park (\$49,149) household represents the lowest income earnings.

Household with Food Stamp/SNAP benefits over the past 12 months - According to 2007 – 2011 ACS data, 6.5% of County households have used Food Stamp/SNAP over past 12 month period. The ACS data also indicates that Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (13.3%), Suitland/Coral Hills (11.9%), Kentland/Palmer Park

(13.3%), and East Riverdale/Bladensburg (10.5%), four of the six TNI communities, have a significantly higher need for nutritional assistance and nutritional subsidies. More importantly, all TNI communities' estimates are over the Countywide and Washington Metro Area estimates for household needing nutritional assistance and/or nutritional subsidies (8%).

Labor Force and Employment

According to 2007 – 2011 ACS data, the County's civil workforce totals 497,423, or 73.5% of all County **workers over 16 years of age**. This represents an estimate consistent with the Washington Metro Area (73.2%).

The ACS data indicates unemployed workers in the County **over the 16 year of age** totals 44,014, or 8.8% of all unemployed workers Countywide. This estimate is twice that of the estimate for the Washington Metro Area (4.6%). Furthermore, unemployed workers in all TNI communities are above the Countywide estimate; whereas Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (15.9%), Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (14.1%), Kentland/Palmer Park (12.8%), and Langley Park (16.2%) reflect the highest concentration of unemployed workers in all TNI communities. ACS data reflects unemployed workers in Coral Hills/Suitland (11%) and East Riverdale/Bladensburg (11%) have slightly lower concentrations of unemployed workers; however, the estimates are significantly higher than the Countywide and Washington Metro Area estimates.

Selected Housing Characteristics of TNI Areas

This section will provide an overview of the housing characteristics, such as housing occupancy, housing age, tenure, housing cost burden, bedroom size, and housing occupancy in TNI communities. The housing characteristics were used to develop a baseline for comparison with Countywide data, as well as, identify the specific needs in the TNI communities. The analysis was focused on defining the housing needs within TNI communities, where strategies to lessen and/or eliminate the needs in the TNI communities can be implemented.

Table 2 - Housing Occupancy

	Prince George's		GLASSMANOR-OXON HILL		HILLCREST HEIGHTS-MARLOW HEIGHTS		SUITLAND-CORAL HILLS		KENTLAND-PALMER PARK		EAST RIVERDALE-BLADENSBURG		LANGLEY PARK	
	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent
Total housing units	327,005	327,005	7,546	100	4,714	100	9,464	100	5,280	100	9,869	100	4,907	100
Occupied housing units	302,091	92.4%	6,545	86.7	4,364	92.6	8,627	91.2	4,843	91.7	9,049	91.7	4,425	90.2
Vacant housing units	24,914	7.6%	1,001	13.3	350	7.4	837	8.8	437	8.3	820	8.3	482	9.8

Housing Occupancy: Across the board, in the region and the County, the vacancy rates are significantly higher for rental than owner housing units. The percentage of vacant housing units in the County (7.6%) is comparable to the metro Area (7.5%). They are higher for the older established communities, such as DC, and Arlington County. With the exception of Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights, the percentages of vacant housing units are higher in all the TNI communities. Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (13.3 %) has the highest incidences of vacant housing units.

The vacancy rate is significantly higher for rental (7.7%) than owner (2.1%) units. The 7.7% rate in the County translates to more than 24,900 units. The largest numbers of rental vacant units in the TNI communities are: 1001 in Glassmanor/Oxon Hill, 837 in Suitland/Coral Hills, and 820 in East Riverdale/Bladensburg.


Housing Age: In Prince George's County and the Metro Area, a comparable percentage of the housing units (25%) are 55 years or older. Arlington County and DC have very high percentages of units 55 years or older (48% and 65% respectively). Based on the 2007 – 2011 ACS data, the total number of housing units Countywide totals 327,005, where 82,922, or 25.3%, are 55 years or older. The second largest concentration of housing units in the County were built between 1960 and 1969 (20.9%). This ratio is consistent with the housing stock in the Washington Metro Area (25.5%). In contrast, housing units built in 2005 or later represent the lowest number of housing units Countywide (13,084, or 4.0 %). This ratio is also consistent with the Washington Metro Area (5.3%).

Older housing units typically require significant maintenance and repairs, and the challenge is how to establish programs to assist residents to keep up with the cost of needed maintenance and repairs. Within TNI communities, the ACS data indicates a concentration of housing 55 years or older in Langley Park (53.5%), Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (51.6%), and East Riverdale/Bladensburg (44.0%). TNI

communities having the lowest concentration of newly built housing units, or those built in 2005 or later, are Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (0.3%), Langley Park (0.4%), and East Riverdale/Bladensburg (0.7%). This trend is consistent with Countywide trends and suggests that further housing development should focus in the TNI communities.

Housing Tenure: According to 2007 – 2011 ACS data, the majority of residents entered the County within the past 10 years, where 19% moved into the County between 1990 and 1999. In addition, the ACS data reflects growth rates in the TNI communities to be consistent with Countywide trends over the same 10 year time period. All TNI communities reflect residency tenure equal to or above the Countywide rate; whereas the highest incidences are recorded in Langley Park (83.4%), East Riverdale/Bladensburg (70.1%), and Kentland/Palmer Park (67.0 %).

Figure 8 - Housing Tenure in TNI Communities




Within TNI communities, the ACS data indicates a concentration of owner-occupied housing stock in Hillcrest Height/Marlow Heights (55.5%), Kentland/Palmer Park (53.2%), and East Riverdale/Bladensburg (46.1%). The lowest concentration of owner-occupied housing units is recorded in Langley Park (22.9%). In comparison, the ACS data reflects concentrations of renter-occupied housing units in all TNI communities, with higher than County and Washington Metro Area ratios in Langley Park (77.1%), Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (64.5%).

In addition, the ACS data indicates a concentration of higher than Countywide homeowner-occupied vacancy rates in Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (3.2%) and concentration of higher than Countywide rental-occupied vacancy rates in Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (11.2%), Suitland/Coral Hills (9.6%), and East Riverdale/Bladensburg (8.8%).

Housing Cost Burden: Housing cost burden is a serious challenge in the County. A household is considered to experience housing cost burden when it spends 30% or more of its total income to pay for housing and related costs. A high incidence of housing cost burden can have wide-ranging implications to residents’ quality of life and the economy. If residents spend large amounts to pay for housing, they typically have less of their incomes left to spend on other basic or essential needs. Consequently, they are unable to support local businesses and so, unable to help businesses to grow and strengthen the local economy.

Figure 9 - Housing Cost Burden in TNI Communities



Owner Cost Burden – Compared to the Metro Area, a high percentage of homeowners in Prince George’s County experience housing cost burden. A total of 47.7% of County households that are owners with mortgages are cost burdened, with 36.8% of them severely cost burdened¹. The other 11% cost burdened households that are owners spend 30% to 34.9% of their income on housing and related costs. In contrast, 37.4% of owners in the Washington Metro Area that have mortgages are cost burdened, with 27.8% severely burdened. The percentages of severely cost burdened owners in the neighboring counties are: 28.1% in Charles, 11% in Montgomery, and 11.1% in the DC. The incidence of severe owner housing cost burden is even higher in selected TNI communities, such as, Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (13.4%), Kentland/Palmer Park (14.2%), and Langley Park (28.4%). Some owner households that do not have mortgages also experience housing cost burden. However, overall, the incidence is lower than owners with mortgages.

Renter Cost Burden – Housing cost burden is an even greater challenge for renter households in the County and the TNI communities. The rate of housing cost burden is high overall for renter households in the region and the County. The data show that renter households in the TNI communities experience even greater cost burden than the County, as a whole. For example, the rate of incidence is 56.2% in Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights, 54.9% in Suitland/Coral Hills, and 52.4% in Langley Park.

Housing Units/Bedrooms

Based on the 2007 – 2011 ACS data, the highest number of housing units (type) is three bedroom housing units, totaling 103,555, or 31.7%, of all Countywide housing units (bedrooms). This ratio is consistent with the Washington Metro Area, where 30.4% of all housing units are three bedroom units. Efficiencies and five bedroom housing units represent the lowest bedroom category available in the County (9.0%) and Washington Metro Area (9.2%).

Studies show that the biggest need over the next two decades will be for multi-family rental units within the beltway, or established communities. Therefore, strategies should be developed to preserve the existing multi-family housing stock. In addition, current projections indicate that single family housing

units will be needed by 2030; indicating again the need for strategies to preserve the existing housing stock in established communities within the Inner Beltway of the County.⁷¹

Within TNI communities, the ACS data indicates a concentration of bedroom housing units higher than the Countywide percentile as follows:

- **One Bedroom Housing Units** – The ACS data indicates that all TNI communities have a high concentration of one bedroom housing units over the Countywide percentile of 12.8%, whereas the highest concentration are located in Langley Park (29.5%), East Riverdale/Bladensburg (21.6%), and Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (20.1%).
- **Two Bedroom Housing Units** – The ACS data indicates that all TNI communities have a high concentration of two bedroom housing units over the Countywide percentile of 22.7%, where the highest concentrations are recorded in Langley Park (46.4%), Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (40.4%), and Suitland/Coral Hills (33.2%).
- **Three Bedroom Housing Units** – According to the ACS data Kentland/Palmer Park (49.1%), Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (40.2%), and Coral Hills/Suitland (38.5%) have a concentration of three bedroom housing units over the Countywide percentile of 31.7%. The remaining four TNI communities are having concentration in this bedroom type consistent with the Countywide and Washington Metro Area percentiles of 31.7% and 30.4%, respectively.
- **Larger bedroom housing units, such as four and five bedroom units**, have concentration in TNI communities below the Countywide and Washington Metro Area.

Occupants for Room

The County is virtually comparable to the Metro area as well as the individual counties for occupants per room. However, the highest occupancy per room occurs in East Riverdale/Bladensburg and Langley Park, where the levels of occupants per room are significantly higher than the County and region. High occupancy per room is related to factors, such as, household income, housing affordability, family size, and socio-cultural characteristics of residents. Strategies to improve education and job training, and consequently, wage levels, as well as, supply of lower priced housing units, will likely help improve housing affordability and occupancy.

According to the 2007 – 2011 ACS data, residents living within TNI communities with 1.0 to 1.5 persons per room are concentrated in Langley Park (18.6%). Also, the ACS data indicates a concentration of housing 55 years or older in Langley Park (53.5%), Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (51.6%), and East Riverdale/Bladensburg (44.0%). Consequently, strategies are needed to provide larger housing units to address overcrowding in the TNI communities, while keeping rents and home purchase price affordable for the current and future residents.

⁷¹ Source: “Housing the Regions’ Future Workforce: Policy Challenges for Local Jurisdictions,” George Mason University(2011), pg. 14-15

TNI Communities' Summary

Population: Based on the ACS 2007 – 2011 data, the population in the TNI communities totaled approximately 110,100. This represents 12.8% of the County's total population of 858,539 residents. The ACS data reflects the resident populations in the East Riverdale/Bladensburg and Suitland/Coral Hills TNI communities have the highest concentration of residents at 29% and 20%, respectively. Strategies are needed to enhance services for the growing population of seniors and Hispanics.

Poverty and Disability: The condition is severer in the TNI communities within the County. Kentland/Palmer Park, East Riverdale/Bladensburg, and Langley Park have even higher percentages of residents below the poverty level. According to 2007 – 2011 ACS data, TNI communities have higher concentrations of people living below the poverty level than the Countywide ratio (8.2%); where the highest incidences are located in five of the six TNI communities, namely Langley Park (26.5%), Kentland/Palmer Park (13.6%), East Riverdale/Bladensburg (10.7%), Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (9.4%), and Suitland/Coral Hills (8.5%). Strategies are needed to address the existing housing stock within TNI communities to accommodate all TNI community residents that are veterans and/or disabled. In addition, strategies are needed to increase household income to eliminate high incidents of poverty in TNI communities amongst all special population groups.

Age: Based on ACS demographic data, over 378,100, or 45%, of TNI residents are between the ages of 25 and 54 years. The data indicates a high concentration of pre-school children in East Riverdale/Bladensburg (9.6%) and Langley Park (9.0%); working adult's ages 20 to 64 years in East Riverdale/Bladensburg (5.1%) and Suitland/Coral Hills (2.6%); and Senior over the age of 65 years have the highest concentrations of residents in East Riverdale/Bladensburg (10.7%), Langley Park (10.2%), and Suitland/Coral Hills (8.1%). Studies indicate that the population in the County will grow older, and therefore, strategies to address housing "affordability" are needed to lessen the impact of housing cost burden on TNI residents.⁷²

Ethnicity: Blacks/African Americans represent the highest ethnicity in all TNI communities, except for East Riverdale/Bladensburg and Langley Park. The ACS data reflects concentrations of Blacks/African Americans higher than the County's percentage rate of 63.6 % in Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (92.3%), Suitland/Coral Hills (91.7%), Glassmanor/Oxon Hills (87.7%), and Kentland/Palmer Park (84.2%).

Hispanics represent the second highest ethnicity in all TNI communities, except for Suitland/Coral Hills. The ACS data reflects concentration of Hispanics higher than the County's percentage rate of 14.5 % in East Riverdale/Bladensburg (55.9%) and Langley Park (50.1%).

Educational Attainment: Educational Attainment is below the County and regional levels in the TNI communities. According to 2007–2011 ACS data, concentration of residents with less than a high school education are located in Langley Park (63.1%), East Riverdale/Bladensburg (28.8%), Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (21.2%), and Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (20.3%). The ACS data reflects the lowest concentration of college graduates in Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (2.6%), Suitland/Coral Hills (4.7%)

⁷² Source: Housing the Region's Workforce: Policy Challenges for Local Jurisdictions, "George Mason University (2011), pg.

and Kentland/Palmer Park (4.5%). Strategies are needed to provide educational opportunities to TNI residents to attain and/or complete high school, and potentially, vocational, college, and/or graduate school. These strategies should focus on providing a skilled and professional workforce to sustain all existing and future economic industries with TNI communities, as well as Countywide, by providing the skilled worker the support the public and private markets.

Median Household Income: According to 2007 – 2011 ACS data, the County’s median household income was \$73,447 per year. The ACS data also indicates that all TNI median household incomes are significantly below the Countywide estimates, where Langley Park households represent the lowest income earnings (\$49,149). Studies indicate the job growth in the Washington Metro Area will be primarily in lower wage jobs, and therefore, median income for the TNI communities will continue to be below the regional median.⁷³

Household with Food Stamp/SNAP benefits over the past 12 months: According to the 2007 – 2011 ACS data, 6.5% of County households have used Food Stamp/SNAP over the past 12 month period in TNI communities. The ACS data also indicates that Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (13.3%), Suitland/Coral Hills (11.9%), Kentland/Palmer Park (13.3%), and East Riverdale/Bladensburg (10.5%), four of the six TNI communities, have a significantly higher need for nutritional assistance and nutritional subsidies. More importantly, all TNI communities’ estimates are over the Countywide and Washington Metro Area estimates for household needing nutritional assistance and/or nutritional subsidies (8%).

Unemployment: Unemployed workers in all TNI communities are above the Countywide estimate; whereas Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (15.9%), Hillcrest Heights/Marlow Heights (14.1%), Kentland/Palmer Park (12.8%), and Langley Park (16.2%) reflect the highest concentration of unemployed workers in all TNI communities. Strategies are needed to provide education attainment in the markets of construction, health care, science and biotechnology to meet the anticipated job growth in the TNI communities.

Housing Occupancy: TNI communities have an 8.8% vacancy rate for rental unit and 1.0% vacancy rate for homeowners.

Housing Age: The majority of structures are 55 years or older in the TNI communities. Strategies are needed to preserve the existing housing stock through rehabilitation and/or code enforcement.

Housing Tenure: According to 2007 – 2011 ACS data, the majority of residents entered the County within the past 10 years. All TNI communities reflect residency tenures equal to or above the Countywide rate; whereas the highest incidences are recorded in Langley Park (83.4%), East Riverdale/Bladensburg (70.1%), and Kentland/Palmer Park (67.0%).

- **Owner-Occupied:** Within TNI communities, the ACS data indicates a concentration of owner-occupied housing stock in Hillcrest Height/Marlow Heights (55.5%), Kentland/Palmer Park (53.2%), and East Riverdale/Bladensburg (46.1%). The lowest concentration of owner-occupied housing units is recorded in Langley Park (22.9%).

⁷³ Source: Housing the Region’s Workforce: Policy Challenges for Local Jurisdictions, “George Mason University (2011), pg. 17

- **Renter-Occupied:** The ACS data reflects concentrations of renter-occupied housing units in all TNI communities, with higher than County and Washington Metro Area ratios in Langley Park (77.1%), Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (64.5%).
- **Housing Vacancies:** The ACS data indicates a concentration of higher than Countywide homeowner-occupied vacancy rates in Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (3.2%) and concentration of higher than Countywide rental-occupied vacancy rates in Glassmanor/Oxon Hill (11.2%), Suitland/Coral Hills (9.6%), and East Riverdale/Bladensburg (8.8%).

Strategies are needed to meet the anticipated need for multi-family rental units. Studies indicate that multi-family units, both owner-occupied and renter-occupied, will be in great demand to meet the needs of the TNI working age resident, senior, and millennium population.

Housing Cost Burden: Sixty-three percent (63%) of all gross rent in TNI communities is over \$1,000 per month. The data indicates that over 40% of all TNI residents are paying over 35% of their household income in rent. Strategies are needed to meet the anticipated need for multi-family dwellings, both rental and owner-occupies, with housing costs in the amount of \$400,000; and rents of no more than \$1,250 per month.

Appendix 7.14 – Analysis of Impediments – Action Plan

8. Fair Housing Action Plan

Based on the identified impediments to fair housing choice and the proposed actions included in Section 7, the following Fair Housing Action Plan has been developed. The format of this chart should more easily facilitate the completion of the Urban County's and City's Annual Action Plan and CAPER documents. Each year during the Annual Plan process, the Urban County and City of Bowie will identify the strategies it will undertake to affirmatively further fair housing. At the end of each program year, progress made toward achievement of the strategies will be reported in the Urban County's and City's CAPERs.

**Figure 8-1
Fair Housing Action Plan**

	Planned Action Year					Responsible Entity
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	
Goal: Broaden home ownership opportunities for members of the protected classes						
Task: Continue to offer financial incentives toward the creation of new home ownership opportunities through the County's My HOME program and NSP. Ensure that mortgage products are appropriate for the applicant in terms of amount, cost, terms, etc.	•	•	•	•	•	DHCD
Task: Continue to fund home ownership counseling and financial management education for lower-income households, particularly minorities	•	•	•	•	•	County DHCD, City of Bowie
Task: Continue to enforce a Section 3 policy to ensure that employment and other economic and business opportunities generated by HUD assistance are directed to public housing residents and other LMI residents	•	•	•	•	•	County DHCD, City of Bowie
Goal: Expand the supply of decent, affordable housing available in the Urban County						
Task: Continue CDBG-funded rehabilitation activities to improve the quality of the existing affordable housing stock where feasible	•	•	•	•	•	County DHCD, City of Bowie
Task: Continue the City's systematic code enforcement policy to improve and preserve the existing multi-unit affordable housing stock.	•	•	•	•	•	City of Bowie
Task: Award a higher preference in entitlement allocations for new affordable housing projects for families. Increase the HOME per-unit subsidy if necessary.		•	•	•	•	DHCD/ County Council
Task: Develop and adopt a Moderately Priced Housing Ordinance that includes an affordable housing set-aside for new residential development.			•			County Council
Task: Establish and capitalize a County Housing Trust Fund with a dedicated source of revenue to provide financing for affordable housing units.					•	County Council

cont'd ...

Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

	Planned Action Year					Responsible Entity
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	
Goal: Expand the supply of affordable housing accessible to persons with disabilities						
Task: Continue working with the ADA, Coordinator in the DFS to collaborate on accessibility training and compliance issues, specifically, training on housing accessibility	•					DHCD
Task: Require that all new and substantially rehabilitated CDBG- and HOME-assisted units comply with visitability standards. Conduct site visits prior to the issuance of occupancy permits.		•				County DHCD, City of Bowie
Goal: Balance investment in revitalizing impacted areas with investment in expanding affordable housing options in opportunity-rich neighborhoods						
Task: In developing policy priorities for CDBG and HOME funds, give first priority to the use of funds for new family rental and sales developments in non-impacted areas.		•	•	•	•	County Council
Task: As part of the Consolidated Planning Process, map the location of all new CDBG/HOME-assisted projects; analyze this information to determine the relative breakdown of projects in impacted/ non-impacted areas. Establish internal goals for achieving balance, include this analysis in each year's CAPER.	•	•	•	•	•	County DHCD, City of Bowie
Goal: Ensure that the entitlement funding application and review processes affirmatively further fair housing						
Task: Continue to review applications for CDBG and HOME funds to ensure compliance with all appropriate statutes, regulations and policies. Recommendations for funding should be made to County Council.	•	•	•	•	•	County DHCD, City of Bowie
Task: Provide fair housing training to department heads and executive leadership to ensure that decision-making affirmatively furthers fair housing	•	•	•	•	•	County DHCD, City of Bowie
Task: Require fair housing training as a mandatory component of the local government application process, or at least strongly encourage local government applicants to receive fair housing training as part of the process.	•	•	•	•	•	DHCD
Task: Eliminate requirements that support from the community and elected officials is needed if public financing is used for a housing project.	•					DHCD/County Council
Task: If the County does not have an affirmative marketing policy that applies to all CDBG- or HOME-assisted housing projects with five or more units, it must prepare and adopt one.	•					DHCD
Goal: Increase the capacity of the Human Relations Commission						
Task: Amend the Human Relations Ordinance to grant the power of enforcement to the HRC. In this way, County residents can have access to a local entity when seeking enforcement and damages for housing discrimination.			•			County Council

cont'd

Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

	Planned Action Year					Responsible Entity
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	
Goal: Incorporate fair housing principles across government						
Task: Include a Housing Element in the County General Plan when it is updated, including an over-arching statement of fair housing policy, support for affordable housing for both renters and owners and respect for racial, ethnic and economic diversity.	•					
Task: Take steps to ensure that the fair housing policy extends to all aspects and departments of local government. Ensure that all department heads understand the County's/City's responsibility to affirmatively further fair housing. Department heads and elected officials should, in turn, take steps to impart an understanding of this policy to staff and the public.	•	•	•	•	•	
Goal: Broaden general awareness of rights and responsibilities related to fair housing						
Task: The City of Bowie should allocate 1% of its annual CDBG entitlement grant to carry out fair housing activities.	•	•	•	•	•	City of Bowie
Task: The Urban County should continue to allocate 1.5% to 2% of its annual CDBG grant for such activities as education and outreach, enforcement and testing.	•	•	•	•	•	DHCD
Task: Contract with an experienced FHP agency to perform paired testing of rental housing.		•		•		City of Bowie
Goal: Ensure that public housing meets the accessibility needs of residents and applicants						
Task: Update the Section 504 Needs Assessment to ensure that the inventory meets current standards for accessibility and that the goals set in the 1993 assessment have been met.	•					HAPGC
Task: To the extent practical, take advantage of opportunities to spread accessibility features across more communities, so that UFAS-accessible units are available in various locations.	•	•	•	•	•	HAPGC
Goal: Enhance the extent to which members of the protected classes have access to participation in County planning, policy and program offerings.						
Task: Conduct the four-factor analysis (detailed in the Federal Register dated 1/22/2007) to determine the extent to which programs are adequately accessible to potential beneficiaries with limited English proficiency.		•				DHCD, HAPGC, City of Bowie
Task: Maintain records of the demographic characteristics of residents appointed to boards and commissions dealing with housing-related issues, work toward representation of members of the protected classes proportional to their presence in the general population.		•		•		
Goal: Address the disproportionate impact of mortgage loan denials and high-cost lending on minority applicants						
Task: Engage HUD-certified housing counselors to target credit repair education through existing advocacy organizations that work extensively with minorities.		•	•	•	•	DHCD
Task: Conduct a more in-depth analysis of HMDA data to determine if discrimination is occurring against minority applicants.	•					DHCD

Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

Appendix 7.15 – Public Hearing Comments

County Council of Prince George’s County, Maryland
Public Hearing
County Administration Building
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, Maryland
April 14, 2015 at 7:00 pm

Public Hearing Comments

CR-008-2015 – Consolidated Plan

Rachelle Harrod

Representing: Independence Now, Inc.

- Stated that more subsidized, affordable, and accessible housing is needed in the Transit Oriented Development areas.

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Maryann Dillion

Representing: Housing Initiative Partnership

- Stated Montgomery County and the District of Columbia invest local funds into affordable housing and Prince George’s County does not. Prince George’s County is in need of affordable housing and recommends using local funds.

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Regina Lee

- Housing Choice Voucher recipient and unable to use voucher.

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Alicia Silva

- Stated there is a need for code enforcement in the Langley Park area. There is also a need for inspectors that speak Spanish.

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Claudia Sacramento

- Lives in Langley Park and stated the housing strategy is moving in the right direction due to the bad housing conditions in Langley Park.

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Cheryl Court

- Stated there is a need to focus on the housing stock in the County. Also stated that Prince George's County needs to use local funds to make affordable housing in addition to using a Housing Trust Fund and the First Right of Refusal Law.

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Starshama White

- Concerned about Public Housing units at Owens Road being turned into a Seniors only building and others being displaced.

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

CR-009-2015 – Annual Action Plan**The Honorable Vernon Archer, Mayor****Representing: Town of Riverdale Park**

- Applied for CDBG funding but was not recommended; would like to be reconsidered for infrastructure funding.

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Steve Beavers**Representing: City of College Park**

- Applied for CDBG funding but was not recommended; would like to be reconsidered for infrastructure funding.

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Ji-Young Cho**Representing: Korean Community Service Center of Greater Washington**

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Dr. Jacquelyn Henry**Representing: Mission of Love**

- Applied for CDBG funding but was not recommended; would like to be reconsidered for funding.

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan. Mission of Love was reconsidered awarded CDBG funds.

Andrea Kolp

Representing: Compass, Inc.

- Applied for CDBG funding but was not recommended; would like to be reconsidered for funding.

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Emily Kleeman

Representing: Laurel Advocacy and Referral Services

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Cheryl Garnette

Representing: The Ivy Community Charities of Prince George’s County

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Daniel Corradi

Participant @ The Ivy Community Charities of Prince George’s County

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Gabriella Corradi

Participant @ The Ivy Community Charities of Prince George’s County

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Mellanese Sims

Participant @ The Ivy Community Charities of Prince George’s County

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Elliot Sims

Participant @ The Ivy Community Charities of Prince George’s County

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Rachel Sims

Participant @ The Ivy Community Charities of Prince George's County

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Raymond Harrod

Representing: First Generation College Bound

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Marissa Jagarnath

Member at First Generation College Bound

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Fitsume Mulugeta

Member at First Generation College Bound

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Kaylae Dozier

Member at First Generation College Bound

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Carltonae Colding-Gordon

Member at First Generation College Bound

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Michael Oye Adeniran

Member at First Generation College Bound

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Samiah Swann

Member at First Generation College Bound

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the

FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Daisha Lathan

Member at First Generation College Bound

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Saran Baker

Representing: The Ivy Community Charities of Prince George’s County

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Kelly Okleson

Representing: The Neighborhood Design Center

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Kim Rhim

Representing: The Training Source, Inc.

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Joseph Fisher

Representing: First Generation College Bound

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Tonya Hedgepeth

- In support of CR-009-2015

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.

Stuart Eisenberg

Representing: Hyattsville Community Development Corporation

- In support of CR-009-2015
- There is a need for more Economic Development funds

DHCD Response: All comments received have been accepted and considered in the development of the FY 2016 – 2020 Consolidated Plan and FY 2016 Annual Action Plan.