

2015

# CASE STUDY: SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM REDESIGN

CITY OF FLINT

## Contributors

- CITY OF FLINT
- THE CLOUDBURST GROUP
- LOCAL INITIATIVES SUPPORT CORPORATION
- 
-



# CONTENTS

- 2 .....EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
- 3 .....CONTRIBUTORS
- 3 .....BACKGROUND
- 3 .....STRATEGY FOR REDESIGNING THE HOUSING AND  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM
- 5 .....CED ADVISORY COMMITTEE STRATEGIC PLAN
- 5 .....STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVES
- 5 .....CED'S NEW ROLE
- 6 .....FLINT'S PARTNERING PARADIGM
- 7 .....EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANT PROGRAM  
[METRO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - ADMINISTRATOR PARTNER]
- 8 .....CDBG - PUBLIC SERVICES [UNITED WAY - FIDUCIARY PARTNER]
- 10 .....SINGLE INTAKE/SCREENING FOR OWNER OCCUPIED  
REHAB (HOME) AND EMERGENCY REPAIR (CDBG)  
[GCCARD—PROJECT IMPLEMENTING AGENCY PARTNER]
- 12 .....COMPLIANCE MONITORING AND PAYMENT PROCESSING  
[CONTRACTOR PARTNER]
- 13 .....STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS FOR YOUR COMMUNITY
- 15 .....TOOLS



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Confronting budget constraints and reductions in federal and state grant allocations, many distressed communities are cutting back on essential affordable housing and community development activities. In presenting the City of Flint Michigan's experience as a case study, this document demonstrates ways that communities facing similar challenges can maintain robust housing and community development programs despite a challenging economic environment and diminishing resources—both monetary and in terms of human capital—by forming strategic relationships with community partners, partnering with qualified agencies to perform specific activities, and leveraging resources to sustain needed services and even to achieve greater impact.

The following Case Study provides background on conditions in Flint as well as the key contribution of community partners in a strategic planning process that led directly to allow external agencies to administer key processes.

### **Specifically, the City planned to shift key responsibilities to local partners for:**

- Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)—Public Services
- Emergency Solutions Grant Program (ESG)
- Elements of its HOME Investment Partnership funds (HOME) and CDBG programs linked to home repair activities
- Payment processing and monitoring across these programs

The Case Study presents a framework for understanding the different kinds of partnerships developed in Flint. This framework may be useful in comparing and contrasting the nature of the redesigned assignments of roles and responsibilities. The Case Study also raises questions that community leaders should review in their exploration of undertaking comparable redesign in their own communities.

**NOTE:** After extensive consideration, the City of Flint decided not to hire a payment processing and monitoring contractor. However, this Case Study highlights issues for other municipalities to consider when seeking out and working with a payment processing and monitoring contractor. Finally, the Case Study provides tools and strategies in its Appendices intended to help other communities that are considering taking similar steps.

---

## CONTRIBUTORS

This Case Study is the result of a collaborative effort of the City of Flint's Division of Community and Economic Development (CED) staff, the Flint-based staff of the Local Initiatives Support Corporation, and staff and consultants from The Cloudburst Group (working under a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] award to provide Direct Technical Assistance through its OneCPD Program).

---

## BACKGROUND

For the last century, Flint's history was dominated by both the auto industry and car culture. The City's population peaked in 1960 at almost 200,000, at which time it was the second largest city in the state. During the 1950s and 60s Flint experienced the height of its prosperity and influence. However, from the late 1960s through the end of the 20th century, disinvestment, deindustrialization, depopulation and urban decay heavily impacted the City. Initially, white flight was a key contributing factor in these shifts in Flint; by the early 1970s, however, decline was exacerbated by the 1973 oil crisis and significant job losses in the U.S. auto industry.

The rate of deindustrialization accelerated in the 1980s, with local General Motors (GM) employment falling from a high of 80,000 to under 8,000 by 2010. Globalization and a decline in GM sales have both played a role in Flint's sharp economic and population decline.

As of January 2013, as a result of the shrinking tax base, the city of Flint faced a cumulative deficit of \$19 million that resulted in retrenchment, a hiring freeze and layoffs of municipal employees. Consequently, the staff of the DCED was reduced, causing a shortage of resources with which to carry out much-needed community and economic development programs in the city.

---

## STRATEGY FOR REDESIGNING THE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM

The Division of Community and Economic Development (CED) manages Flint's allocation of HUD Community Planning and Development funds. In Flint these HUD funds include CDBG, HOME, and ESG. CED is situated within the Department of Planning and Development, which also houses the City's Planning and Zoning, Building Inspections, Blight Elimination and Parks and Recreation divisions. The Planning Department recently led a broad effort to update Flint's Master Plan.

**Dwindling staff resources:** As a result of declining population and decreasing revenues, Flint has experienced substantial reductions in city staffing and services. The staff of CED has been reduced from 14 in 2010 to 7.5 in 2014; staffing levels for 2014-15 have not yet been finalized but are unlikely to increase. In addition, as city administrations have changed, there has been substantial transition in staff, resulting in lack of continuity and loss of consistency in application and use of policies and procedures.

**Creation of a Community and Economic Development Advisory Committee:**

In response to this resource crisis, the strong philanthropic and nonprofit sectors from the region rallied in support of the city.

**Members of the Advisory Committee are affiliated with:**

- Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
- Center for Community Progress
- Office of Representative Dan Kildee
- Genesee County Land Bank
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation
- Ruth Mott Foundation
- Flint Area Reinvestment Office
- Community Foundation of Greater Flint

These community partners, along with CED, formed an Advisory Committee to develop a strategy for responding to the problems facing the city. The Advisory Committee wanted to institutionalize the responsibilities and activities of CED in a way that would:

- Ensure continued compliance with federal program regulations.
- Enable the City to continue to receive and optimize the use of its allocations of federal funds.
- Capitalize on the Department's leadership role to create a comprehensive community development delivery system for the City of Flint.

With these objectives in mind, the Advisory Committee, working with CED staff, issued a White Paper in 2012 that set out recommendations for revising the roles and responsibilities of CED in concert with an increasing role for the philanthropic community and planned a strategic planning retreat to develop a road map for improving community development service delivery.

## CED ADVISORY COMMITTEE STRATEGIC PLAN

The leadership of Flint envisioned CED as “... an idea center within city government that interacts with human services providers, public health agencies, educators, public housing agency, federal state and local program partners to enhance the living environment in neighborhoods for children, families and senior citizens. This center should provide professional and technical advice and assist residents in improving the quality of life and help policy makers and others in developing strong neighborhoods.” The division was charged with engaging the CED Advisory Committee to identify key activities that could have a significant impact on the residents of Flint. The Advisory Committee planned and held a strategic planning retreat in May 2013 intended to guide the work of CED and CED’s partners.

## STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVES

**The CED Strategic Plan envisioned four strategic objectives:**

- Reduce blight by strategically investing resources to stabilize Flint’s neighborhoods
- Enhance the quality of life in Flint by improving public safety
- Increase access to supportive employment opportunities and experiences for Flint’s low- and moderate-income young adults, aged 15-24, that includes life skills and education components
- Develop an effective and efficient housing investment strategy for the City of Flint

As part of this strategic effort the roles of CED and its organizational partners in the community would evolve to meet the emerging challenges of the economic environment.

## CED’S NEW ROLE

Realizing that constricted staff resources were limiting CED’s ability to administer and oversee all CPD program activities in-house, the City and its Advisory Committee developed a model for a new community development delivery system that changed the role of the CED.

The new role supports a shift from a general transactional focus for CED, freeing up staff and resources for creation and maintenance of a comprehensive community development delivery system by:

- Continuously assessing and responding to local market conditions;
- Developing a comprehensive housing market strategy;
- Strengthening and supporting local CDCs;
- Communicating impacts of CED that encourage community engagement; and
- Aligning programs with all elements of the city's master plan, as well as engaging community and regional partners in program planning and delivery.

A primary goal in these changes is to move the City's community development programs toward a "best practice model," demonstrating that diminishing financial and human resources do not have to lead inevitably to a degrading of program quality; rather, CED is striving to maintain focus on continuous improvement in the face of these constrictions.

The role of the CED Advisory Committee and other partners in supporting community development was also revised to include:

- Supporting education and orientation for elected and appointed officials;
- Supporting market research and data collection to inform policy and program direction;
- Supporting policy changes to enhance the community development system;
- Supporting CDCs and Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO); and
- Communicating the role and impact of CED.

The Advisory Committee members and CED thought it important to implement this strategic plan to guide investments over a two year period while the City completed its Master Plan for the redevelopment of the city.

## ..... **FLINT'S PARTNERING PARADIGM**

Flint made a strategic decision: to move from implementing its community development programs with internal staff to leveraging resources with community partners and revisiting roles and responsibilities for program implementation. The intent has been to allow the City to work through partnerships to carry out key activities, while also ensuring that the City retained the required oversight of the use of public funds. This partnering model also allowed CED staff responsibilities to be redefined to take on additional responsibilities in line with the City of Flint Strategic Plan and Master Plan.

Flint's approach was thoughtful and flexible. The City built different partnerships on different aspects of community development, drawing on community agencies' strengths and current responsibilities in some cases, and in others, designing specific "contractual requirements" to encourage qualified entities to bid for the role. These partnerships were established as a response to the resource-constrained environment in which the City needed to decrease staff and eliminate the transactional nature of

the agency's work. Partnering was also instrumental to achieving CED's new role and strategic directions, outlined above.

Key distinctions among the different partnerships developed in Flint are described here. The intended purposes, and advantages as well as challenges of forming and maintaining each type of partnership, are discussed in detail in the next section.

<p><b>ADMINISTRATOR</b> Metro</p>	<p>Responsible for managing multiple activities, including contract management, general administration, financial management (including invoice review and approval), monitoring and oversight, and reporting and data collection. In this scenario, the city retains the authority to allocate and make financial awards to agencies.</p>
<p><b>FIDUCIARY</b> United Way</p>	<p>Provides financial management and oversight to help ensure compliant use of public funds.</p>
<p><b>PROJECT IMPLEMENTING AGENCY</b> GCCARD</p>	<p>Carries out agreed upon projects that are eligible under the Federal regulations.</p>
<p><b>CONTRACTOR</b> TBD</p>	<p>Carries out compliance, monitoring, invoicing and payment request activities to decrease the transactional responsibilities of City.</p>

## EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANT PROGRAM [Metro Community Development - Administrator Partner]

### Explicit purposes for the partnership:

The Emergency Solutions Grant Interim Rule dated December 5, 2011, allows a recipient of Emergency Solutions Grant funds to delegate administration of funds to one or more subrecipients. In this case, the City was trying to optimize the use of its administrative funds to ensure continued compliance with federal program regulations, while lessening transactional responsibilities for CED's reduced staff.

The City identified Metro Community Development (Metro) as a partner that it could enlist to expand its capacity by sharing administrative responsibilities, specifically those related to management, oversight and monitoring of ESG program participants. Metro Community Development is the regional Continuum of Care (CoC) lead and functions in a very similar role for the State of Michigan's ESG program. Metro also functioned in a similar capacity for the City with the Homeless Prevention and Rapid Rehousing (HPRP) program. In addition, Metro is the Homeless Management and Information System (HMIS) administrator for the CoC, and already provides training and technical assistance to the local CoC partners, thus this relationship with the City provides a natural extension of that role.

The redesign shifts the City out of direct contractual relationship with the nonprofit agencies carrying out ESG-funded activities. The subrecipients now contract directly with Metro, although the City retains authority to decide on overall allocations among activities, and continues to make awards to applicant organizations. The changing relationships among the City, Metro and nonprofit subrecipients is made clear in Appendix 4.

#### **Advantages of partnering:**

- Capitalizes on Metro's expertise in this specialized area allowing other stakeholders and community participants to benefit from their knowledge.
- Limited ESG administration resources are maximized by allocating to an organization that already provides similar services for related activities.
- City can strengthen its capacity to provide technical assistance and training to the administrator, and be less encumbered by administrative requirements including contract development, verification of insurance, invoicing and monitoring.

#### **Challenges associated with partnering:**

- The City's administrative and financial processes and systems made the transition extremely labor intensive and complicated.
- New invoicing tools had to be developed in order to track expenditures by agency even though payment is issued to Metro alone (because City is still responsible for drawing down funds in HUD's Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS), which is done by the City, not Metro).
- Without the ability to review backup documentation, City must develop a level of trust that Metro is reviewing agency pay requests and backup documentation at the same or higher level of review to ensure compliance.
- New tools had to be developed to ensure that monitoring conducted by Metro met all HUD requirements.
- The HUD Field Office in Detroit has expressed concern about Metro's capacity to carry out these many responsibilities with current levels of staffing, although following a week-long monitoring visit these concerns were allayed.

## **CDBG - PUBLIC SERVICES**

**[United Way - Fiduciary Partner]**

#### **Explicit purposes for the partnership:**

Due to a reduction in staff in CED, the City found it very challenging to handle a large number of contracts with organizations seeking grants between \$10,000 and \$50,000. Requesting organizations were generally small entities with limited capacity to manage federal funds which therefore required a considerable amount of staff oversight. In conversation with community partners, CED determined there could be a more effective mechanism for providing support to small neighborhood-based youth initiatives, while reducing the burden on City staff and significantly increasing the level of resources invested in youth recreation.

The City saw the opportunity to partner with the United Way of Genesee County (UW) as a way to provide small grants to many more community groups than if the City had tried to administer grants directly. This initiative also aligned with the UW's national mission of supporting health and their long-standing commitment to youth. The UW has a long history of managing multiple grants very capably, and was able to contribute in-kind administrative and programmatic support to neighborhood groups, overseeing the collection of information on participant eligibility and ensuring proper documentation for procurement and payment processing, thereby freeing up neighborhood partners to carry out activities directly with local youth.

The City also used this opportunity to take advantage of emerging HUD guidance to stretch resources wisely. In CPD Notice 13-07, HUD clarified its policy for allocating staff costs between program administration and activity delivery. The City worked with Cloudburst and consultant Jim Broughman, one of the authors of the original CDBG regulations, to design the program in such a way that it maximizes the use of activity delivery while leveraging United Way resources. Specifically, CDBG activity delivery funds pay for youth services provided by neighborhood agencies, as well as for the UW's staff time for activity delivery tasks such as procurement, preparing and executing contracts, and processing contractor payments. The UW's in-kind administrative contribution is used judiciously to cover activities not directly tied to the delivery of services.

The partnership was envisioned as the City entering into a single Public Service grant with the UW, which in turn would make small grants to neighborhood groups for youth recreation. The UW issued a simple RFP, then screened and selected participating agencies based on the eligibility of their proposed activities. Collaboration with local foundations expanded the reach and impact of the program in its first year. In one case the Community Foundation of Greater Flint provided the UW with a tool known as the Neighborhood Small Grants Program, a proven model for neighborhood grant-making based on simplicity and accountability, while another foundation expressed interest in participating as a funder in future years.

Participating neighborhood groups proposed specific uses of the funds. Examples included renting vans for transporting children to other communities for competitions or training camps, renting space for tournaments, and purchasing uniforms and sports equipment. Under this initiative, once an organization is selected to receive one of the mini-grants, UW staff work with the group to ensure that proper eligibility information is collected, to secure complete and accurate documentation for grant expenditures, and to support outreach and maximum participation. Finally, UW staff work to assemble close-out information on the eligibility of participants, numbers participating and specific activities carried out, to ensure that federal CDBG reporting requirements are met.

**Advantages of partnering:**

By reducing the level of City staff effort to provide support and technical assistance for a small number of groups, this approach exponentially expanded the number of grass roots neighborhood-based organizations that can gain access to these CDBG-Public Service funds as well as leveraging philanthropic efforts that support youth development. Small organizations supported by this program have been able to access other nonprofit capacity building services offered by the UW, organizations benefited from connecting with other grantees, and the initiative helped the UW achieve a more diverse network of partners.

In this first year of the partnership, the City's confidence in the UW's ability to manage the administrative and oversight responsibilities of the use of federal funds is strong. The City's hope is that the staff employed to support local groups have been actively involved and accessible to ensure that the program effectively enrolled participating youth groups, strengthened the network of grass roots organizations, and met the various thresholds of compliance and accountability for the CDBG program

**Challenges associated with partnering:**

While the City and UW are optimistic that this new initiative will be successful, it will be important to assess whether specific measures of enrollment, participation, and compliance have been met. It may be that a different level or type of support for participating groups will be needed to optimize results in future years.

.....

## **SINGLE INTAKE/SCREENING FOR OWNER OCCUPIED REHAB (HOME) AND EMERGENCY REPAIR (CDBG)**

**[GCCARD—Project Implementing Agency Partner]**

**Explicit purposes for the partnership:**

A governmental entity may pass CDBG funds through to another nonprofit or local government entity as a subrecipient to implement programs on its behalf. The subrecipient, known here as the Project Implementing Agency, must be another governmental entity or a nonprofit organization. In this situation, the original CDBG grantee retains the responsibility to monitor the subrecipient to ensure the grant funds are being used for authorized purposes and as required by the grant agreement and applicable regulations. In Flint's community development delivery system, the Genesee County Community Action Resource Development Agency (GCCARD), as a CDBG subrecipient, plays the role of the Project Implementing Agency.

GCCARD, an agency of county government that performs community action responsibilities, has previously worked collaboratively with CED through cross-referral

for services and as a past administrator of its Citywide Emergency Repair (CWE) program. Under the new single intake portal, GCCARD will gather intake information and do eligibility screening both for the CDBG-funded CWE program and for the HOME-funded owner-occupied rehab program. CDBG activity delivery funds may be used to support HOME-funded projects which are also CDBG-eligible. GCCARD was chosen based on its demonstrated capacity in administering home repair, as noted above, and on its implementation of the Department of Energy (DOE) Weatherization program.

GCCARD will be responsible to ensure that all program requirements for the specific HUD program—CDBG or HOME—are met. These include such items as income eligibility, proof of property insurance, payment of local taxes, etc. In addition, GCCARD will assess each unit for which assistance is requested, to determine whether it is best served by a “full-code” rehab funded by HOME, emergency repair of specific systems in the house to address health and safety concerns funded by CDBG, and/or rehabbed in coordination with DOE Weatherization (such as roof repair/replacement). GCCARD will determine the program(s) to be used and will develop repair specifications and assessments. GCCARD will procure contractors for CWE and will use the city’s procured contractor for HOME owner-occupied rehab.

CED will provide HOME funds directly to the contractor, based on GCCARD’s recommendation and a City inspection. CED will reimburse GCCARD using CDBG funds for delivery costs in both programs, and for contracted repairs in the CWE program.

#### **Advantages of partnering:**

- Allowable home repair under the weatherization program is very limited; seamless coordination with CDBG will provide greater ability to serve homes where repairs are necessary to achieve the full benefits of the weatherization program.
- As program target area priorities change and regulations are modified in both the HOME and CDBG programs, GCCARD will be able to identify the most appropriate form of assistance for households needing home repairs.
- GCCARD provides essential additional capacity in the face of hiring restrictions within the City and CED. As a high-capacity service delivery partner, GCCARD can quickly revive the CWE program, which has been on hold for several years because of staffing limitations.

#### **Challenges associated with partnering:**

GCCARD will need to become familiar with the 2013 HOME regulations, especially the new property standards at 24 CFR 92.251 as they go into effect in January 2015. In addition, GCCARD and the City will need to be in close communication to ensure efficient procedures and effective communications between themselves, and among GCCARD’s contractors for Citywide Emergency Repairs, the City’s previously-procured contractor for owner-occupied rehab, City building inspectors, and the City finance department.

## COMPLIANCE MONITORING AND PAYMENT PROCESSING

### [Contractor Partner]

The City of Flint considered hiring a Compliance Monitoring and Payment Processing partner to take on its monitoring and payment processing duties and even undertook an RFP process to select a partner. However, for several reasons, the City of Flint decided not to proceed at this time, but may revisit the possibility in the future. The City anticipated receiving responses from companies that provide this service to other municipalities, hoping to achieve efficiencies of scale. However, responses received did not offer any net cost savings. Thus the City determined it was more cost-effective to revise internal policies and procedures and restructure existing staff work efforts to gain some of the efficiencies that were expected to be received from a contractor. So that other municipalities may benefit, the process for initiating and the potential benefits of hiring a contractor partner are included below.

#### **Explicit purposes for the partnership:**

The overriding goal of partnering with a Monitoring and Payment processing contractor is to reduce City staff costs and streamline operations, while ensuring that HUD funds are spent on eligible activities, adhering to HUD cost principles and in compliance with federal rules. This strategy is also intended to identify and prevent deficiencies and to design corrective actions to improve or reinforce program participant performance, while relieving municipality staff from the transactional process.

#### **How different partnerships are built, with community partners taking on different functions:**

A municipality could procure a qualified partner for this work through a competitive process. In this relationship the City staff would take on a management oversight role to verify that the contractor has appropriate checks and procedures in place to monitor performance of nonprofits and efficiently process reimbursement and payment requests. By focusing on specific performance measures a municipality would:

- Ensure that programs and technical areas are carried out efficiently, effectively, and in compliance with applicable laws and regulations
- Assist program participants in improving their performance, developing or increasing capacity, and augmenting their management and technical skills
- Stay abreast of the efficacy of community development programs and technical areas within the communities these programs serve

#### **Advantages of partnering:**

Efficient payment processing and effective monitoring systems start with good program design and clear performance expectations that are articulated in agreements with contractors that have the capacity to adhere to HUD program requirements. These are all advantages of partnering with experienced private sector vendors. A municipality may enter into a contract with a contractor that routinely manages and/or audits financial transactions. In doing so, a municipality and its contractor would agree on the monitoring goals and payment processing roles and responsibilities to develop a streamlined yet effective monitoring and payment system that will:

- Assess and improve the quality of City and subrecipient performance
- Determine the level of City and subrecipient compliance
- Address city and subrecipient management deficiencies and design corrective actions
- Highlight City and subrecipient accomplishments
- Identify best practices that might be replicated by other partners
- Improve performance of City and subrecipient program managers to carry out activities in a timely manner, comply with regulations, improve management quality, solve problems and avoid audit findings
- Identify and recommend opportunities for improvement through program design changes, adoption of best practices or use of new technologies

### **Challenges associated with partnering:**

Federal regulations are clear that grantees are held accountable for implementation of HUD grants and ensuring that funds are used in accordance with all program requirements. Partnering with a vendor through a contract to manage payment and compliance monitoring processes does not relieve the grantee of the responsibility for adherence to Federal regulations and statutes. The grantee continues to play an important role when these tasks are outsourced. Consequently, the grantee must be diligent about developing appropriate performance measures, and must conduct frequent checks to ensure that all Federal requirements are met.

## **STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS FOR YOUR COMMUNITY**

The City of Flint undertook this thoughtful restructuring in response to years of economic disinvestment that stressed City resources. There had been City-wide reductions in staffing and even though sufficient HUD funds were in place to support staff working on HUD programs, CED positions were also eliminated. Awards to inexperienced developers and CHDOs with limited capacity left the City exposed to audit findings and funds recapture. Working with these inexperienced developers put additional burden on the reduced staff to provide technical assistance, develop corrective actions, and provide monitoring oversight.

Other communities facing related or even very different challenges may also want to

consider redesigning their delivery of key housing/homelessness services. Important assessment factors to consider, related to resources and capacity, include:

- Are experienced staff leaving and not being replaced with staff of similar skill and expertise?
- Are resources even available to replace departing HUD-program staff?
- Do nonprofit community partners or other local government departments in the city or the region have the capacity to take on added responsibilities? If this is not the case, are Technical Assistance resources available to help build capacity and tools for this purpose?
- Does the jurisdiction have the staff capacity and systems in place to provide adequate oversight for subrecipients and contractors to ensure compliance with federal program requirements?
- Can the jurisdiction identify specific programs/partners to work with, based on qualifications, related experience and/or high capacity?

Once a community has a clearer sense of local conditions and capacity, they might explore the issues through a cost benefit analysis perspective, asking:

- What specific measurable objectives would we hope to accomplish through partnering with outside agencies to perform activities that used to be performed by the jurisdiction?
- Are there other ways to accomplish these same objectives?
- What benefits can we identify, both to our community and to the jurisdiction, of this partnership?
- What risks or potential risks would be heightened by this partnership?

Reviewing key relationships and relational implications of service delivery system redesign, early in the consideration, is crucial. The community should ask:

- What is the HUD Field Office's view?
  - What information will they need about proposed partners, the proposed allocation of responsibilities, or other concerns they may have?
  - What is their view on adequate oversight and monitoring of HUD resources?
  - What forms of assistance and support can they provide to the jurisdiction and its partners?
- Who in the community—in addition to jurisdiction staff and HUD—should be included early on in this consideration? Are there collective bargaining issues that need to be explored?
- How would the proposed redesign affect other ongoing service delivery efforts, e.g., Coordinated Entry/Assessment activities of the Continuum of Care?

Consideration of shifting responsibilities from public entities to private partners, as described in this document, raises important issues of authority, control, oversight,

and financial gain. The authors want to emphasize the need to go through a strategic planning process—one that involves multiple stakeholders—to ensure that these concerns are voiced and openly evaluated in the very early stages of any partnership work. The merits and downsides of staying “as is” vs. shifting responsibilities to a community partner or multiple partners need to be made explicit early on.

## TOOLS

In Flint, City and Technical Assistance team members used a number of simple and adaptable tools to design and implement the partnerships. These included:

**NOTE: The files shown below can be viewed and printed from the attachments section of this pdf**

### Administrator: ESG

**Purpose:** Outlines in contractual terms the elements of the partnership



ESG MEM-ORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING



CONTRACT



PRIMER (Handbook)



ESG SUB STRUCTURES DIAGRAM

### Fiduciary: CDBG-Public Services

**Purpose:** Determine if the division and the United Way’s partners are complying with federal requirements in relation to appropriate activities and eligible participants



PROJECT DELIVERY REGULATIONS

### Project Implementation Agency: HOME and CDBG

**Purpose:** Illuminates responsibility and accountability for the new arrangement; makes apparent which activities are shifting to the partner and which are not



CHECK LIST OF RESPONSIBILITIES FOR CITY AND PARTNER

### Contractor: Payment Processing and Contract Monitoring

**Purpose:** Clarifies steps of complex processes that may have grown up organically—allows City to rethink these as well as making explicit for bidders what will be required



HANDBOOK



PROCESS MAPS FOR PAYMENT CONTRACTOR



RFP