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Despite the seemingly positive gains made over the last decade in both population and improvements to the median household income, wages and job growth have not been able to keep up with the cost of living in the Miami area –creating in its wake a staggering number (67 percent) of low-to-moderate income households and a city that nearly half of its households (46 percent) are cost-burdened.

Using the CHAS data provided by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and supplemented with a literature review as well as data from the Census and the Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing, we found two trends emerge that shed light on the housing needs in the City of Miami. The first trend illustrates the changes currently underway in the city that is drastically shifting the demographic landscape and, in turn, the housing needs of the city. The second trend is in regards to the mismatch between the income earned and the cost of housing in the City of Miami. This second trend in particular helps to explain the city’s most pertinent housing problem: the sheer number of households that are cost-burdened.

Trends

TREND 1: Demographic Changes Signal an Increased Need for Housing –especially in certain subsets of the population

- City of Miami is experiencing robust population growth that will certainly increase demand for housing options.
- The growth of the non-family households in the City of Miami will likely impact the demand for smaller housing units overtime.
- The fact that school-aged children were the only cohort to experience a significant decrease in population leads to more questions than answers about the changing housing needs of the city, especially in small related households made up of two to four persons.
- The city’s older population share of the total population has been trending upward and has a greater tendency of being from a household from the lowest income category.

TREND 2: A housing cost/income mismatch has led to a significant number of cost-burdened households and the need for more affordable housing options

- A staggering 67 percent of the households in the City of Miami earn 80 percent or less than the HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI).
- Almost half of the City of Miami’s households are cost-burdened. Projections estimate that the trend will continue through 2030.
- The City of Miami is located within one of the top ten Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) with the widest wealth gaps and where residents would need to earn three times the federal poverty line to live a modest lifestyle.
- The Miami area has the most cost-burdened middle-income households in the nation due to a combination of very low income and the combined costs of housing and transportation.
• The Miami area job market was defined by a hiring slump in 2013 that further aggravates the mismatch between income and cost of living.

Housing Problems

The trends summarized above coincide with the findings of the analysis of housing problems within the City of Miami required for this report. Based on the CHAS data, housing cost burdened is the most common housing problem in the City of Miami across income, tenure, race and ethnicity. The second most common housing problem in the City of Miami is overcrowded units. Below is a summary of the findings:

HOUSING PROBLEM 1: Cost-burdened Households is a serious and common housing problem in the City of Miami. The CHAS data clearly illustrates that cost-burdened households is the greatest housing problem facing the City of Miami. There are a total of 44,055 households in the City of Miami that are severely cost-burdened and 28,370 that are cost-burdened—greatly outpacing the other housing problems significantly.

• As one might suspect, the poorest households are the most cost-burdened – An astounding 25,615 of the lowest income bracket (0-30 percent AMI) households spend more than 50 percent of their income on housing. This one group makes up 58 percent of the total severely cost-burdened households.
• Renters are most likely to experience housing problems, especially poor households – With regards to sheer numbers, renter households in the City of Miami are more likely to experience housing problems. A staggering portion of the cost-burdened (79 percent) and severely cost-burdened (69 percent) households in the city of Miami are renters. Of these renters, the severely cost-burdened households earning 0-30 percent AMI were the single largest cohort with over 20,000 households to experience any one of the four housing problems analyzed.
• Small related households and elderly households are also cost-burdened – With regards to small related households, 45,750 households are cost-burdened or severely cost-burdened. The greatest majority of these households are renters, especially in the low-income categories. While the elderly renter households also experienced high rates of housing problems (36,515 households), this was the only household type with a significant number of homeowners experiencing cost-burden due to housing costs. As to be expected, this was most pronounced in the low income-brackets, most likely due to senior citizens living on fixed income.

HOUSING PROBLEM 2: Overcrowded units, especially those that are inhabited by renter households between 0 to 50 percent AMI. However, the CHAS data illustrates that this problem is a distant second with only 7,600 households considered overcrowded or severely overcrowded across incomes and tenure. Despite these low figures, there is evidence that points to a greater number of households living in overcrowded quarters in the city and is discussed in greater detail in the report.
Summary of Housing Needs

This section explores demographic changes and common housing problems within the City of Miami households in order to determine the housing needs of our community. Despite the positive gains made over the last decade in both population and improvements to the median household income, it has not been enough to keep up with the cost of living in the Miami area, creating in its wake a staggering number (67 percent) of low-to-moderate income households and a city that nearly half of its households (46 percent) are cost-burdened. Although Hispanics (in part due to their large numbers) renters which comprise the poorest households in the city are most likely to be cost-burdened, this housing problem permeates throughout the city across income, tenure, race and ethnicity.

Using the CHAS data provided by HUD and supplemented with a literature review as well as data from the Census and the Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing, we found two trends emerge that shed light on the housing needs in the City of Miami: 1) Demographic changes that signal an increase need for housing; and 2) A housing cost/income mismatch which has led to a significant number of cost-burdened households and the need for more affordable housing options. These two trends are explored in greater detail below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Base Year: 2000</th>
<th>Most Recent Year: 2010</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>362,470</td>
<td>391,458</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>134,344</td>
<td>149,077</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$23,483.00</td>
<td>$29,621.00</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Miami is experiencing robust population growth that will certainly increase demand for housing options – The 2010 census validated what many have been observing for years: population growth in the City of Miami -Miami-Dade County’s urban core- is making a comeback. In fact, according to the Census, from 2000 to 2010, 15 percent of the county’s growth occurred in the City of Miami when prior decades the city only contributed 4 percent or less to the county’s growth. In fact, the city’s growth has been has been so recent that 57 percent of the population added to the city since 1970 occurred during the last decade.
Based on the decennial census, the Census Bureau annual adjusts the population estimate in the Population Estimates Program (PEP); these estimates are used in federal funding allocations, as survey controls, as denominators for vital rates and per capita time series, and as indicators of recent demographic changes. According to the latest population estimate from the US Census Bureau’s PEP, today the City of Miami’s total population is 408,750. The population growth in the year between the decennial census and the latest estimate was just under 9,000 people; this net gain in population in just one year was significantly greater than all the growth during the 1990s decade and very similar in growth to the two previous decades, the 1970s and 1980s. In addition, it should be taken into consideration that the City of Miami is located in the fourth “hardest to count” metropolitan area in the country—meaning that a significant portion of the city may be officially undercounted with at least one in five residents living in a hard-to-count neighborhood.(1) In fact, the City of Miami won a Census Challenge in 2007 that recalculated the city’s population estimate from 409,719 to 424,662 and later grew to 433,136 by 2009 before falling again during the decennial census in 2010.(2) The findings from the Census Challenges are supported by a Drilldown study conducted by Social Compact in 2009 that found that the City of Miami had a substantial greater market size than traditional data sources had illustrated. Social Compact’s 2009 population estimate for the Miami study area was 504,266; 19 percent higher (approximately 82,000 more people) than the 2008 traditional market estimate of 422,182, and 37 percent higher (nearly 137,000 more people) than the Census 2000 estimate of 367,426.

The growth of the non-family households in the City of Miami will likely impact the demand for smaller housing units overtime - The decade between the two census in 2000 and 2010 represents a shift in the type of households in the City of Miami towards non-family households. Although family households still represent a majority, it grew over the past ten years only modestly. On the other hand, non-family households grew at an impressive 34.1 percent during the same time period to now make up 43.1 percent of the total households in Miami. According to the Census more Americans are living alone than ever before (27.4 percent) and the share of households with children has halved since the 1970s to 20 percent. (1) These same trends are apparent in the City of Miami as well. In particular, the greatest gains in non-family households were among those living alone; the city added 11,810 people (28.9 percent) to this category over the last decade for a total of 33.3 percent—greater than the national trend stated above.

Along this same vein, the only household type to lose population was families of married couples with children. In contrast to the region, the loss of this household type was most pronounced in the City of Miami (-6.2 percent) compared to the County (-5.7 percent), and the State of Florida (+1.2 percent).(2)

(2) Source (City of Miami): U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 & 2010 Census, Summary File 1, Table DP-1; and (Miami-Dade County and Florida): US Census Bureau, Census 2000 and Census 2010, Demographic Profiles, Miami-Dade Department of Planning and Zoning, Research Section, June 2011.
The city’s older population share of the total population has been trending upward and have a greater tendency to be from a household from the lowest income category. According to the 2010 Census, there were more people who were 65 years and over in 2010 than in any previous census. Among places with a population of 100,000 or more, four of the ten places with the highest percentage of the population 65 years and over were located in Florida. Specifically, the City of Miami was one of these ten places, ranking tenth with a total population of 63,987 (16 percent) 65 years and over. These statistics are important to consider in light that the growth rate of the elderly population is low compared to workforce age residents in the city, but make up a significant share of the city’s population compared to other large cities. Furthermore, according to Table 2, a significant portion of the lowest income category is made up of elderly households. Approximately 35 percent of the 62 to 74 population and 46 percent of the over 75 population have an annual income between 0-30 percent of the HUD Area.

The fact that school-aged children were the only cohort to experience a significant decrease in population leads to more questions than answers about the changing housing needs of the city, especially the small related households—The Census data on the age of the city’s residents confirms the loss in family households with children in that it illustrates a significant loss in school aged children in the City of Miami. Interestingly, this decrease in the population of children was parallel to a noteworthy increase in the young workforce age population that has occurred over the same period—especially the 25 to 34 cohort population gains in the city (21.3 percent) were impressive when compared to the county (0.9 percent) and to the state (9.9 percent). This group most likely represents the “small related” household in the CHAS data that demonstrated housing problems relating to cost-burden. The data creates more questions than answers: Is this due to an increase in young childless professionals attracted to the urban core? Are they beginning to start families as indicated by the jump in the under 5 year population? As these children age, will these families remain in the City of Miami? Are families with children in school leaving the city due to the lack of housing choices or are there other reasons associated with the trend? It should also be noted that, according to Table 2, when income is taken into consideration with households with young children six and under—just like the elderly households—there is a disproportionate number in the low to moderate category in the city of Miami.
TREND 2: A housing cost/income mismatch has led to a significant number of cost-burdened households and the need for more affordable housing options.

A staggering 67 percent of the households in the City of Miami earn 80 percent or less than the HUD Area Median Family Income (HAMFI) – According to the CHAS data, there are a total number of 99,515 low to moderate income households in the City of Miami that represent a 67 percent of total households in the city. The most recent Census figures show improved statistics for the city’s income by household. According to a comparison between the 2000 Census and the most recent American Community Survey, the city lost a significant share of the households that earned less than $10,000—from 24.2 percent in 2000 to 16.6 percent of the city’s total households. Likewise, there were gains in the share of all the income brackets from $35,000 and above. Despite these changes, the same figures illustrate that all the households making below the $35,000 income bracket make up 55.7 percent of the city’s households. Therefore, regardless of the income gains made by the city’s households, as the CHAS data and the Census data indicate, a significant portion of the city’s households earnings make them vulnerable to becoming cost-burdened by rising costs in housing and other cost of living expenses.
Almost half of the City of Miami’s households are cost-burdened, projections estimate that the trend will continue through 2030 – According to the Shimberg Center for Housing Studies, 73,137 city households (46 percent) pay more than 30 percent of income for housing; by comparison, 29 percent of households statewide are cost-burdened. Of these 46 percent of cost-burdened households in Miami, about half (24 percent) are severely cost-burdened—meaning these households pay more than half their household income on housing. It is important to note that of the City’s cost-burned households, a significant majority (68 percent) are renters.

Shimberg considers these figures as an important need indicator that can serve as an approximation of the total number of households that would benefit from some type of housing assistance that includes the construction of new affordable housing units, but also the provision of subsidies to make current units more affordable. It is also useful for planning purposes to study the projected increase severely cost-burdened, low-income households over multi-year periods in order to properly mitigate possible future affordable housing shortages. The table below details the projected level of severely cost-burdened households in Miami that earn 80 percent of AMI or less. The income variation in the table helps inform the city on where the needs will be for future targeted housing assistance taking into account that the construction of new units for low-income households means that not all new rent- or price-restricted units will be affordable to all households (for example, a household at 30 percent AMI would still pay more than half of its income for rent in an apartment with rent set for households with incomes of 60 percent AMI). This is important because according to the table, about half of the estimated new severely cost-burdened households in the next years will be renters from the most poverty stricken households in the city.
The City of Miami is located within one of the top ten MSAs with the widest wealth gaps and where residents would need to earn three times the federal poverty line to live a modest lifestyle.

The US Census Bureau determines income equality based on the Gini Index as measured by using the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey. When considering the most populous U.S. Metropolitan Areas, the Miami MSA ranked second worst in the nation during the 2005-2009 period and eighth worst in 2012.[1] A recent analysis of the 2012 figures combined the Gini Index data with income, poverty and home value data from the Census Bureau and poverty rates estimated by the Brookings Institution. This analysis found that the Miami MSA’s income was mostly concentrated among the top-earning households in 2012, with five percent of the households accounting for more than a quarter of all income in the area.[2] In addition, the analysis also found that the MSA’s urban core is significantly poorer (28.3 percent) when compared to the suburban areas (16.3 percent).

The Economic Policy Institute (EPI) Family Budget Calculator estimates the income a family would need for a secure but modest lifestyle that takes into account community-specific housing costs and other needs such as food, child care, transportation, and health care. On average, families would need more than twice the amount of the federal poverty line, in the Miami MSA families would need to earn three times. For example, according to the calculator, a two-parent one-child household in the Miami MSA would need to earn $60,404 a year for basic expenses while the federal poverty line for a family of the same size was estimated to be $19,090.[3] EPI's calculated budget for Miami families is also more than $20,000 over the median household income for the City of Miami, which was $30,270 according to the most recent 5-year estimates from the American Community Survey.[4]

The Miami area has the most cost-burdened middle-income households in the nation due to a combination of very low income and the combined costs of housing and transportation — Although the figures clearly indicate that Miami’s poorest residents are severely cost-burdened, there is growing evidence that the middle class is also being squeezed. The report, Losing Ground: The Struggle of Moderate-Income Households to Afford the Rising Costs of Housing and Transportation (2012), found that moderate-income households earning between 50 and 100 percent of the median household income in their area spend an average of 59 percent of their income on housing and transportation. [1] Of the 25 largest metro areas, the report found the cost burdens to be highest in the Miami area, where moderate-income households spend a staggering 72 percent of their income on housing and transportation. It is
important to note that, in spite of average housing and transportation expenses in the Miami area — the severe cost burden facing moderate income households is because housing and transportation expenses are so out of sync with the local median income, which is one of the lowest in the nation.[2]

[2] Ibid.

The Miami area job market was defined by a hiring slump in 2013 that further aggravated the mismatch between income and cost of living - The City of Miami is located within Miami-Dade County, home to about 60 percent of the region’s jobs.[3] However, the area is still suffering from a stalled job market in both payroll and the number of new employment opportunities marked by a hiring slump for most of 2013.[4] According to the Miami Herald, the county saw in November 2013 a slowdown in payroll gains compared to the pace set after jobs started growing again in 2009.[5] Furthermore, while Miami-Dade County added 9,000 jobs since October 2012, the gains are anemic for a county that a year ago was creating more than 20,000 new jobs over the prior year.[6] One of the weak spot in the labor market has been construction despite the fact that home values have been on the rise in 2013 and buyers are once again purchasing homes.[7]

For those that are able to find jobs, earnings are down or flat –especially for minority workers. Florida has the second largest total number of workers with earnings at or below the federal minimum in the U.S.[8] These workers in Florida saw their wages fall behind the cost of living for the past decade, with the median hourly wage down 4.3 percent since 2000, according to a Florida International University (FIU) study, “The State of Working Florida 2013.” Another finding from the FIU study was that black workers were three times more likely to earn less than white workers, while Hispanic workers were two times as likely to earn less than white workers.[9]

### Number of Households Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-30% HAMFI</th>
<th>&gt;30-50% HAMFI</th>
<th>&gt;50-80% HAMFI</th>
<th>&gt;80-100% HAMFI</th>
<th>&gt;100% HAMFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households *</td>
<td>43,635</td>
<td>28,710</td>
<td>27,170</td>
<td>12,580</td>
<td>36,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Family Households *</td>
<td>11,610</td>
<td>11,885</td>
<td>13,530</td>
<td>5,730</td>
<td>15,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Family Households *</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>3,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age</td>
<td>10,705</td>
<td>6,270</td>
<td>5,025</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>5,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household contains at least one person age 75 or older</td>
<td>9,925</td>
<td>4,670</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>2,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger *</td>
<td>6,195</td>
<td>4,615</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>2,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS
### Housing Needs Summary Tables

1. Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed needs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;50-80% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>1,290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed needs)

- Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities
- Severe Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)
- Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)
- Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)
- Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)
## Table 3 – Housing Problems Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero/negative Income</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having 1 or more of four housing problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,030</td>
<td>10,440</td>
<td>5,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>4,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>760</td>
<td>3,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37,830</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,140</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having none of four housing problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,275</td>
<td>10,630</td>
<td>2,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,445</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,515</td>
<td>5,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41,865</td>
<td>3,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>14,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>485</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

## Table 4 – Housing Problems 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLD</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Related</td>
<td>8,885</td>
<td>1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,585</td>
<td>1,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,335</td>
<td>2,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22,805</td>
<td>5,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Related</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>655</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

3. Cost Burden > 30%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Related</td>
<td>8,885</td>
<td>1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,585</td>
<td>1,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,335</td>
<td>2,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22,805</td>
<td>5,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Related</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>655</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5 – Cost Burden > 30%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>9,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total need by income</td>
<td>27,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

### Table 6 – Cost Burden > 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>8,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Related</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total need by income</td>
<td>22,505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

### Table 7 – Crowding Information – 1/2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family households</td>
<td>1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple, unrelated family households</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, non-family households</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total need by income</td>
<td>2,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS
Describe the number and type of single person households in need of housing assistance.

Data not available

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance who are disabled or victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.

Data not available.

What are the most common housing problems?

Based on the data collected for this report, housing cost burdened is the most common housing problem in the City of Miami across income, tenure, race and ethnicity. The second most common housing problem in the City of Miami is overcrowded units, especially those that are inhabited by renter households between 0 to 50 percent AMI.

Are any populations/household types more affected than others by these problems?

As one might suspect, the poorest households are the most cost-burdened. An astounding 25,615 of the lowest income bracket (0-30 percent AMI) households spend more than 50 percent of their income on housing. This one group makes up 58 percent of the total severely cost-burdened households. In fact, when seen together, the majority of the severely cost-burdened come from the two poorest income brackets: 0-30 percent and 30-50 percent AMI.

Renters are most likely to experience housing problems, especially poor households. With regards to sheer numbers, CHAS Table 3 illustrates that renter households in the City of Miami are more likely to experience housing problems. A staggering portion of the cost-burdened (79 percent) and severely cost-burdened (69 percent) households in the city of Miami are renters. Of these renters, the severely cost-burdened households earning 0-30 percent AMI were the single largest cohort with over 20,000 households to experience any one of the four housing problems analyzed. However, it is worthy to note that while renters are significantly greater in numbers, when analyzing the figures within each universe of income bracket and tenure, a pattern emerges that shows that housing problems are more likely within
households that own their house. Although this homeowner trend is greatly overshadowed by the sheer number of renters with housing problems, it is important to understand the trends within each type of household in order to better understand their specific housing needs.

With regards to small related households, 45,750 households are cost-burdened or severely cost-burdened. The greatest majority of these households are renters, especially in the low-income categories. While the elderly renter households also experienced high rates of housing problems (36,515 households), this was the only household type with a significant number of homeowners experiencing cost-burden due to housing costs. As to be expected, this was most pronounced in the low income-brackets, most likely due to senior citizens living on fixed income.

Describe the characteristics and needs of Low-income individuals and families with children (especially extremely low-income) who are currently housed but are at imminent risk of either residing in shelters or becoming unsheltered 91.205(c)/91.305(c)). Also discuss the needs of formerly homeless families and individuals who are receiving rapid re-housing assistance and are nearing the termination of that assistance

The following are the characteristics of households served, under either prevention or rapid re-housing. Under HPRP funding, low-income households above 30% AMI were eligible for assistance. This accounted for approximately 20% of households served under HPRP which ended June 30, 2012. Under the new ESG funding, eligibility is limited to households at or below 30% AMI. So, 100% are ELI. Households who are not within ELI are not able to be served through these funds but continue to be at risk. 16% of households had no income upon entering the program. 26% had income from Social Security Disability (SSI) and 33% had earned income. The majority of households were non-Hispanic; 29% white, and 71% Black or African-American. Only 1% were veterans, although this has been high as 5% in previous years. Overall, when we took at 3 year look back, among the prevention and rapid re-housing program, we are seeing approximately 90% stay successfully housed. The majority of imminent risk households had a pending eviction in court or were already doubling up as a result of an eviction court order. A portion of households were also individuals who aged out of foster care, but their assistance was paid through other sources. Rapid Re-housing Due to limitations in ESG funding, the households eligible for Rapid Re-Housing were limited to persons at or below 30% AMI. The length of time of assistance was also limited due to the decrease in funding. While a majority of households served have been able to become stable and self-sufficient within a 6 month assistance period, there is a subset of households that need longer assistance due to continued unemployment or lack of sufficient affordable housing in the area, in particular for persons who are disabled. Households with disabilities (on SSI income) for the most part need longer term assistance such as an ongoing rental and utility subsidy. Attempts are made to use ESG funds as a gap while they wait for additional assistance, but it is not always available.

If a jurisdiction provides estimates of the at-risk population(s), it should also include a description of the operational definition of the at-risk group and the methodology used to generate the estimates:

The estimates for the “at risk” are aggregated from the Miami Dade County Continuum of Care (CoC) issued by the Miami Dade Homeless Trust. Specifically, the data is sourced from households served
under the Homelessness Prevention component of the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP).

**Specify particular housing characteristics that have been linked with instability and an increased risk of homelessness**

As shown throughout the report, there are large numbers of households in the City of Miami paying more than half of their gross monthly income for housing costs. Furthermore, this report also discusses how the cost of living expenses like transportation and healthcare furthermore burdens the city’s households, flat wages and a persistent hiring slump has made many households vulnerable to eviction and homelessness if their income is suddenly reduced for any reason (e.g., job loss, cut in work hours or government benefits) or they encounter an unexpected expense (e.g., medical emergency, major car repair) or experience serious illness and cannot work.

**Discussion**

**Over all homeless figures have dropped, except for an uptick of homeless families most likely due to increasing cost of housing and flat wages** - According to the Miami-Dade County Homeless Trust, the number of people on the streets has declined from 2,490 in October 1998 to 848 in August 2013 --of which currently 350 are estimated to live in the City of Miami.[1] Housing resources increased during the late 1990s, partially funded by a one percent food and beverage tax, is directly attributed to a decline in the city’s homeless population.[2] The shrinking number of homeless appears to be a national trend illustrated by the National Alliance to End Homelessness’ (NAEH) report on the State of Homelessness in America (2013) which found that national homeless figures have declined in all subpopulations with the exception of persons in families.[3] The trend appears to be occurring in Miami as well, in that the Point In Time (PIT) estimates show that the only homeless population to increase since the last Consolidated Plan was the number of persons in families with children; according to the PIT estimates, the number of families in shelter totaled 1,227 in 2008 and account for 1,317 as of 2013.[4] According to NAEH, the homelessness in this subpopulation is being driven by inability of families to pay for housing, a problem that is “mushrooming” due to increasing rents and flat income.[5]


NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems – 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

According to HUD’s eCon Planning Suite desk guide, a disproportionately greater need exists when the members of a racial or ethnic group at an income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percent or more) than the income level as a whole. However, the City of Miami’s designation since the 1970s as a “majority minority” municipality[1] adds a layer of complexity when analyzing the data for this section. The city’s Hispanic community makes up 70 percent of the city and, thereby, skewing the analysis of disproportionately greater need. In addition, there are many Black communities that are traditionally underserved and with documented housing problems that are outnumbered when taking into consideration only “majority” populations. As such, issues of residential segregation are important to take into consideration when identifying a racial group that has a disproportionately greater need in housing.

Taking these issues into consideration, it is important to discuss the racial and ethnic landscape of the city. Miami has a unique context for this discussion because it is among the nation’s largest cities with a large share of non-white population. The growth in the minority population in the City of Miami is largely due to the increase in Hispanic and Latino populations. As such, the “majority minority” designation does not mean that Miami has become more racial diverse; rather it has become increasingly a city of immigrants from the Caribbean and Latin America. This is evident by the Census figures that demonstrate that the White and Black Non-Hispanic populations have declined in absolute numbers since the 1970s; whereas the Hispanic population has experienced steady growth. In 2010, the Census found that this trend continues in part today. The Hispanic population over the past decade outpaced the growth rate of the city as a whole; the city’s population grew by 10.2 percent, while the Hispanic population grew by 17.2 percent to now make up 70 percent of the city’s population. Different from past decades, the White Non-Hispanic population experienced growth, adding over 11,000 people to the city to now make up 11.9 percent of the population. This is important because the only group to continue to lose population is the Black community. According to a comparison of the 2000 and 2010 Census, the Black population in the City of Miami fell by almost 4,000 people to now make up 19.2 percent of the population.

In addition to the changes described above, there is one other aspect to the racial and ethnic composition of the city that bears noting. Due to changes in the Census survey in 2000, race and ethnicity are two different categories. Since the Hispanic population in the City of Miami is significantly large and can additionally select a race in the census survey, the traditional racial categories become skewed. For example, the 2010 Census found that there is a White population of 289,920 (72.6); however, 84 percent of that White population is Hispanic. To a much smaller degree, there is also a portion of the Black population that is Hispanic—approximately 15 percent.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>31,950</td>
<td>6,410</td>
<td>3,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>6,865</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>23,205</td>
<td>5,015</td>
<td>1,655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:
1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

Race and Ethnicity (2010) and Growth Rate (2000 to 2010), City of Miami

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
<th># 2010</th>
<th>% 2010</th>
<th># Change 2000-2010</th>
<th>% Change 2000-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>399,457</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>36,987</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Race</td>
<td>388,717</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>43,429</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>289,920</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>48,450</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>76,880</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>-3,978</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3,953</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>16,684</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>-2,950</td>
<td>-15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>10,740</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>-6,442</td>
<td>-73.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISPANIC OR LATINO

| Total population         | 399,457| 100.0% | 36,987             | 10.2%              |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 279,456| 70.0%  | 41,105             | 17.2%              |
| Mexican                  | 5,830  | 1.5%   | 2,151              | 58.9%              |
| Puerto Rican             | 12,789 | 3.2%   | 2,532              | 24.7%              |
| Cuban                    | 137,301| 34.4%  | 13,538             | 10.9%              |
| Other Hispanic or Latino | 123,536| 30.9%  | 22,874             | 22.7%              |
| Not Hispanic or Latino   | 120,001| 30.0%  | -4,118             | -3.3%              |
| White alone              | 47,622 | 11.9%  | 4,725              | 11.0%              |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census, Summary File 1
### 30%-50% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>24,700</td>
<td>4,395</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>18,690</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI

Data: 2006-2010 CHAS
Source:

*The four housing problems are:
1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

### 50%-80% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>18,715</td>
<td>9,475</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14,355</td>
<td>6,880</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI

Data: 2006-2010 CHAS
Source:

*The four housing problems are:
1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%
### 80%-100% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>5,870</td>
<td>7,510</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 12 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI**

**Data:** 2006-2010 CHAS  
**Source:**

*The four housing problems are:  
1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%*
Discussion

Taking the demographic information into consideration, it isn’t a surprise that CHAS data finds that the racial/ethnic households with the greatest share of the four housing problems occur in the Hispanic community across income brackets. According to CHAS, 74 percent of the city’s households with one or more problem are Hispanic with the single largest AMI category being those households earning between 0 and 30 percent of the median income. However, if the city were to solely base the analysis of “disproportionately greater need” on the definition provided by HUD’s eCon Planning Suite desk guide (where members of a racial or ethnic group at an income level experience housing problems at a greater rate of 10 percent or more than the income level as a whole), these same CHAS tables would find two groups that would qualify: 1) the small Asian population earning 0-30 percent AMI; and 2) The Black
population earning 0-30 percent AMI. Most notable is the Black 0-30 AMI population that makes up 49 percent of the total Black population in the city with one or more housing problem.

These findings have to be taken with a grain of salt because the concept of disproportionate need as currently defined may not be fully applicable to our city. Hispanics are not really a “minority” in the City of Miami given that they are 70 percent of the population and the overall high level of needs experienced by low-income Hispanic households drive up the averages, but at the same time are not 10 percent higher than the average.
NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems – 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

According to HUD’s eCon Planning Suite desk guide, a disproportionately greater need exists when the members of a racial or ethnic group at an income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percent or more) than the income level as a whole. As in the previous section, the results of this analysis may be skewed due to the large share of Hispanic households with housing problems across income brackets.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severe Housing Problems*</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>27,010</td>
<td>11,350</td>
<td>3,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>5,830</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>19,465</td>
<td>8,755</td>
<td>1,655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:
1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

30%-50% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severe Housing Problems*</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>15,575</td>
<td>13,525</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>3,085</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jurisdiction as a whole</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black / African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>American Indian, Alaska Native</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11,705</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The four severe housing problems are:
1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

### 50%-80% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severe Housing Problems*</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>7,835</td>
<td>20,345</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>3,540</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5,585</td>
<td>15,650</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The four severe housing problems are:
1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

### 80%-100% of Area Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severe Housing Problems*</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>11,060</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
---|---|---|---
Black / African American | 275 | 1,775 | 0
Asian | 35 | 195 | 0
American Indian, Alaska Native | 0 | 0 | 0
Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0
Hispanic | 1,430 | 7,630 | 0

Table 16 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:
1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

Discussion

An examination of the CHAS data by income categories reveals a similar trend as the one discussed in the previous section. When considering the HUD definition for “disproportionately greater need” (where members of a racial or ethnic group at an income level experience housing problems at a greater rate of 10 percent or more than the income level as a whole), again the city’s Black population stands out with 61...
percent of their households with 0-30 percent of AMI have one or more housing problems. The only other group that qualifies under this definition would be the White population of households earning 50-80 percent of AMI.

In terms of share of the total population of households, the Hispanic population makes up roughly three quarters of all the three lowest income categories with the only except being a decrease (yet still significant majority with 62 percent) in the 80-100 percent AMI bracket. The fluctuations of households with a housing problem are more evident in the remaining third of the city. The percentage of White households experiencing a housing problem actually increases the wealthier the income bracket. This trend may be explained by the cost-burden due to housing costs being experienced by all races and income categories as discussed in pervious sections. It is interesting to note that the reverse pattern occurs with the Black households whose share of households with a housing problem decreases as it become wealthier. Perhaps this trend is explained simply the number of households that decline as the income brackets increase in wealth. An analysis of each racial and ethnicity group by AMI independently of each other reveals that more than 70 percent of every group is experiencing one or more housing problems at the lowest income bracket (0-30 AMI). This is a significant finding, considering that the groups hold relatively steady in all the other income brackets.
NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens – 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction:

According to HUD’s eCon Planning Suite desk guide, a disproportionately greater need exists when the members of a racial or ethnic group at an income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percent or more) than the income level as a whole. As in the previous section, the results of this analysis may be skewed due to the large share of Hispanic households with housing problems across income brackets.

Housing Cost Burden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Cost Burden</th>
<th>&lt;=30%</th>
<th>30-50%</th>
<th>&gt;50%</th>
<th>No / negative income (not computed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>65,640</td>
<td>39,530</td>
<td>49,660</td>
<td>3,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11,415</td>
<td>4,835</td>
<td>5,640</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>10,915</td>
<td>5,260</td>
<td>8,245</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>42,095</td>
<td>28,985</td>
<td>35,200</td>
<td>1,715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

Discussion:

According to the previous sections in this chapter, cost-burden is the most significant housing problem facing City of Miami households; this is especially true in the lowest income-bracket. When examining the CHAS data for the greatest share of cost-burdened households of the racial or ethnic groups due to cost burden, a similar trend emerges as in the previous sections. According to CHAS Table 17, the Hispanic community presents the greatest share and number of cost-burdened households in the city across all income brackets—but especially in sheer numbers in the 0-30 percent AMI cohort. However, when taking the HUD definition into consideration, only two household type emerges: Asian and White households in the 0-30 percent AMI bracket.

In addition, the CHAS data also provides the number of households whose income is zero or negative due to self-employment, dividends, and net rental income. These households are not included in the other two categories because households with zero or negative income cannot actually have a cost burden.
However, because they still require housing assistance, this category is counted separately. According to the CHAD data provided for the City of Miami, there are a total of 3,395 households that fall within the negative/no income category. The greatest share of these households are Hispanic (51 percent) and Black (29 percent).
NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion – 91.205(b)(2)

Are there any Income categories in which a racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need than the needs of that income category as a whole?

In utilizing the HUD definition for “disproportionately greater need”, the Analysis of the disproportionately greater need section in this report demonstrated that African American Households in the City of Miami earning between 0-30 percent AMI as well as White and Asian households earning between 50-80 percent AMI stood out for both having one or more housing problems. Other household populations that qualified under this definition are the 0-30 percent AMI Asian and White with a significant percentage of cost-burdened households.

Also, as discussed previously, because the City of Miami is a ‘majority-minority’ city, the results of the analysis for disproportionately greater need may be misleading. In terms of real numbers, the reality is that far more Hispanic households experience housing problems than any other group. Specifically, Hispanic households as a group are usually four times of the number of other types of households listed in the tables across housing needs categories. In terms of share within each income category, again the Hispanic households represent the largest share (approximately from 60 to 75 percent) across the AMI brackets. Specifically, the CHAS Table 17 clearly illustrates that there is a disproportionate greater need in the Hispanic 0-30 percent AMI category. The 42,095 households represented in this category is the largest single racial/ethnic group across all AMI brackets; the closest second group are the 32,500 Hispanic households in the >50 percent AMI category. With that said, it bears worth repeating that Hispanics make up 70 percent of the City of Miami population and are expected to be heavily represented across the AMI categories.

In addition, it is also important to note that the figures in the CHAS tables do not take into consideration that the City of Miami is a racially/ethnically segregated community (explored more in detail below) in which disproportionately greater need can be geographically concentrated in traditionally underserved areas where Black residents reside, such as Overtown, Liberty City and Little Haiti.

If they have needs not identified above, what are those needs?

N/A

Are any of those racial or ethnic groups located in specific areas or neighborhoods in your community?

Included in the appendix of this report are a variety of maps and tables that illustrate how demographic patterns of income, race, and ethnicity reveal great disparity and insular racial and ethnic enclaves. The Black population is clustered north of downtown and the Hispanic population is concentrated in the Southern and Western portions of the City. This polarization creates challenges for the City in trying to integrate distressed communities into the broader economy.

The degree of this polarization can be measured with a dissimilarity index to ascertain differences in residential patterns of one ethnic/racial group in relation to another. Specifically, the index measures how
one particular group is distributed across census tracts in the city in comparison to another group. The index has a possible score between zero to 100, a high value indicates that the two groups tend to live in different tracts. As a point of reference, a value of 60 (or above) is considered very high and means that 60 percent (or more) of the members of one group would need to move to a different tract in order for the two groups to be equally distributed.[1] Values of 40 or 50 are usually considered a moderate level of segregation, and values of 30 or below are considered to be fairly low.[2]

According to Brown University, the dissimilarity index of the City of Miami from 1980 to 2010 confirms that the city’s racial groups are significantly segregated. According to the data from Brown University’s US2010 dissimilarity index, it is worthy to note that Miami’s Black community consistently rates very high in dissimilarity with all of the other groups and this trend is reflected across decades. In fact, it is the only group to consistently score a value above 60. In 2010, the Black/White (75.5), Black/Hispanic (77.2), and Black/Asian (76.9) values clearly demonstrates that the city’s Black community is the most concentrated racial category. Review of the city maps by income reveal that these segregated communities are also where much of the city’s low-income residents are concentrated validating in part the results of this chapter in that there may be a disproportionately greater need to address housing problems in Miami’s Black neighborhoods.

The isolation index is another useful tool to measure segregation by exploring the level of concentration of any one group in a neighborhood. The Index determines a percentage of same-group population in the census tract where the average member of a racial/ethnic group lives with the a lower bound of zero signaling that a very small group that is quite dispersed to 100 meaning that group members are entirely isolated from other groups.[3] It should be kept in mind that this index is affected by the size of the group -- it is almost inevitably smaller for smaller groups, and it is likely to rise over time if the group becomes larger. According to the data from Brown University’s US2010 isolation index, Hispanics and Blacks are more likely to live in isolation. The minor adjustments in the increase in isolation (Hispanics) and the decrease in isolation (Blacks) must be taken with a grain of salt due to changes in the overall population of these groups that may be impacting these trends. Generally speaking, however, it is clear that the Black and Hispanic population within the city have traditionally lived in enclaves and that the trend show very little chance of changing in the near-term.

[2][3] Ibid.
NA-35 Public Housing – 91.205(b)
Introduction

Public Housing (PH) in our area is operated and managed by another jurisdiction, specifically the Public Housing and Community Development (PHCD) Department of Miami-Dade County. Data indicates that this is the ninth largest public housing authority in the U.S. In its most recent PHA Five-Year and Annual Plan (FY), PHCD indicated that it has 9,189 public housing units in the entire County. Upon further analysis, data indicates that @ 6,800 of these units are located within City limits at 65 different sites (please see table). When looking at the age of these sites, more than half (35) were built on or before 1973 making them at least 40 year old. Given the age of the PH stock within our jurisdiction, the City supports the implementation of the PHCD's FY 2011-16 Capital Fund 5-Year Action Plan to renovate or modernize public housing units so that occupancy is maximized and current public housing stock is preserved, especially given the demand for these units. During an application cycle that ran from July 7-31, 2008, PHCD received 71,376 applications for the waitlist for its for its project-based (Public Housing and Moderate Rehabilitation), Assisted Living Facilities, and tenant-based(Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher) programs. Additionally, at least 40% of new admissions to Public Housing must be extremely low-income (30% of area median income or below); the remaining 60% of new admissions can be up to the low-income level (80% of the area median income).

Meanwhile, the City operates both a Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program of 136 vouchers and a Moderate Rehabilitation program of 280 units set within 16 privately owned buildings and offering efficiencies, one-bedroom and two-bedroom units. The HCV waiting list opened on May 16 and 17, 2007, approximately 9,500 applied within that period, and given the small size of the program a waitlist of 70 persons was randomly sorted (via computer). In this waitlist, a special preference was established for persons who were elderly or disabled. Of the 70 persons on the waitlist, 28 identified that preference. The City's Moderate Rehabilitation program opened its waitlist in December 2003 and established a waitlist of approximately 20,000 persons. The City is still working through that waitlist. Note: The default data shown in the graphic below and titled "Totals in Use" reflects combined counts for both Miami-Dade County and the City of Miami. Both Housing Authorities were included in this Consolidated Plan, in order to encompass Public Housing stock. Also, the City does not have any special purpose vouchers, so those noted in the tables, are overseen by the County.
### Totals in Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Certificate Mod-Rhab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Vouchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenant-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Purpose Voucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Unification Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals in Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># of units vouchers in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>8,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,516</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,184</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 - Public Housing by Program Type

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

Data: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Source:

Public Housing Units within City of Miami geographic limits (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th># of units in use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHunitsinCityofMiami
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHunits in City of Miami</th>
<th>Page 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. River Drive 15</td>
<td>1 BM, 2 BR, 1.5 BA, 1 AL, I ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. River Drive 25</td>
<td>1 BM, 1 BR, 1 AL, I ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. River Drive 35</td>
<td>1 BM, 1 BR, 1 AL, I ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. River Drive 45</td>
<td>1 BM, 1 BR, 1 AL, I ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. River Drive 55</td>
<td>1 BM, 1 BR, 1 AL, I ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total River Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHunits in City of Miami</th>
<th>Page 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Atlantic Drive 15</td>
<td>1 BM, 2 BR, 1.5 BA, 1 AL, I ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Atlantic Drive 25</td>
<td>1 BM, 1 BR, 1 AL, I ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Atlantic Drive 35</td>
<td>1 BM, 1 BR, 1 AL, I ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Atlantic Drive 45</td>
<td>1 BM, 1 BR, 1 AL, I ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Atlantic Drive 55</td>
<td>1 BM, 1 BR, 1 AL, I ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Atlantic Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consolidated Plan  MIAMI

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)
### Characteristics of Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Mod-Rehab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Vouchers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Project-based</th>
<th>Tenant-based</th>
<th>Special Purpose Voucher</th>
<th>Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing</th>
<th>Family Unification Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Homeless at admission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Elderly Program Participants (&gt;62)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>3,772</td>
<td>4,524</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Disabled Families</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>2,561</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Families requesting accessibility features</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>8,077</td>
<td>13,516</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13,184</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of HIV/AIDS program participants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of DV victims</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

**Data Source:** PIC (PIH Information Center)

### Race of Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Mod-Rehab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Vouchers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Project-based</th>
<th>Tenant-based</th>
<th>Special Purpose Voucher</th>
<th>Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing</th>
<th>Family Unification Program</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,769</td>
<td>3,705</td>
<td>6,158</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6,002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>7,328</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7,154</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consolidated Plan MIAMI 38

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 07/31/2015)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Mod-Rehab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Vouchers</th>
<th>Special Purpose Voucher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Project-based</td>
<td>Tenant-based</td>
<td>Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Table 20 – Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type**

**Data Source:** PIC (PIH Information Center)

### Ethnicity of Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Mod-Rehab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Vouchers</th>
<th>Special Purpose Voucher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Project-based</td>
<td>Tenant-based</td>
<td>Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>6,391</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>7,125</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Table 21 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type**

**Data Source:** PIC (PIH Information Center)
Section 504 Needs Assessment: Describe the needs of public housing tenants and applicants on the waiting list for accessible units:

This information is being provided by Miami-Dade County's Public Housing & Community Development (PHCD) Department as they operate public housing within our jurisdiction. As cited from their most recent Consolidated Plan, PHCD will fully comply with HUD Notice PIH 2002-01 (HA) [Accessibility Notice:Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 and the Fair Housing Act of 1988] when requests are made for a reasonable accommodation due to a disability. An applicant or participant must qualify under the following Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) definition of disability: a physical or mental impairment that limits an individual's ability to participate in major life activities; a record of such impairment; or, being regarded as having such an impairment.

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

As indicated in the available data, the poverty levels amongst residents of assisted housing suggest a need for both traditional assistance programs to help clients avoid hunger and to meet basic healthcare needs, as well as initiatives to help them to expand access to job training programs, build assets, increase earnings, and make progress toward economic self sufficiency. As households experience an increase in income, they are able to move up and out of assisted housing, thereby freeing up vacated units for other households in need of these units.

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

The need for affordable rental housing is demonstrated by PHCD's current waiting list for assisted housing. In general, PHCD's resident population is reflective of the population of the County as a whole, whereby both seniors and the disabled are represented proportionately to the region's population.

Discussion

In the last waitlists established for the City of Miami's Section 8 programs, specific information on race and ethnicity was NOT requested in the application itself. As such, the City cannot provide certain demographic information on said waitlists at this time. The City has noted HUD's expectations as to identifying particular characteristics of Section 8 applicants, and will request this type of data (ethnicity, race, etc.) in future waitlists. In May 2013, it was announced that Miami-Dade's PHCD Department will receive $327,024 to assist 45 homeless veterans via the Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) program. These numbers are not yet reflected in this document.
NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment – 91.205(c)

Introduction:

The P-I-T census of January 24, 2013 of the Miami-Dade County CoC indicated a total of 2,963 sheltered persons and 839 unsheltered persons for a total of 3,802 persons. This number dropped slightly from the total census count taken on the same date in 2012, where the total homeless population totaled 3,954, of which 3,086 persons were sheltered. Although today’s average homeless census is significantly lower than in years past – December 2003 logged a total of 7,627 homeless persons in the CoC -- the change from 2012 to 2013 amounted to a 4% decline in the total number of homeless in the continuum. This could be related to other variables including the local economy, high unemployment rates, high foreclosure rates, etc.

We will first take a County-wide look at the Jan. 2013 PIT data to better understand the needs of the community at large. When looking at the homeless sub-populations in their totality (sheltered and unsheltered) the numbers are telling: 618 persons were considered chronically homeless (16.25% of the total homeless); there were a total of 253 veterans (6.7%); 767 persons (20.2%) were severely mentally ill; 791 persons (20.8%) had chronic substance abuse issues; 113 persons had HIV/AIDS (3%); and, 500 persons were victims of domestic violence (13.2%). These numbers reveal that over 50% of the CoC’s homeless population has underlying issues – outside of homelessness – which require long-term support services and resources. The latter is concerning given that funding is limited, and the bulk of the funding available in the CoC is directed towards getting the homeless housed. As of early 2013, the Trust identified the unmet year-round beds/units needs of the CoC as follows: 1932 permanent supportive housing units, 457 transitional housing units, and 152 emergency shelter units (year-round beds).

In 2012, the Miami-Dade County CoC’s federal award for homeless projects/activities was approximately $31.8 million. The bulk of this funding ($20.45 million) went to permanent supportive housing, approximately $6.5 million went to transitional housing, and around $3.8 million went to supportive services only.

Miami - A Snapshot of the Unsheltered

In the January 2013 PIT, approximately 61% (511 persons) of the unsheltered were located within City of Miami limits. Sixty-nine percent (351 persons) of the City’s unsheltered was located in Downtown Miami. Historically, a large amount of the County's unsheltered homeless population has congregated in the City's downtown area. First, the area is home to the largest public hospital (Jackson Memorial Hospital) in the County, the Federal Detention Center is located here at the corner of NE 4th Street and North Miami Avenue, and over a dozen service facilities that cater to the homeless population are here, as well. Please see attached map issued by the Downtown Development Authority. Downtown Miami also offers multiple public transit options and religious groups frequently visit this area to extend free street feedings to the unsheltered homeless, even though the latter is strongly discouraged by the Homeless Trust.

For decades, Downtown Miami was primarily a commercial downtown, with a small residential population. However, Downtown Miami has changed significantly in the past decade and all signs point to further change in the next. As issued by the Downtown Development Authority in 2011, The Population & Demographic Profile Report: Downtown Development Authority District and Adjacent Areas of Influence indicates that the population of the Greater Downtown Miami area hovered at just under 66,000 people in 2011, a 68% population increase in the same area since the 2000 Census. As noted in the same report, a sizable residential condominium boom has changed the area's demographics.
dramatically, with the number of housing units in the Greater Downtown area increased by 100%, with nearly 26,000 units constructed since the year 2000.

This boom in the area's residential population seems to have coincided with a hike in the number of unsheltered homeless persons who stay in downtown Miami. While the second 2013 PIT count (August 29) showed an overall County drop in the number of unsheltered homeless persons (848), the number of unsheltered persons within *City of Miami limits* increased to 582, accounting for 69% of the total unsheltered in all of Miami-Dade County. Yet again, the bulk of Miami's unsheltered were counted in Downtown Miami (391 persons). These hard facts are of concern to the DDA and to the City of Miami Commission, especially because it is believed that the bulk of these unsheltered homeless are "chronically" homeless as defined by HUD, and often refuse to enter a shelter and/or the Continuum of Care. Much local discussion has taken place on how to best address the chronically homeless population.

**Homeless Needs Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night</th>
<th>Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year</th>
<th>Estimate the # becoming homeless each year</th>
<th>Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year</th>
<th>Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>3,276</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>1,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Households with Only Children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Households with Only Adults</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>3,248</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless Individuals</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless Families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccompanied Child</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with HIV</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 22 - Homeless Needs Assessment*
Alternate Data Source Name:
2013 Point in Time (PIT) count

Data Source Comments:
The data estimating the # of persons experiencing homelessness each year, the # becoming homeless each year the # exiting homelessness each year, and the # of days persons experience homelessness is from calendar year 2012, as that was the most recent data provided to us by the Homeless Trust (CoC).
DOWNTOWN STUDY AREA POPULATION

The Downtown Study Area includes the Miami Downtown Development Authority Districts including Brickell, the Central Business District (CBD), the Arts & Entertainment District, the Wynwood/Edgewater District and adjacent areas of influence. The Downtown Study area is bounded by Interstate 195 (Julia Tuttle Causeway) on the north, by I-95 on the west, by SW 26 Road (Rickenbacker Causeway) on the south and by Biscayne Bay on the east. The study area is approximately 3.8 square miles in size and encompasses all or part of eight zip code areas, 24 census tracts and 690 census blocks as defined for the 2010 Census.

![Downtown Miami Area Population & Household Growth](image)

**EXHIBIT 1.1 POPULATION & HOUSEHOLD TRENDS/ESTIMATE**

Population and household growth trends and current estimates for the Downtown Miami Area are illustrated in Exhibit 1.1. The resident population in the downtown study area totaled 65,696 persons, based on the 2010 U.S. Decennial Census. As shown above, total population in the Downtown Miami Area increased by approximately 26,600 people during the ten year period from 2000 to 2010 for a 68% gain. Growth during the past decade represented an average annual increase of approximately 2,600 persons and 1,600 households per year.

The downtown area population as of June 30, 2011 is estimated to be approximately 71,600, based on occupancy surveys, residential sales and leasing trends since the Census in 2010. Approximately 2,600 households moved into new residential units in the downtown area from February through December 2010, based on the ‘Residential Closings and Occupancy Study’ prepared for the Miami DDA and published in February 2011. The annual rate of population growth in the downtown area based on residential sales and leasing activity during the first six months of 2011 climbed to nearly 4,400 persons with a corresponding increase in the number of households set to reach about 2,400 households per year.
Sixty-nine percent of the City's unsheltered was located in Downtown Miami. Historically, a large amount of the County's unsheltered homeless population has congregated in the City's downtown area which in the past had primarily been occupied by commercial spaces. The more recent residential condominium boom in Downtown Miami has changed the area's demographics dramatically. In the Populations & Demographic Profile Report: Downtown Development Authority District and Adjacent Areas of Influence issued by the DDA in 2011, the population of the Greater Downtown Miami area in 2011 sits at just under 66,000 people, a 68% population increase in the same area since the 2000 Census. The report also noted that since 2000, the number of housing units in the Greater Downtown area increased by 100%, with nearly 26,000 units constructed since the year 2000. This boom in the area's residential population also seems to have coincided with a hike in the number of unsheltered homeless persons who stay in downtown Miami (as per PIT Counts). The latter combination has lead to a spike in resident and business complaints regarding public health and safety issues in relation to the unsheltered (street) homeless. In 2010, the Miami Development Downtown Authority mapped the number of homeless service facilities in the Greater Downtown Miami area and found a total of 16 sites. Outside of this, the area is also home to the largest public hospital (Jackson Memorial Hospital), and the Federal Detention Center located at the corner of NE 4th Street and North Miami Avenue. Downtown Miami also offers multiple public transit options and religious groups frequently visit this area to extend free street feedings to the unsheltered homeless, even though the latter is strongly discouraged by the Homeless Trust. Although data is not referenced here, in the City's case, the second 2013 PIT count (August) shows a spike in the number of unsheltered persons in Miami with 582 out of total of 848 unsheltered homeless persons County-wide, accounting for 69% of the total. Yet again, the bulk of Miami's unsheltered (67%) were counted in Downtown Miami. These hard facts are of concern to the DDA and to the City of Miami Commission, especially because it is believed that the bulk of these unsheltered homeless are "chronically" homeless as defined by HUD, and often refuse to enter a shelter and/or the Continuum of Care. Factors that could potentially have contributed to this increase are the economy and high unemployment rates in the Miami-Dade County Metropolitan area.
FL-600 Miami/Dade County CoC
Point in Time Date: 1/24/2013

Summary by household type reported:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
<th>Transitional Housing</th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households without children</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>2,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with at least one adult and one child</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with only children</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>2,025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of homeless persons by subpopulations reported:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subpopulation</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless Individuals</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless Persons in Families</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Mentally Ill</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Substance Abuse</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of Domestic Violence</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Race programs are included in the Transitional Housing category.

Jan.2013Recap
### January 24, 2013 Homeless Census Total Street Population Percentages Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Breakdown</th>
<th>Total Street Population</th>
<th>South Miami Dade County</th>
<th>City of Miami</th>
<th>City of MiamiBeach</th>
<th>Miami Dade County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender/Male to Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender/Female to Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Identify</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Breakdown</th>
<th>Total Street Population</th>
<th>Dade County</th>
<th>City of Miami</th>
<th>MiamiBeach</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Identify</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Breakdown</th>
<th>Total Street Population</th>
<th>South Miami Dade County</th>
<th>City of Miami</th>
<th>MiamiBeach</th>
<th>Miami Dade County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Identify</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Estimates</th>
<th>Total Street Population</th>
<th>South Miami Dade County</th>
<th>City of Miami</th>
<th>MiamiBeach</th>
<th>Miami Dade County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Identify</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Status</th>
<th>Total Street Population</th>
<th>South Miami Dade County</th>
<th>City of Miami</th>
<th>MiamiBeach</th>
<th>Miami Dade County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of persons in Families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of persons in Couples</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weather Conditions: Clear, high in the Low 60's
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Breakdown</th>
<th>South Miami Dade County</th>
<th>City of Miami</th>
<th>City of Miami Beach</th>
<th>Miami Dade County</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender/Male to Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender/Female to Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Identify</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>511</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>838</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Breakdown</th>
<th>South Miami Dade County</th>
<th>City of Miami</th>
<th>City of Miami Beach</th>
<th>Miami Dade County</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Identify</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>511</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>838</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Breakdown</th>
<th>South Miami Dade County</th>
<th>City of Miami</th>
<th>City of Miami Beach</th>
<th>Miami Dade County</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Identify</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>511</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>838</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Estimated</th>
<th>South Miami Dade County</th>
<th>City of Miami</th>
<th>City of Miami Beach</th>
<th>Miami Dade County</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Identify</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>511</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>838</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Status</th>
<th>South Miami Dade County</th>
<th>City of Miami</th>
<th>City of Miami Beach</th>
<th>Miami Dade County</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of persons in Families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of persons in Complexes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>511</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>838</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Families</th>
<th>South Miami Dade County</th>
<th>City of Miami</th>
<th>City of Miami Beach</th>
<th>Miami Dade County</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Couples</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Weather Conditions: Clear, high in the low 80s*
### Neighborhood Sector Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIAMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population in Miami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Geographic Area Covered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD SECTOR NAME</th>
<th>StreetPopDetailsPage3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIAMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Total Population in Miami</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weather Conditions

- Clear, high in the 80's
StreetPopDetailsPage4

Indicate if the homeless population is:

Has No Rural Homeless

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):

Data is available and noted in chart above.
Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance for families with children and the families of veterans.

As indicated in the chart above, based on estimates provided by the Housing Trust, approximately 3,276 persons in households with adults and children will experience homelessness each year averaging 97 days of homelessness. Some 38 persons in households with only children will experience homelessness, averaging 62 days of homelessness. Data indicates that 173 veterans will experience homelessness each year, averaging 91 days of homelessness. These numbers were provided based on the 2012 calendar year by the Homeless Trust.


The Unsheltered -- When looking into the unsheltered population of Miami-Dade County, roughly 81% is comprised of males, the predominant ethnicities are African-Americans (42%) followed by Hispanics (29%). As to race, 406 persons were black, 357 were white, and 76 could not be properly identified (were sleeping, covered, etc.).

Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.

As indicated in the chart, all households with children were sheltered as is the policy of the CoC. Approximately 22% of the homeless population was unsheltered at the time of the Jan. 2013 PIT count with the bulk counted as single persons (95%). More than half (55%) of the unsheltered population have an estimated age of 45-54 or 55-61.
Discussion:

As briefly addressed above, there has been a spike in resident and business complaints regarding public health and safety issues related to the unsheltered homeless in Downtown Miami and City leaders are attempting to address these concerns. To that end, several recent developments bare mention.

In October of 2013, the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) voted to contribute $25,000 to an existent countywide (CoC) study to determine who exactly the unsheltered homeless are, and why some are resistant to seeking shelter. The study will be handled by several entities with experience working with this community, including the Miami Coalition for the Homeless and Barry University students. The DDA hopes that hard data can help its efforts in seeking additional assistance from the State of Florida to address the unsheltered homeless in the Downtown Miami area. Concurrently, the DDA and City of Miami had been seeking legal modifications to a settlement agreement known as the case of Michael Pottinger, et al. vs. the City of Miami which commenced in 1988 and settled in 1998 with a consent decree that granted certain additional rights to the homeless and protected their property. In January 2014, press reports indicated that a compromise was drawn up subject to the approval of the City Commission and the Court. Should this modification be approved as required by law, then certain activities would no longer be considered legal, e.g., the homeless would no longer be permitted to build fires in parks or to build makeshift tents for sleeping. Plus, it also lays out a procedure for law enforcement or community outreach workers to offer shelter – if available – to a homeless person. In Jan. 2014, the City Commission approved allocating approximately $240,000 from the City’s FY12-13 budget to Camillus House, to provide 100 mats exclusively designated for the City’s homeless in the Camillus pavilion for the nightly use of homeless individuals, along with meals, showers, restrooms, etc.

In August 2013, the first youth-focused (unaccompanied) homeless count took place, in an effort to better understand the extent of youth homelessness. Known as the iCounty, the process for gathering the data was developed via a collaboration of local entities and the Trust and includes comprehensive outreach utilizing youth volunteers and social media, working lock-step with the Miami-Dade County Public School system. The 2014 iCount is scheduled for the same day as the bi-annual countywide homeless count, when volunteers and professionals comb the streets of the County to get an accurate count of the homeless population.

In December 2013, the Miami-Dade County Homeless Trust issued a draft update to the Miami-Dade Community Homeless Plan, titled Priority Home, to the Miami-Dade County Community Homeless Plan. This draft was compiled based on meetings and discussions of the Homeless Trust Board and the Trust’s Committees, and their consideration of additional strategies to further align local CoC activities with the expected approaches related to compliance with the federal Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act of 2009. As part of this effort, the Trust will redirecting its outreach to focus on an individual's vulnerability and in late 2013, it set aside an additional 250 beds in its facilities for the chronically homeless.
NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment - 91.205 (b,d)

Introduction:

This section is meant to describe the specific housing needs of certain population groups that are not homeless but require supportive housing. The groups to be addressed in this assessment include:

- Elderly Persons (defined as 62 years and older);
- Frail Elderly (could not locate data on this sub-set)
- Persons with mental, physical, and/or developmental disabilities;
- Persons with Alcohol or other Drug Addiction;
- Persons with HIV/AIDS and their families;
- Victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking

The housing needs of each one of these groups differ enormously. Some of them have characteristics that make it very hard to gather the most basic information about them. Even though there are many agencies and groups involved in improving the quality of information available for some of these groups, it is still difficult to produce precise numbers and to forecast with certainty what their needs will be in the future. As such, in most instances we are utilizing and citing the most readily available data from state sources as certain other state/community entities service these specific groups and as such, can better address their needs. In most cases where state information is utilized, please note that the data is typically County-specific, which in our case correlates to Miami-Dade County whose boundaries extend outside those of the City of Miami. Because we are also a HOPWA administrator, we will begin our assessment with a careful look at this population first.

Persons with HIV/AIDS and their families

The City of Miami (City) serves as the administrator of the formula grant-funded Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program for the entire geographical area of Miami-Dade County given that pursuant to federal regulations implementing the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act of 1990, the City is the municipality with the largest population in the Miami-Dade Eligible Metropolitan Division (EMD). The HOPWA Program serves all residents of Miami-Dade County and is administered by the City of Miami’s Department of Community & Economic Development. The City works with all levels of government, service providers, consumers and the private sector in developing housing and housing-related support services for persons living with HIV/AIDS (PWAs) in the MSA.

The Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Partnership, through its Housing Committee, serves in an advisory capacity to the Department of Community Development and City Commission with regard to HOPWA formula grant funds awarded to the City on behalf of the Miami-Dade Eligible Metropolitan Division (EMD). Specifically, the City of Miami looks to the Partnership’s Housing Committee for community input and advice concerning resource allocation, HOPWA program policies, and coordination of efforts to address housing needs with care and treatment services and activities directed at persons living with HIV/AIDS. The City of Miami is formally represented on the Partnership and its Housing Committee.
HOPWA

Current HOPWA formula use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current HOPWA formula use:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative cases of AIDS reported</td>
<td>34,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area incidence of AIDS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate per population</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new cases prior year (3 years of data)</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate per population (3 years of data)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current HIV surveillance data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current HIV surveillance data:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons living with HIV (PLWH)</td>
<td>12,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Prevalence (PLWH per population)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new HIV cases reported last year</td>
<td>1,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 – HOPWA Data

Alternate Data Source Name:

Data Source Comments:

HIV Housing Need (HOPWA Grantees Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of HOPWA Assistance</th>
<th>Estimates of Unmet Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenant based rental assistance</td>
<td>6,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term Rent, Mortgage, and Utility</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Based Housing (Permanent, short-term or transitional)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 – HIV Housing Need

Alternate Data Source Name:
Unmet Needs for HOPWA-Eligible Households

Based on prior programmatic experience, short-term rental assistance is ineffective as clients cycle in and out of homelessness. Moreover, clients surveyed have strong preference to be part of the community at large and not reside in community residences. Since clients are living longer, there is less of a need for housing facilities or ALFs. Thus, the community unanimously requests rental assistance over other types of programmatic assistance. This has been documented consistently for significant periods now through HIV/AIDS Housing Needs County-Wide Consumer Surveys. The community has voiced need for mortgage and utility assistance, though no quantitative analysis of such need has been performed. The city has funded such assistance during the current fiscal year.

Data Source Comments:

Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

Elderly - With an estimated 3.25 million persons aged 65 and older, the 2010 Census clocks the State of Florida with the second highest number of persons in this age group of any of the states, accounting for 17.3% of Florida’s population. Miami’s age 65+ population seems to be in keeping with this trend and as based on U.S. Census 2010 demographic data, 16% of the City of Miami’s population is 65 years and over, making the jurisdiction the 10th place* (*Places of 100,000 or more total population. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census Summary File 1) in the nation with the highest percent of persons 65 years
and over (a total of 63,897). When looking specifically at 62 years and older group, the percentage hikes up to 18.9% of the population (75,474 people). According to U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Selected Economic Characteristics (ACS), 32.4% of individuals age 65 and over in the City are below have income in the past 12 months that is below the poverty level.

**Person With Disabilities** (mental, physical and/or developmental) means a person who is determined, pursuant to HUD regulations, to have a physical, mental, or emotional impairment that: (1) is expected to be of long-continued and indefinite duration; (2) substantially impedes his or her ability to live independently; (3) and, is of such a nature that the ability to live independently could be improved by more suitable housing conditions; (4) or, has a developmental disability as defined in 42 U.S.C. 6001. The HUD definition does not exclude persons who have the disease of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) or related conditions and the characteristics of this group are addressed later in the Plan.

Please note, there are variations in the severity of the impairments that affect persons who meet the definition of disability and information on these variations on a local level is sadly lacking, and cannot be provided. However, for a general look at available disability data, below is a table breaking down information on the estimated 51,384 persons in the City of Miami who have a disability (13% of the total population), as indicated in the 2009-2011 American Community Survey (ACS) 3-Year Estimate. Within the overall population of persons with a disability, 40.6% are 65 years and over, 9.3% are aged 18 to 64, and 3.8% are ages 5 to 17. In the 65+ age group, the bulk of persons have ambulatory (28.6%) and independent (23.3%) living difficulty.

**Persons with Alcohol or Other Drug Addiction** - The State of Florida operates addiction treatment centers throughout the state and in the Data Snapshot issued by the state’s Department of Children & Families (DCF) in February 2011, trend data indicates that the number of adults served in community substance abuse programs has climbed, while the number of children in these programs has slightly declined. The data is noted by region, with Miami falling included in the “Southern” classification, which encompasses Miami-Dade and Monroe counties. The area reported 12,061 adults and 7,215 children (ages 10-17) were served in the southeastern portion of the State of Florida during state fiscal year 2009-2010 for addiction issues.

**Victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking**

**What are the housing and supportive service needs of these populations and how are these needs determined?**

We are still working on research towards completing this section.

**Needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS** - A 2011/12 County-wide Housing Needs Assessment of persons living with HIV/AIDS. Survey respondents’ average income was $729 a month. 51.5% of respondents reported monthly income of less than $1,000 and 20.5% of respondents reported monthly income between $1,000 and $2,000. 37% of respondents reported earning income from doing work. Average rent of those without assistance is $617.78. At the time of the Needs Assessment, persons with incomes of $1000 would be spending close to 62% of their income on rent. The latest survey continued to show extremely low need for home health care or related help with self-care. Respondents indicated
increased need for basic financial services, including job training and placement. However, a significant number reporting experiencing homelessness: 32.5% reported having been homeless (meaning having slept in a place not meant in a place to live in, e.g. the streets, or in an emergency shelter at some point in time.) Of those, a high percentage reported chronic homelessness. In addition, 25% of all respondents reported a mental health history. The 2013 Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Housing Gap Analysis found that 10,100 persons living with HIV/AIDS in Miami-Dade County are in need of housing assistance. The 2013 HUD Fair Market Rent for a two-bedroom unit is $1,122. A household with a $25,000 yearly income would be required to spend approximately 54% of its household income on rent. Individuals on disability currently receive $710 a month and cannot afford an efficiency ($719) nor a one-bedroom unit ($876).

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

The Miami-Dade County metropolitan area has the fourth highest number of living AIDS cases in the country (the top ranked in order of highest number of cases are the metropolitan areas of New York City, Los Angeles, and Washington, D.C.). HIV/AIDS disproportionately affects minority populations in Miami-Dade County, as is the case nationally. Blacks represent 50% of living AIDS cases and 44% of HIV cases in Miami-Dade and Hispanics represent 35% of AIDS cases and 42% of HIV cases. A more stark picture of the epidemic is provided by the Department of Health’s “One-In Statements”: One in 57 adult males in Miami-Dade is living with HIV/AIDS. Of these, one in 25 Black adult males are living with HIV/AIDS; one in 58 White adult males are living with HIV/AIDS; and one in 78 Hispanic adult males are living with HIV/AIDS. One in 152 adult females in Miami-Dade is living with HIV/AIDS. Of these, one in 36 Black adult females are living with HIV/AIDS; one in 445 White adult females are living with HIV/AIDS; and one in 454 Hispanic adult females are living with HIV/AIDS.

The last County-wide survey of PLWH/As showed that 83.5% rejected AIDS-only housing with a preference for tenant-based rental assistance. Successful TBRA program outcomes require housing-related service support. Regular and on-going HOPWA Housing Specialist support received by HOPWA Long-Term Rental Assistance clients has proven key to the reduction of eviction, program termination, homelessness and loss of access to care and treatment that otherwise would been risked due to the above factors. It is extremely important to take into account that the rate of persons surviving with the disease and the level of poverty within the PLWH/A population are placing significant pressure on the already limited resources available for housing assistance and other housing-related support services. For persons living with HIV/AIDS, factors impacting housing stability include lack of income, difficulty in locating safe and affordable housing, prevalence of substance abuse, mental health issues, poor household budgeting and management skills, all of which impede staying connected to the HIV/AIDS care system.

Discussion:

The Miami-Dade County metropolitan area has the fourth highest number of living AIDS cases in the country (the top ranked in order of highest number of cases are the metropolitan areas of New York City, Los Angeles, and Washington, D.C.). HIV/AIDS disproportionately affects minority populations in Miami-Dade County, as is the case nationally. Blacks represent 50% of living AIDS cases and 44% of
HIV cases in Miami-Dade and Hispanics represent 35% of AIDS cases and 42% of HIV cases. A starker picture of the epidemic is provided by the Department of Health’s “One-In Statements”: One in 57 adult males in Miami-Dade is living with HIV/AIDS. Of these, one in 25 Black adult males are living with HIV/AIDS; one in 58 White adult males are living with HIV/AIDS; and one in 78 Hispanic adult males are living with HIV/AIDS. One in 152 adult females in Miami-Dade is living with HIV/AIDS. Of these, one in 36 Black adult females are living with HIV/AIDS; one in 445 White adult females are living with HIV/AIDS; and one in 454 Hispanic adult females are living with HIV/AIDS.

Regarding exposure to HIV, male sexual contact with another male accounted for 65.9% of the cases; heterosexual sexual contact accounted for 77.4% cases among women and 16.8% among men; and intravenous drug use accounted for 7.3% among women and 3.4% among men. In the case of exposure to AIDS, male sexual contact with another male accounted for 55.1% of the cases; heterosexual sexual contact accounted for 65.9% cases among women and 15.7% among men; and intravenous drug use accounted for 22.4% among women and 12.7% among men.

The 2013 Miami-Dade HIV/AIDS Housing Gap Analysis found that 10,100 persons living with HIV/AIDS in Miami-Dade County are in need of housing assistance. The 2013 HUD Fair Market Rent for a two-bedroom unit is $1,122. A household with a $25,000 yearly income would be required to spend approximately 54% of its household income on rent. Individuals on disability currently receive $710 a month and cannot afford an efficiency ($719) nor a one-bedroom unit ($876).

A 2011/12 County-wide Housing Needs Assessment of persons living with HIV/AIDS. Survey respondents’ average income was $729 a month. 51.5% of respondents reported monthly income of less than $1,000 and 20.5% of respondents reported monthly income between $1,000 and $2,000. 37% of respondents reported earning income from doing work. Average rent of those without assistance is $617.78. At the time of the Needs Assessment, persons with incomes of $1000 would be spending close to 62% of their income on rent. The latest survey continued to show extremely low need for home health care or related help with self-care. Respondents indicated increased need for basic financial services, including job training and placement. However, a significant number reporting experiencing homelessness: 32.5% reported having been homeless (meaning having slept in a place not meant in a place to live in, e.g. the streets, or in an emergency shelter at some point in time.) Of those, a high percentage reported chronic homelessness. In addition, 25% of all respondents reported a mental health history.
NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs – 91.215 (f)

Describe the jurisdiction’s need for Public Facilities:

The DCED issues a Request for Proposals (RFP) every other year for all CDBG funded activities and/or projects including the Public Facilities category. For FY 14-15 we received ten such RFPs, which were then reviewed and scored, with the highest scoring projects presented to the City Commission for their ultimate funding determination. The DCED also works closely with the City's Department of Capital Improvements/Capital Improvements Program (CIP) which is tasked by the City Code and Florida Statutes with creating a Multi-Year Capital Plan that identifies all of the public improvements necessary across the City-at-large. The projects are organized by fund and programmed for a five-year period, and further described as to their funding status (funded, partially funded, or unfunded).

The DCED reviews this plan with emphasis on those that are partially funded, and then identifies what facilities and/or improvements are within low- to moderate- income areas, working cooperatively with elected officials and CIP's Administration to best determine which projects are most viable given available CDBG funding. The most obvious public facilities needs include park improvements and renovations to neighborhood facilities, child care centers, fire facilities, and parking facilities, where activities benefit extremely low-, very low-, and low to moderate-income citizens.

One of the eleven distinct programs identified in the most recent CIP Multi-Year Capital Plan (issued December 13, 2012) plan is the public facilities category. Include some here?

How were these needs determined?

CIP undertakes outreach year-round with elected officials and constituent groups.

Describe the jurisdiction’s need for Public Improvements:

For a City as diverse as Miami, the list of public improvements is vast so the Consolidated Plan of 2014-18 will focus on those that stand out as high priorities based on the DCED's communications with the Building, CIP and Public Works Departments and these departments' independent analyses of neighborhood and constituent needs. The DCED further refines this list and looks to the needs that lie within low- to moderate-income neighborhoods. To that end, the following public improvements have been identified as key during the next five years: 1. street improvements (several areas); 2. Water & Sewer Department (County managed) upgrades in City of Miami neighborhoods; 3. further construction and development of the Miami River Greenway to provide outdoor recreational opportunities for persons who live and work along the Miami River; 4. Funding of additional beds for the homeless, specifically in the downtown area where many chronically homeless persons live under bridges and along public streets; and, 5. The purchase/addition of more park land to the City's current inventory.

How were these needs determined?
When conducting the Parks and Public Spaces Master Plan Survey (2006) of City residents in relation to funding capital improvements in City parks in connection to the City’s *Miami Parks and Public Spaces Master Plan (May 2007)* as prepared by Goody Clancy, 36% of respondents opted to improve existing parks, playgrounds and recreation facilities. Based on surveys and studies conducted by the City's Parks department, most citizens recognize adding additional park space to the City’s inventory. To further reinforce this need, the Miami Comprehensive Neighborhood Plan (January 2013) cites the "need to achieve a medium-term objective of providing a park within a ten-minute, barrier-free walk of every resident" (Obj. PR1.1). The Miami River Commission is an independent body of citizen volunteers tasked with overseeing the local/state/federal (public and private) dollars awarded towards the construction and beautifications efforts of the 10-mile Miami River Greenway outlined in the *2001 Miami River Greenway Action Plan*, to ultimately feature a public pedestrian and bicycle pathway, along with kiosks, informational kiosks, decorative lighting and landscape along one of the City's most vital resources - the Miami River. Aside from maintaining the River which is an environmental resource and a fundamental part of the City's heritage, this effort aids the commercial fishing and boatyard businesses of this working river, and efforts to protect it will catalyze the residential, commercial, and retail development in the neighborhoods around the river. This long-time restoration and development is a result of the approval of the *2001 Miami River Greenway Action Plan*, green-lighted by the City of Miami, Miami-Dade County, and the Miami River Commission. The Miami Comprehensive Neighborhood Plan (MCNP) also recognizes the importance of preserving the Miami River and there are several policies in place to look after its preservation and development, one of which is cited in Policy PA3.1.5, "The City shall encourage the development and expansion of the Port of Miami River Working Waterfront consistent with the future land use, coastal management and conservation elements of the City’s comprehensive plan."

Describe the jurisdiction’s need for Public Services:

The City has historically relied on the input gathered during the public hearings process to establish its public service priorities. The public hearings held in the summer of 2013 identified the following activities as most important: elderly meals, child care services, job training programs, job creation programs, and programs for the handicapped/disabled. Aside from this, surveys were distributed to all in attendance during the hearings, to further confirm priorities. As indicated in the U.S. Census Bureau 2010 Census Summary File, Table DP-1, 34.9% of the City's population is over the age of 62. When comparing the 2000 and 2010 Census, the category of persons aged 55 to 59 saw a 29.2% growth, and the category of 60 to 64 years of age saw an 11.8% growth. All signs would indicate that Miami's older population is continuing to age in place. Because of the numbers, elderly services (specifically meals) are of great concern in most districts and is a top priority amongst most districts. Given the 15% CDBG public service cap, agencies providing other services (such as childcare and job training) often feel shortchanged. To that end, City agencies and administrators have voiced their belief that a waiver to the public service cap, allowing for a higher 25% to be allocated to public service activities, would help fund additional services that are crucial to a community that is attempting to alleviate the economic burdens of a high, low-income elderly population. Several City of Miami Commissioners and the Mayor
have met with Miami's Congressmen to discuss this situation and ultimately, the City understands that this type of modification would have to be approved by U.S Congress.

**How were these needs determined?**

The list of Public Service needs was developed during the five (5) public meetings held in August of 2013.