



MIAMI BEACH

DRAFT

FY 2013 – 2017

Consolidated Plan
Action Plan

Prepared by:

City of Miami Beach

Office of Real Estate, Housing and Community
Development

DRAFT

Executive Summary

ES-05 Executive Summary

1. Introduction

The City of Miami Beach's FY 2013-2017 Consolidated Plan represents and summarizes the objectives and outcomes identified by citizens, advisory committees, public service providers, community development corporations and City staff.

The overall goal of the community planning and development programs covered by this plan is to develop and redevelop viable urban communities by:

1. Providing decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities principally for low- and moderate-income persons. The primary means towards this end is to extend and strengthen partnerships among all levels of government and the private sector, including for-profit and non-profit organizations, in the production and operation of affordable housing.

Decent housing includes assisting homeless persons to obtain appropriate housing and assisting persons at risk of becoming homeless; retention of the affordable housing stock; and increasing the availability of permanent housing in standard condition and affordable cost to low-income and moderate-income families, particularly to members of disadvantaged minorities, without discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, familial status, or disability. Decent housing also includes increasing the supply of supportive housing, which combines structural features and services needed to enable persons with special needs, including persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, to live with dignity and independence; and providing housing affordable to low-income persons accessible to job opportunities.

2.) Providing a suitable, sustainable living environment includes improving the safety and livability of neighborhoods; increasing access to quality public and private facilities and services; reducing the isolation of income groups within a community or geographical area through the spatial deconcentration of housing opportunities for persons of lower income and the revitalization of deteriorating or deteriorated neighborhoods; restoring and preserving properties of special historic, architectural, or aesthetic value; and conservation of energy resources.

3.) Expanding economic opportunities includes job creation and retention; establishment, stabilization and expansion of small businesses (including microbusinesses); the provision of public services concerned with employment; the provision of jobs involved in carrying out activities under programs covered by this plan to low-income persons living in areas affected by those programs and activities; availability of mortgage financing for low-income persons at reasonable rates using nondiscriminatory

lending practices; access to capital and credit for development activities that promote the long-term economic and social viability of the community; and empowerment and self-sufficiency opportunities for low-income persons to reduce generational poverty in federally assisted and public housing.

Our Mission

We are committed to providing excellent public service and safety to all who live, work, and play in our vibrant, tropical, historic community.

Our Vision

The City of Miami Beach will be:

- Cleaner and Safer;
- More Beautiful and Vibrant;
- A Mature, Stable Residential Community with Well-improved Infrastructure;
- A Unique Urban and Historic Environment;
- A Cultural, Entertainment, Tourism Capital; and
- An International Center for Innovation in Culture, Recreation and Business.

2. Summary of the objectives and outcomes identified in the Plan Needs Assessment Overview

Objectives and outcomes identified in the Plan include:

- **Public Facilities and Improvements**
- **Public Services**
- Youth services
- Senior services
- Childcare
- Homeless Services
- **Housing**
- Multi-Family Rental Rehabilitation

3. Evaluation of past performance

The City has met frequently with the Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) and the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee to evaluate the past performance of activities and agencies funded by the City. Activities funded by the City benefited low and moderate income individuals, households and neighborhoods. In order to meet the needs of low and moderate income youth, a new Boys and Girls Club Center was built in the South Beach Target Area. In order to meet the needs of low and moderate income seniors, the Jewish Community Services Senior Center was renovated and a new Senior Center was built in the North Beach Target Area. Finally, Miami Beach CDC has built over 500 units of affordable housing.

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

The City consulted with CDAC, AHAC, the Miami-Dade Homeless Trust, public service providers and community development corporations to identify outcomes and objectives in the Plan.

5. Summary of public comments

An ad was placed in the Miami Herald on May 5, 2013 announcing a 30 day comment period. A public meeting was held on May 8, 2013.

6. Summary of comments or views not accepted and the reasons for not accepting them

The City of Miami Beach's FY 2013-2017 Consolidated Plan represents summarizes the objectives and outcomes identified by citizens, advisory committees, public service providers, community development corporations and city staff.

7. Summary

The City of Miami Beach's FY 2013-2017 Consolidated Plan represents summarizes the objectives and outcomes identified by citizens, advisory committees, public service providers, community development corporations and city staff.

The City consulted with CDAC, AHAC, the Miami-Dade Homeless Trust, public service providers and community development corporations to identify outcomes and objectives in the Plan.

The City will leverage its entitlement funds with other government funding and private sector financing to meet the outcomes and objectives in the Plan.

The Process

PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies

1. Agency/entity responsible for preparing/administering the Consolidated Plan

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

Agency Role	Name	Department/Agency
Lead Agency	MIAMI BEACH	

Table 1 – Responsible Agencies

Narrative

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

Brian Gillis, Community Development Coordinator, 305-673-7000 x 6120, briangillis@miamibeachfl.gov

PR-10 Consultation

1. Introduction

The City consulted with the Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC), the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC) and its subrecipients to identify high priority housing and community development needs.

Summary of the jurisdiction's activities to enhance coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies

The City enhanced coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies by meeting with the following entities:

- **Housing Providers**
- The Housing Authority of the City of Miami Beach
- Miami Beach CDC
- Douglas Gardens
- **Public Service Providers**
- UNIDAD
- Boys and Girls Clubs of Miami Dade County
- Food for Life
- Jewish Community Services
- Little Havana Activities Nutrition Center
- **Homeless Agencies**
- The Miami-Dade County Homeless Trust
- Citrus Health Network, Inc.

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

The Miami-Dade County Homeless Trust (Trust) serves as the lead agency for the Miami-Dade County Continuum of Care (CoC) structure. It is governed by the Miami-Dade County Homeless Trust Board, it is comprised of a 27-member, broad-based membership, including the City of Miami Beach, representing numerous sectors of our community. The board uses recommendations from its sub-committees, as well as recommendations from Homeless Trust staff and feedback from community meetings with providers to guide policy development for the CoC, including funding and project prioritization. This structure allows for a clear and transparent CoC leadership structure, participation of all stakeholders in the decision making process for funding and priorities and a coordinated response targeted toward strategic solutions to ending homelessness in Miami-Dade County.

Each year the Trust's CoC Sub-Committee identifies the community's homeless housing and services needs. The process involves extensive input from the community, including surveys of homeless persons and input from homeless providers, as well as public comment meetings, and review and approval by the Homeless Trust Board; all meetings are publicly noticed. This resulted in the following 2012 funding priorities:

- 1) Permanent housing for individuals or families experiencing chronic homelessness, veterans (individuals or families), and families with children.
- 2) Transitional Housing for - individuals or families experiencing chronic homelessness, veterans (individuals or families), and families with children.
- 3) Safe Havens, 4) Services Only – including outreach and the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS).

The City of Miami Beach, Homeless Services Division provides homeless outreach, partially funded by the Trust, to those homeless in the City of Miami Beach in accordance with the Trust's Outreach, Assessment and Placement model. The model provides a standardized procedure for homeless persons to access the continuum of care and ensures they access services appropriate to their individual needs.

The outreach teams also participate in the coordinated outreach process, another program funded by the Homeless Trust, which provides behavioral health outreach workers who work alongside regular outreach workers targeting chronically homeless persons. The coordinated outreach process brings together all the CoC outreach teams, including the Veterans Administration, once a month to discuss issues encountered, as well as discussing referrals to low demand, Housing First permanent housing program for the chronically homeless to be placed directly into from the street.

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

The City of Miami Beach does not receive ESG funding, but does coordinate with the Miami-Dade County Homeless Trust to prioritize ESG objectives which currently are emergency shelter, homeless prevention and rapid re-housing. Priorities will be evaluated annually and take into account performance standards and outcomes. The Homeless Trust is currently developing a centralized assessment tool to capture data on all clients accessing services. HMIS is administered county-wide by the Homeless Trust. Providers who receive Trust funding are required to utilize the system and are provided individual user licenses, technical assistance and training related to the HMIS system. Among many of its functions, the system is used to generate reports on monthly and annual progress, provide point in time information, and conduct referrals from one program to another in accordance with both Homeless Trust and HUD policies and procedures.

2. Agencies, groups, organizations and others who participated in the process and consultations

Agency/Group/Organization	Agency/Group/Organization Type	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?
MIAMI BEACH CDC	Housing Neighborhood Organization	Housing Need Assessment Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Market Analysis	Agency was consulted during the update of their Strategic Plan.
UNIDAD OF MIAMI BEACH, INC.	Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Services-Victims of Domestic	Economic Development Anti-poverty Strategy Non Housing Need Assessment	Agency was consulted during the non housing community development needs assessment.

Agency/Group/Organization	Agency/Group/Organization Type	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?
	Violence Services-homeless Services-Health Services-Education Services-Employment Service-Fair Housing Neighborhood Organization		
Jewish Community Services of South Florida, Inc	Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-homeless Regional organization	Homelessness Strategy Non housing need assessment	Agency was consulted during the non-housing needs assessment process.
Housing Authority of the City of Miami Beach	Housing	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs	The HACMB was consulted during the housing needs assessment process.
Boys & Girls Clubs of Miami-Dade	Services-Children Regional organization	Anti-poverty Strategy Non Housing Need Assessment	Agency was consulted during the non-housing needs assessment.
LITTLE HAVANA ACTIVITIES AND NUTRITION CENTERS OF DADE COUNTY, INC	Services-Children Regional organization	Anti-poverty Strategy Non Housing Need Assessment	Agency was consulted during the non-housing needs assessment.

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

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

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

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Continuum of Care	Miami-Dade County Homeless Trust	Provided the Point-In-Time Count data, 10 Year Plan to End Homelessness, Continuum of Care Housing Gap Analysis and Housing Population,
Comprehensive Plan	City of Miami Beach	The Housing Element identifies housing goals, objectives and policies.
Local Housing Assistance Plan (LHAP)	City of Miami Beach/RHCD	The LHAP identifies affordable housing strategies.
Strategic Plan 2011 Update	City of Miami Beach	The Strategic Plan includes the City's Mission Statement, Vision Statement, Value Statements, and Key Intended Outcomes.
HACMB Five Year Plan	The Housing Authority of the City of Miami Beach	

Table 3 – Other local / regional / federal planning efforts

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

The City cooperated and coordinated with other public entities, including the State and adjacent units of general local government in the implementation of the Consolidated plan. The City plans to leverage its CDBG and HOME funds with State of Florida SHIP funds, and Miami-Dade County CDBG, HOME and SURTAX funds.

Narrative

PR-15 Citizen Participation

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

Citizen Participation Outreach

Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
Public Meeting	Non-targeted/broad community				
Newspaper Ad	Non-targeted/broad community				
Other	Non-targeted/broad community				www.miamibeachfl.gov

Table 4 – Citizen Participation Outreach

Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

Needs Assessment Overview

AHAC, CDAC, the Committee on the Homeless, subrecipients and City staff identified the following housing and community development needs:

- **Public Facilities and Improvements**
- Flood Drainage Improvements
- Operating Costs of Homeless/AIDS Patients Programs
- **Public Services**
- Youth services
- Senior services
- Childcare services
- Homeless services
- **Housing**
- Rehabilitation: Multi-unit Residential

NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment

Summary of Housing Needs

There are a total of 20,050 low to moderate-income households in Miami Beach, representing nearly 45% of the total households. Given the overall strength of property values, it creates significant cost burden and overcrowding problems. Many large lower income households are forced into rental communities with limited options for affordable units with 3 or more bedrooms.

Demographics	2000 Census (Base Year)	2005-2009 ACS (Most Recent Year)	% Change
Population	87,933	87,677	-0%
Households	59,723	44,593	-25%
Median Income	\$27,322.00	\$41,892.00	53%

Table 5 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data
 2000 Census (Base Year)
 2005-2009 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Number of Households Table

	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	>80-100% HAMFI	>100% HAMFI
Total Households *	7,415	5,285	7,350	4,250	
Small Family Households *	1,070	1,325	2,180	7,760	
Large Family Households *	30	85	165	825	
Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age	1,225	765	815	375	2,180
Household contains at least one person age 75 or older	2,490	1,250	795	475	1,435
Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger *	515	345	630	2,500	
* the highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI					

Table 6 - Total Households Table

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Housing Needs Summary Tables for several types of Housing Problems

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

	Renter				Owner				Total
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	
Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	95	145	165	35	440	40	20	0	60
Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	275	410	425	105	1,215	0	60	40	145
Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	35	110	205	125	475	0	0	0	10
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	2,795	1,995	1,040	120	5,950	1,155	910	910	3,460
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	880	650	2,840	890	5,260	220	460	470	1,405
Zero/negative income (and none of the above problems)	430	0	0	0	430	340	0	0	340

Table 7 – Housing Problems Table

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

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

	Renter				Owner					
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
Having 1 or more of four housing problems	3,200	2,660	1,840	380	8,080	1,195	995	950	540	3,680
Having none of four housing problems	1,970	925	3,690	2,480	9,065	270	705	870	845	2,690
Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems	430	0	0	0	430	340	0	0	0	340

Table 8 – Housing Problems 2

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

3. Cost Burden > 30%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
Small Related	780	970	1,295	3,045	140	245	375	760
Large Related	30	45	70	145	0	0	30	30
Elderly	1,605	590	390	2,585	865	1,010	565	2,440
Other	1,635	1,650	2,485	5,770	370	200	435	1,005
Total need by income	4,050	3,255	4,240	11,545	1,375	1,455	1,405	4,235

Table 9 – Cost Burden > 30%

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

4. Cost Burden > 50%

	Renter				Total	Owner				Total
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total		0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	
Small Related	700	830	205	1,735	140	200	250	590		
Large Related	30	30	10	70	0	0	30	30		
Elderly	870	365	175	1,410	680	635	345	1,660		
Other	1,530	1,245	650	3,425	335	160	295	790		
Total need by income	3,130	2,470	1,040	6,640	1,155	995	920	3,070		

Table 10 – Cost Burden > 50%

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

5. Crowding (More than one person per room)

	Renter				Total	Owner				Total
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI		0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	
Single family households	215	465	480	205	1,365	0	60	40	55	155
Multiple, unrelated family households	30	30	75	0	135	0	0	0	0	0
Other, non-family households	65	25	115	35	240	0	0	0	0	0
Total need by income	310	520	670	240	1,740	0	60	40	55	155

Table 11 – Crowding Information

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

What are the most common housing problems?

The most common housing problems are cost burden and overcrowding.

+Affordability of available housing in both owner and rental markets is the most common problem

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

In Miami Beach lower income residents, larger families, elderly residents, and minorities are more affected by housing problems. Neither renters nor owners are exempt from experiencing the affects of housing cost burden. More than 25% of total households have an income cost burden greater than 30%; and nearly 15% of households have an income cost burden greater than 50%.

Overcrowding is primarily experienced by renters. Most available affordable rental properties are apartments/condominiums and are limited in square footage and the number of bedrooms.

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

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:

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

Discussion

It is important to stress that cost burden poses a significant deterrent to providing appropriate housing for both renters and owners. Nearly 45% of all households are at or below 80% AMI. and nearly 17% of all households are at, or below, 30% AMI, represented by a significant number of elderly residents. Half of the households at or below 30% AMI have a household member over 62 years of age; and 33% of

those households have a member over 75 years of age. This means a significant number of households may be on fixed income and unable to keep up with the rising cost of properties.

Miami Beach has enjoyed a real estate market that has retained strong market values despite the general downturn in the national real estate market. This fact creates limitations on homeownership opportunities. Virtually all of the single-family homes are financially inaccessible by households that are even at 100% AMI. Ownership is generally left to the acquisition of a condominium; and even that is prohibitive in many of the properties. This issue has created a “double-edged sword” for the City as it struggles with providing affordable housing without negatively impacting rising property values.

Overcrowding is also a housing problem on Miami Beach. This is a more significant problem in the rental market than the ownership market. Many of the available rental multifamily properties on Miami Beach are apartments or condominiums with limited square footage and bedrooms. Most are efficiencies, one, and two-bedroom. This creates a significant problem for a large number of families that require 3 or more bedrooms.

NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems

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

Miami Beach residents with the greatest need for housing assistance are those households that experience housing cost burden and those that experience overcrowding.

According to the CHAS data, Hispanic households make up 59% of the 18430 households that has at least one housing problem, followed by White households at 36%, and Black households at 3%. However, within each of those ethnic groups, approximately 77% of that group's total households have at least one housing problem.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	5,495	1,145	770
White	1,840	320	335
Black / African American	130	0	75
Asian	35	0	90
American Indian; Alaska Native	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	3,380	825	240

Table 12 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 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%

30%-50% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	4,770	515	0
White	1,260	95	0
Black / African American	75	0	0
Asian	75	0	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	3,220	405	0

Table 13 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 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%

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	6,100	1,250	0
White	2,485	330	0
Black / African American	285	0	0
Asian	45	65	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	3,255	855	0

Table 14 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 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%

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	2,065	2,185	0
White	970	845	0
Black / African American	25	75	0
Asian	0	55	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	40	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	1,070	1,105	0

Table 15 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 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%

Discussion

Although it can be seen that within the three largest racial/ethnic groups that there is a similar experience with regard to at least one housing problem; examination by the level of income uncovers more of a disparity. Hispanic households that have income of less than 30% AMI; represent 61% of the households with at least one housing problem within that income category.

NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems

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

Severe housing problems are generally defined as those households that experience overcrowding and cost burdens of more than 50% of income. Those households with lower income generally experience a disproportionately greater housing need.

Hispanic households make up 59% of the 11760 households that has at least one severe housing problem, followed by White households at 35%, and Black households at 3%. Within each of these ethnic groups, approximately 49% of that group's total households have at least one severe housing problem.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	4,395	2,240	770
White	1,665	500	335
Black / African American	130	0	75
Asian	35	0	90
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	2,505	1,705	240

Table 16 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 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

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	3,655	1,630	0
White	1,005	350	0
Black / African American	30	50	0
Asian	65	15	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	2,425	1,205	0

Table 17 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 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%

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	2,790	4,560	0
White	1,120	1,695	0
Black / African American	145	135	0
Asian	10	100	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	1,485	2,625	0

Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 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%

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	920	3,325	0
White	370	1,445	0
Black / African American	10	90	0
Asian	0	55	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	0	40	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0
Hispanic	550	1,630	0

Table 19 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 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

Again, although it can be seen that within the three largest racial/ethnic groups that there is a similar experience with regard to at least one severe housing problem; examination by the level of income uncovers more of a disparity. Hispanic households that have income of less than 30% AMI; represent nearly 57% of the households with at least one severe housing problem within that income category.

NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens

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

There are two important factors when measuring affordability: income and housing price. Cost burden is considered a problem when housing cost exceeds 30% of income, and a severe problem when the cost burden exceeds 50%. According to the CHAS data, 22805 households experience housing cost burden, which is 50% of total households.

Housing Cost Burden

Housing Cost Burden	<=30%	30-50%	>50%	No / negative income (not computed)
Jurisdiction as a whole	20,935	10,995	11,810	850
White	11,085	4,910	4,665	410
Black / African American	245	265	255	75
Asian	335	145	110	90
American Indian, Alaska Native	75	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	8,840	5,605	6,525	240

Table 20 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Discussion

According to the CHAS data, Hispanic households make up 53% of the 22805 households that have a housing cost burden problem, followed by White households at 42%, and Black households at 2%. However, within each of those ethnic groups, approximately 50% of that group's total households have a housing cost burden problem.

NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion

Income categories in which a racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need

With regards to housing problems versus severe housing problems, the data delivers similar results for each category on Miami Beach. The Hispanic population represents the largest share of the affected population. This ethnic group comprises more than 50% of the total population of Miami Beach. Nearly 60% of Hispanics are impacted by at least one or more of the housing problems, which suggests that housing has an overall impact on 35% of the City's total population, while considering only one ethnic group. The only other large group is the White population, which comprises more than 30% of the total. Its representation in the data with regards to being impacted by at least one housing problem is just slightly more than its population size. The Black/African American population is the largest of the other racial/ethnic groups, comprising about 4% of the total population, and representing approximately 3% of the population affected by at least one housing problem, depending on the percentage of AMI level.

Needs not previously identified

NA

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

Many of the Hispanic and Black residents are located in the North Beach and South Beach neighborhoods, which are community development target areas.

NA-35 Public Housing

Introduction

Totals in Use

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers in use	0	126	196	2,802	10	2,604	183	0	0

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

Table 21 - Public Housing by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Characteristics of Residents

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Average Annual Income	0	9,229	9,733	11,333	10,193	11,222	12,666	0	0
Average length of stay	0	6	8	7	2	7	0	0	0
Average Household size	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0
# Homeless at admission	0	0	1	143	6	24	113	0	0

	Program Type									
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Special Purpose Voucher			Disabled *
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *	
# of Elderly Program Participants (>62)	0	111	195	1,299	3	1,262	34	0	0	0
# of Disabled Families	0	13	1	664	4	590	70	0	0	0
# of Families requesting accessibility features	0	126	196	2,802	10	2,604	183	0	0	0
# of HIV/AIDS program participants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
# of DV victims	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Table 22 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Race of Residents

Race	Program Type									
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Special Purpose Voucher			Disabled *
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *	
White	0	118	188	2,004	7	1,933	59	0	0	0
Black/African American	0	8	8	793	3	666	124	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0
American Indian/Alaska	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0