Preagreement Costs

May 13, 1988

MT40RANDUM FOR: William Y. Nishimura, Acting Pegicnal Administrator-Regional Housing Commissioner, 9S

?R(X4: Jack R. Stokvis, General Denuty Assi Conmunity Planning and Development

STJBJECT: CoT=unity Development Block Grant Proaram (CD-cri) Waiver Requast for Clark County Nevada

T64.,-- responds to your March 29, 19ES, memorandum concernin Clark County's request for a waiver of 24 CFR 570.200(a)@. Princil@les and 24 CFR 570.200(h), Preaoreeirent Costs. The Cities of Mesquite and Henderson, both urzan count,,, consortium members, have-prooosee to the Coun@.v that they wish to accelerate t,)e construction of certain proposed pro'pcts and advance the funds to j-pa-, for the cost of construction fron local resources and then re3.mburse their accounts ur>on the receipt of their share of the annual CDBC, allotment fron@ Clark County. This arrangement would enable the projects to be undertaken, completed and available to serve low and moderate income persons sooner than if the cities had to accumulate their annual CDB%@J allocations. The City of Mesquite is proposing to construct a library which will primarily serve the co,mmunity's low and moderate income population. The City of Henderson is proposing to rehabilitate a structure and converting

it for use as a senior center, 5@

A waiver of the reculations at 5570.200(a) con erning OME Cost Principles is required because any preagreement costs are

limited to those costs described at §5@0.200(h). A waiv-r of the regulations at 5570.200(li) concerning preagreeirent costs is necessary for multi-year funding commitments in which future years' grants will. be used to reimburse costs for activities undertaken with local funds in the present Cr-IB(, prc%aram year. Taking into consideration the everal-I- benefit to these cctr,munities of completing these projects in the near term and the advantages to Clark County to ireet its community development ,objectives in a timely manner, In order to avoid adversely affecting the purposes of the Acts I hereby waive the 1 ;on preagreement costs at 24 CFR 570.200(a) s570.200(h) under the authority of 24 CFR 570.5 subject to the requirements described below.

Please advise Clark County that such prp--agreement expenditures are at their own risk an.--3 tl%at reiTabursem,7nt fro-.i future grants is contingent upon the future avail3!)ilit-? of CDBG funds. Likewise, such reimburtement would @e contingent u@n the activities being eligible under the 13W and regulations in effect at the tire the rei,-aburse.-tent is sought an@ an compliance with aoplicbble Cr.)rzG proaram requiremenk's.





CDBG Memorandum

Prior to the commitment oA' lo--al funds the activities must b@ described in the County's Final eltateient or in an amendment t-lereto, citizen participation reauire-rent3 MUS*--- t>e ret, including -making clear the amount of fun.4s that are being prograr-,ned fzoa-, future grants that environ-,centa'L, la@r, condetitive procurement anzi other applical.,'Ao%. CLIEC requirements are met.

Al%-houch individual vyaiver3 are not required !or each year in which CT)S,;.flinls are us@L4 by the County to reimburse the local governments, you are reminde6 o.' the requirement in OMP Circular A-37, Attach!,"ent D, Section C(5) Costs, that any

costs incurred prior to the effective data of the grant are allowable only when specifically provided for in ,-hi! cr3nt agreement. ThereA'ore, each arant agreement in wh4-ch CDBrj funds are used for this r)urnose -ist inclule soecific recognition of au--h

p.-e-aq.-ee-,ient co!3ts. Bloc',, 13, ST>ecial ConC!tions, of RtiD Forr.. 7082 m&3, be used for this pjr.@ose with attachments il. necessary.

Should you have any questions or concerns relative to this matter please contact Daniel Dclrill In the Entitlement Cities Division at (FTS) 755-5977.

0511



