

Guide for Review of NSP-1 Cooperative Agreements				
Name of Program Participant:				
Staff Consulted:				
Activity Name, Number and Brief Description:				
Members of Cooperative Agreement:				
Lead Entity:				
Name(s) of Reviewer(s):		Date		<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Review <input type="checkbox"/> In-depth Review

NOTE: All questions that address requirements contain the citation for the source of the requirement (statute, regulation, NOFA, or grant agreement). If the requirement is not met, HUD must make a finding of noncompliance. All other questions (questions that do not contain the citation for the requirement) do not address requirements, but are included to assist the reviewer in understanding the participant's program more fully and/or to identify issues that, if not properly addressed, could result in deficient performance. Negative conclusions to these questions may result in a "concern" being raised, but not a "**finding**."

Instructions: Use this Exhibit for a review for compliance with the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) Cooperative Agreements requirements. One Exhibit is to be completed for each program participant. It is important to note that under the regular CDBG program, cooperative agreements are allowed and will continue to be allowed under NSP-1. If a program participant has an existing cooperative agreement that governs FY 2008 CDBG funds, it will be considered to incorporate NSP funds, as amended appropriately.

Questions:

1.

For the questions below, note that “[t]hese cooperation agreements will continue to apply to the use of NSP funds for the duration of the NSP grant, just as a cooperation agreements covering regular CDBG Entitlement program funds continue to apply to any use of the funds appropriated during the 3-year period covered by the agreements.”			
a. Is the cooperative agreement between “two or more contiguous entitlement communities (metropolitan cities or counties) that are in the same metropolitan area and that are eligible to receive an NSP grant?” [73 Fed. Reg. 58332 and 58334, II.B.5.a]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	N/A
b. Is the cooperative agreement between an “entitlement community that is eligible to receive an NSP allocation... with its state?” [73 Fed. Reg. 58332 and 58334, II.B.5.b]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	N/A

<p>c. Is there an existing cooperative agreement “between a local government and an urban county governing FY2008 CDBG funding (for purposes of either an urban county or a joint or a joint program)?” [73 Fed. Reg. 58332 and 58334, II.B.6]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes No N/A</p>
<p>Describe Basis for Conclusion:</p>	

2.

<p>Is there evidence that the lead entity is maintaining its responsibility for managing the NSP-1 grant (by ensuring compliance with grant requirements, overseeing the reporting, etc.)? [73 Fed. Reg. 58332 and 58334, II.B.5.a. and b]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes No N/A</p>
<p>Describe Basis for Conclusion:</p>	

3.

<p>a. Will the existing cooperative agreement expire prior to the expiration of the NSP-1 grant agreement (three years from the date signed)? [73 Fed. Reg. 58332 and 58334, II.B. and II.B.6]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes No N/A</p>
<p>Describe Basis for Conclusion:</p>	

<p>b. If the answer to “a” above is “yes,” does the lead entity have a plan or policy in place that outlines the cooperative partners’ responsibilities until the expiration of the NSP-1 grant? [73 Fed. Reg. 58332 and 58334, II.B. and II.B.6]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes No N/A</p>
<p>Describe Basis for Conclusion:</p>	

4.

<p>a. Has the program participant applied for its “entire grant, and then enter[ed] into a subrecipient agreement with another jurisdiction or nonprofit entity to administer the grant?” (NOTE: “In this manner for example, all of the grantees operating in a single metropolitan area could designate the same land-bank entity (or the state housing finance agency) as a subrecipient for some or all of their NSP activities.”) [73 Fed. Reg. 58332, II.B]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes No N/A</p>
<p>Describe Basis for Conclusion:</p>	

b. If the answer to “a” above is “yes,” is the program participant properly managing the subrecipient according to their agreement and the NSP-1 requirements? [73 Fed. Reg. 58332, II.B]	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes No N/A
Describe Basis for Conclusion:	

5.

If the responses to any of the questions in this Exhibit indicate a need to go to another section of this Handbook for questions, or seek technical assistance or advice from another HUD staff person, please describe below.
Describe Basis for Conclusion: