

*Utah Division of Housing and Community Development  
Department of Workforce Services  
2010-2015 Consolidated Plan*



**SOUTHEASTERN UTAH ASSOCIATION  
OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS**

**CARBON, EMERY, GRAND AND SAN JUAN COUNTIES**

**2010 – 2015 CONSOLIDATED PLAN**

**2014 UPDATE AND ACTION PLAN**

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Citizen Participation .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Narrative 1 Lead Based Paint.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Narrative 2 - Market Conditions.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Narrative 3 - Barriers to Affordable Housing.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Narrative 4 - Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Narrative 5 - Method of Distribution .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Narrative 6 - Sources of Funds .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Narrative 7 – Monitoring.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Narrative 8 - Specific HOME Submission Requirements.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Narrative 9 - Specific HOPWA Submission Requirement .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Narrative 10 - Homeless and other Special Needs (including ESG).....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Narrative 11 - Discharge Coordination Policy .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Narrative 12 - Allocation Priorities and Geographic Distribution.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Narrative 13 - Community Development (CDBG).....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Narrative 14 - Economic Development (CDBG).....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Narrative 15 - Energy Efficiency .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Narrative 16 - Sustainability and Green Projects.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Narrative 17 - Section 3.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Narrative 18 - Other.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>.....2014FY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT LIST.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Table 1 – Housing, Homeless, and Special Needs Assessment.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Table 2A – State Priority Housing Activities/Investment Plan .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Table 2C – Summary of Specific Objectives (Actions) .....</b>	<b>2234</b>

## **Executive Summary**

*Please provide a clear, concise narrative that includes the key objectives and outcomes identified in the plan and a brief evaluation or overview of past performance.*

### **EVALUATION OF CURRENT NEEDS:**

#### **Housing**

While developing this action plan, SEUALG staff meet regularly with the region's housing and service provider agencies, and city/county planning officials. Housing needs in the southeastern Utah region have changed little over the last few years. The district's owner-occupied rehabilitation program renovates between 12 and 15 homes per year, the identified housing needs across the entire district continues to be:

1. Increase the number of rental housing units affordable for low and very low income residents
2. Preserve existing affordable housing by rehabilitating owner occupied and rental units, with an emphasis on energy efficiency
3. Develop "Workforce Housing," both rental and owner-occupied.
4. Renovate or replace existing pre-1976 and dilapidated mobile/manufactured housing units, both rental and owner-occupied.
5. Develop housing for people with disabilities and other special needs, including supportive housing services and programs.
6. Develop additional units and programs to address homeless issues within the district, including transitional housing.
7. Develop emergency housing facilities and program.

#### **General Community Development**

As part of the process to develop the district's capital improvements prioritization lists, SEUALG staff regularly meets with city and county entities and gather needs assessment information. While projects will be completed as funding becomes, or is, available, the overall community development needs and priorities are:

1. Culinary water projects.
2. Sewer projects.
3. Storm water projects.
4. Public safety (fire protection), emergency and general medical care.
5. Construction or rehabilitation of facilities that provide services to "limited clientele" populations
6. ADA and accessibility projects (i.e. special purpose sidewalk or scooter trails and public facilities access).
7. Multi-purpose community centers
8. Transportation access
9. Recreation projects (parks, playground equipment, skate-parks, sports facilities, ball fields/courts, bike & hiking trails, etc.)
10. Public facilities such as sidewalk, curb & gutter (other than for specific ADA purposes), street signage, etc.
11. General community or master planning.

### **Community & Human Services**

The SEUALG uses ongoing communication with other district entities along with information gathered from public surveys, public forums, hearings and the data collection and reporting systems of various social services programs to determine priorities for this category.

1. Develop, replace or rehabilitate public facilities so services that directly benefit income qualified citizens can be improved and/or increased.
2. Increase the ability of social services programs to serve income qualified clients.
3. Develop transportation systems that meet the needs of the district's senior, low-income, and disabled populations.

### **Economic Development**

While very little HUD funding is used in the southeastern Utah district for economic development activities, economic development is the primary component of the district's ability to sustain its residents. SEUALG staff coordinated closely with the Southeastern Utah Economic Development District and the economic development professionals in all four counties to determine the following needs.

1. Develop projects that directly provide jobs and other economic benefit to income qualified district residents.
2. Continue to make the revolving loan fund programs available throughout the district
3. Expand the B.E.A.R program
4. Expand services offered by the SBDC and the Business and Technical Assistance Center

## **SUMMARY OF PAST PERFORMANCE**

During the last funding year CDBG and other HUD funding has been used to improve the livability of the district's communities, provide accessibility to public services and improve affordable housing stocks. Often HUD funding was combined with other funding sources (OWHLF State of Utah, USDA-Rural Development, Economic Development Administration, Low Income House Tax Credits and Historical Preservation Tax Credits, TANF funding, Community Impact Board funding, Community and Social Services Block Grant funding, Weatherization and H.E.A.T funding and local and private resources, etc.) to leverage more comprehensive projects;

### **Housing and Homeless Projects**

During the 2012-2013 funding year the following housing and homeless projects were completed:

1. Rehabilitated 12 owner-occupied homes and provided rehabilitation program delivery services to 39 households.
3. Provision of supportive services to 8 residents of a group housing program
4. Temporarily house (winter months) 3-11 chronically homeless people
5. Provide rental and deposit assistance to 89 households (homeless prevention)

### **Community Development Projects**

Because housing projects have become such a high priority in southeastern Utah, no community development projects were funded with HUD funds during 2011-2013. However, numerous community development projects were completed throughout the district with funds from

sources other than HUD. A 60 unit complex of low income rental property was finished and available for occupancy in September 2012. This project was funded with OWHLF, LIHTC and other public and private development funds. Two communities completed sewer improvements utilizing CIB funding. SEUALG staff responsible for the Consolidated Plan and updates coordinated with the district communities to develop capital improvement priorities lists and to identify funding sources for needed projects.

### **Economic Development Activities**

Almost 20 years ago the SEUALG applied for and received \$133,000 in CDBG funding to match \$300,000 of EDA funding to start a revolving loan fund. That program continues today and has developed an equity position of approximately \$906,000. According to the EDA 2009 Report the EDA Funding was \$400,000 with a match of \$133,334 where there is an available lending amount of approximately \$300,000. Five years ago the CDBG funding was released from the HUD regulations and oversight and was added directly to the EDA fund. Although, this program no longer carries CDBG identification, activities and accomplishments are still reported in the Consolidated Plan. Last year the following economic development activities were achieved.

1. Made 1 loan (\$50,000) to new and existing businesses. This loan has resulted in the creation so far of 4 jobs for LMI workers.
2. Provided business counseling to 8 potential business start-up clients.
3. The Southeastern Utah Business and Technical Assistance Center incubated 3 new businesses. The largest new business provided 3 LMI new jobs. Three Revolving Loan Funds were committed and approved. There is \$263,000 pending closing.

These businesses were also provided practical technical assistance. In addition the Business Technical Assistance Center graduated 2 businesses.

### **Community and Human Services**

SEUALG CSBG funded staff coordinated with district agencies and organizations to develop programs using CSBG & TANF funding that provided direct services to income qualified households:

1. Provided crisis utility deposit assistance to 37 low-income households.
2. Served 7859 meals through local food banks and 65 Native American families through a food pantry. Nutrition through the feeding of hot meals was done 3 times per week to disabled, low income and seniors.
3. Provided assistive technology repairs, devices & evaluations to 432 clients with disabilities.
4. Provided rent assistance to 29 families with children.
5. Provided 3032 households with utility assistance through the HEAT program.

**Funding Priority Decision Making Process** In the southeastern Utah district, CDBG funding distribution is driven by the Consolidated Planning process which identifies the issues and needs of the district's communities and includes an emphasis on benefits to citizens with low and very low incomes. The Consolidated Plan process also helps housing and human services providers to participate in the local government planning process so that communities can identify and develop needs assessment and projects that benefit low-income citizens. During the annual update process the Consolidated Plan process determines priorities and goals for HUD funding.

The information provided by the Consolidated Plan is then used to annually update the rating and ranking policies that determine which applications receive funding.

### **2014-2015 Priorities**

#### Housing:

1. Complete development of 10 additional units of permanent supportive housing units for mentally ill in Grand County.
2. Rehabilitation of 21 units of public housing in Carbon County.
3. Building 14 units of mutual self-help housing in Grand and San Juan Counties
4. Rehabilitate up to 15 owner occupied homes throughout the district
5. Provide TANF program services to approximately 30 income qualified households
6. Develop emergency shelter programs in Carbon and Emery County
7. Develop a second 60 unit rental project targeted to lower income households in Grand County.

#### Community Development

1. The Natural Hazards: Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan was adopted by all participating municipalities in the southeastern region during the 2013 year. FEMA will provide an official letter of adoption.
2. Broadband Planning Councils were formed for the Governor's Office of Economic Development to receive local input on adoption of broadband in the rural areas.

## **Citizen Participation**

*Please provide a concise summary of the citizen participation process, a summary of any citizen comments or views on the plan, and efforts made to broaden public participation in the development of the Consolidated Plan, including outreach to minorities and non-English speaking persons, as well as persons with disabilities. The summary of citizen comments must include a written explanation of comments not accepted and the reasons why these comments were not accepted. The narrative should also address citizen input into the funding priority decision making process.*

The Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) held a public hearing on January 23, 2014 to solicit comments for the Community Development Block Grant Program. No one from the public attend the hearing. A public hearing to present the draft 2014 Annual Update to the Consolidated Plan was held on March 19, 2014. A public hearing notice was published in all the newspapers in the district and the State Public Notice website. The notice explained that public comments would be accepted until March 25, 2014. Copies of the Consolidated Plan were provided to interested parties listed in "Other Agencies Consulted," and a link to the draft plan was placed the SEUALG's website.

Historically, attendance at formal public hearings held during the consolidated planning/CDBG application process has been low, and the same has been true for the 2013-2014 funding year. In order to obtain as much public input as possible, SEUALG staff attended many of the public meetings and hearings held by district entities. These meetings include local planning and zoning board meetings, housing authority and community housing development organization board meetings, tri-partite board meetings (Community Services Block Grant), interagency

coordinating council meetings, homeless and continuum of care meetings, economic development councils, as well as special programs such as the Regional Transportation Coordinating Council, Pre-Disaster Mitigation Planning, and Broadband Planning, etc. SEUALG staff presented information about the Consolidated Plan, CDBG Program, HOME (and housing rehabilitation) program, etc., and solicited input about the issues, needs, goals and priorities to be identified in the Consolidated Plan. The SEUALG also coordinates with the Community Action Partnership of Utah (CAP-Utah) and provides regular input into their activities. CAP-Utah and the SEUALG staff also conducted two community forums to garner input from the public and help to conduct a public survey for the districts food-banks. SEUALG also held public hearings in 2012 & 2013 in each county to solicit input from the public and district stakeholder agencies on needs and priorities so that programs could be developed whenever funding is available. Information from these hearing and forums was incorporated into the Consolidated Plan needs assessment update. Since 2010 input from citizens has not changed.

Overall, the needs identified were:

1. Not enough full time jobs.
2. Wages are too low and benefits are rarely offered.
3. Lack of medical insurance.
4. Affordable housing is not available.
5. There is no public transportation anywhere in the district.
6. Mental health and substance abuse services are scarce and unaffordable affecting drug issues in the community.
7. There is too much reliance on technology by public service agencies. Clients want/need more assistance from “real” people in order to access programs and services.

### **Other Agencies Consulted**

*List other public/private entities that were consulted in developing this plan.*

While gathering information during the 2013-2014 funding year, the SEUALG consulted with all district cities and the four (4) district counties. The SEUALG assisted two (2) cities with general planning and five (5) cities with land use ordinance planning. The SEUALG also consulted and met with the following organizations/groups and agencies on a regular basis throughout the update year:

The Area Agency on Aging  
The Housing Authority of Carbon County  
Regional Planning Office (SEUALG)  
Interagency Coordinating Councils (ICC)  
The Emery County Housing Authority  
The Housing Authority of S.E. Utah  
Active Re-Entry – Independent Living Center  
Colleen Quigley Domestic Violence Shelter  
Seek Haven Family Crisis Center  
Gentle Iron Hawk Domestic Violence Shelter  
Four Corners Community Behavioral Health  
San Juan County Behavioral Health District

## Community Services Programs

The Grand County Homeless Coordinating Committee (and Continuum of Care Committee)

The Carbon/Emery Homeless Coordinating Committee (and Continuum of Care Committee)

The San Juan County Homeless Coordinating Committee

Balance of State Homeless Coordinating Committee

The Southeastern Utah Economic Development District

County Economic Development Offices

Tri-Partite (CSBG) Advisory Board

Carbon, Emery, Grand and San Juan County School Districts

Public safety agencies in all four (4) counties

The local Department of Vocational Rehabilitation Office

The local offices of the Department of Workforce Services

Solutions of Moab (non-profit homeless service agency)

## **Narrative 1 - Lead Based Paint**

*Estimate the number of housing units that are occupied by extremely low, low, and moderate-income residents that contain lead based paint hazards, as defined in section 1004 of the Residential Lead Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992. Describe how lead issues will be mitigated in structures receiving HUD funds for rehabilitation?*

District-wide between 40% and 60% of the single family housing stock is over 40 years old. After manufactured/mobile home units, this older housing makes up the majority of the units that house lower income households. Although an in-depth district-wide study cannot be done, the results of the limited lead-based paint testing that has been done in the past leads the SEUALG to estimate that up to 35% of the housing units in the southeast Utah region contain some level of lead based paint. In other words, of the approximately 7900 housing units built prior to 1978, 2900 units are presumed to contain lead based paint.

All homes participating in the SEUALG's housing rehabilitation program, that were built prior to 1978, are inspected for lead based paint hazards and tested for the presence of lead based paint.. If lead is found the appropriate mitigation measures are undertaken as required by law, including requiring the use of certified contractors and safe work practices. The homeowner also has the choice to opt out of the program altogether. All owners of homes built prior to 1978 are given a "Renovate Right" pamphlet.

The SEUALG Rehabilitation

Program Manager is a certified lead based paint inspector and risk assessor. The SEUALG Weatherization Program Manager is a certified lead based paint inspector and both staff members are certified to use the agency's XRF machine.

The SEUALG's business technical assistance program provides information and resources to potential and existing contractors about state and federal regulations concerning lead based paint certification and safe work practices.

## Narrative 2 - Market Conditions

*Describe the significant characteristics of the housing market in terms of the supply, demand, condition, and the cost of housing.<sup>1</sup>*

Southeastern Utah was never part of the housing boom experienced in other parts of the country. That does not mean, however, the housing and construction downturn and economic recession did not affect the district's housing markets. Housing markets were affected later than the rest of the county; as foreclosures increased by a multiple of five (5).

While housing costs were never over inflated the ability of lower income households in this district to obtain decent affordable housing has been affected. House flipping never became popular in southeastern Utah. However, during the era of free and easy credit many low-income people gave into the desire to become a homeowner and used some type of sub-prime loan to achieve the dream. When unfavorable changes to the terms of these loans took effect, many of these sub-prime mortgages went into foreclosure. RealtyTrac reports that approximately 57 properties were foreclosed in the southeastern Utah district during 2013. The regional Community Development Corporation's Foreclosure program was not funded for 2011-2013 years. Like the rest of the country, tightening of the credit markets has made it much more difficult for households to purchase or build a home. This market condition is especially concerning in southeastern Utah because by far the majority (74%) of the housing is owner-occupied and, outside of the public housing units, there are very few multi-family rental units available. The rental housing that is available is often outside of the affordability range of about 45% of the district's low-income households. The most current report of 2012 Annual Report on Poverty in Utah, published by the Utah Community Action Programs, reports the following rent burden rates for the district's counties:

<b>County</b>	<b>% of LMI Renters Unable To Afford FMR For 2 Bedroom Unit</b>
Carbon County	53%
Emery County	29%
Grand County	36%
San Juan County	34%

Besides basic affordability, the quality of the housing available to low-income households is often deteriorated or dilapidated. Because so much of the housing in the district is either 40 plus years old or is a manufactured/mobile home, housing quality and energy efficiency are major issues.

Although, private construction of single family homes picked up a bit through 2011, from January of 2009 through December of 2010 construction of new dwelling units in the district stayed relatively flat. . During 2011 and 2012 there were increases in duplex and apartment units being constructed; but a decrease in overall unit construction from the two years prior. A full report for 2013 was not available at the time of this writing.

---

<sup>1</sup> *If a state intends to use HOME funds for tenant based assistance, it must specify local market conditions that led to the choice of that option.*

<b>Number of Housing Units Constructed (2009-2013)</b>					
Year	Duplex/Apt	MFH/Mobile	Single Family	Other Units	Total Units
2009	2	60	102	5	169
2010	8	46	85	5	184
2011	12	19	104	7	140
2012	8	18	109	13	147
2013	0	3	8	0	11

The district's housing authorities continue to report increased wait lists and longer wait times for both rental vouchers and units. Most of the families applying for help are single mothers with 1 to 3 children. For Housing Authority wait times range from 24 months in Carbon County, 12 months in Emery County and 18 months in Grand/San Juan Counties. The number of households on the wait lists range from 5 to 287 individuals/families. Surveys of affordable housing plans and information gathered during the Consolidated Planning process shows that district-wide approximately 1950 additional units of affordable housing (or rent subsidies) are necessary to resolve the housing burden of those low-income (at or below 80% of median income) households that are paying more than 30% of their income for rent, or who live in deficient housing.

Advocacy agencies also report a need for units adapted for those with physical disabilities, mental disabilities, youth aging out of the foster care system and people being discharged from nursing homes, jails, and hospitals. Further, agencies continue to experience a downward slide in their overall funding. Housing Authorities have lost (on average) up to 40% of their funding over the last decade. Active Re-Entry, which provides services for people with disabilities, across the state over the past four (4) years there was 1.1 million dollars, today there is \$250,000 available for those individuals that are program eligible to include income eligible. Depending on funding source; Loan Bank items do not have financial criteria attached, but items purchased by the State funding does. . In the last federal fiscal year, there were 528 individuals with disabilities enrolled in the AT program in Southeastern Utah. This funding helps keep people in their homes by providing ramps, grab bars, roll-in showers and wheel chair/scooter repairs, etc. without charge to income qualified clients. In-home services programs that maintain many elderly in their homes, rather than institutions, have lost significant funding. With the conversion of the district's one emergency shelter into transitional housing there is no longer any housing available for the chronically homeless who also have criminal records that prevent them from participating in most housing programs.

Overall, the ability of the district's low and very low income residents to obtain decent, safe and affordable housing has become much more difficult, especially in the last four years.

## **Narrative 3 - Barriers to Affordable Housing**

*Explain whether the cost of housing or the incentives to develop, maintain, or improve affordable housing are affected by public policies, particularly those of the state. Such policies include tax policy, land use controls, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limits, and policies that affect the return on residential investment. Also describe the overall assessment of housing in the area served under this Consolidated Plan.*

Southeastern Utah district is so sparsely populated the extraordinary land use, zoning, and construction requirements that sometimes prohibit the development of affordable housing in more urban/suburban areas are rarely found in this district. Communities in southeastern Utah have historically used a “pay as you go” system of financing infrastructure expansion (sewer, water, electric lines, natural gas lines, streets, and sidewalks/curb/gutter). In order to mitigate the costs of infrastructure development, new housing and commercial development is usually kept as close as possible to existing cities and towns. Because there is no public transportation available in the district, it’s vital that affordable housing (especially that designed for the low-wage worker) be developed close to jobs, services, and schools. The result is that affordable housing projects must compete against well financed, private development for the same scarce land and public infrastructure access. These two basic “realities” have the effect of increasing costs for development in general and affordable housing in particular.

Because of growth/development pressures associated with the tourism industry, some communities in southeastern Utah have infrastructure impact fees as high as \$10,000 per unit, including each apartment in a multi-family development. This is a significant cost for a low-income housing project to absorb. And because the scarce availability of land in the areas where growth is/has occurred (again, mostly the counties with a significant tourism industry), land costs also often present a barrier to affordable housing. Several communities in southeastern Utah are trying to address some of these barriers by adopting zoning ordinances that encourage the development of affordable housing, i.e., allowing for accessory dwellings, offering high-density bonuses for affordable housing, and relaxing some development requirements (sidewalk parkways, open areas, and landscaping regulations, for instance)

Generally, the primary barrier to the availability of affordable housing in southeastern Utah is the lower wages and incomes within the district. Recent budget cuts do not allow for programs to be offered in these smaller districts. Because tourism is a primary component of the district's economy, and wages in this industry are significantly below the state average, lower income workers often find it difficult to obtain decent, affordable housing.

Because of stagnant population growth during 2000 and 2010, developers have not found it profitable to invest in the district. Except for multi-family type housing units developed as second homes or as investment properties which are rented for tourist room sales and vacation housing, almost all of the housing built in the last ten years has been single family units, constructed one unit at a time by the owner/occupant. A significant portion of those single family units were manufactured homes which do not retain their value, are difficult to finance in the current market and usually have higher maintenance and energy costs.

Finally, because much of the single family housing in the district, including units available for rent, is well over 40 years old, poor housing condition is a major barrier to affordable housing. Housing authorities in southeastern Utah report that often voucher clients end up turning their vouchers in because they cannot find a housing unit that meets the minimum habitability standards at the fair market rate.

## **Narrative 4 - Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing**

*The state is required to conduct an analysis to identify impediments to fair housing choice within the state. The analysis is updated annually. Although HUD does not require the analysis to be submitted as part of the Consolidated Plan, the state submits the analysis and updates with the Consolidated Plan and annual updates. In addition, the state must certify that it will affirmatively further fair housing; which means it will conduct the analysis, take appropriate actions to overcome the effects of any impediments, and maintain records reflecting the analysis and actions in this regard. The AOGs should discuss any local impediments to Fair Housing choice and actions to be taken to minimize those impediments..*

Low incomes combined with a lack of affordable multi-family rental units in general is the primary impediment to fair housing in southeastern Utah

While the southeast Utah district does have a relatively high percentage of minority residents (primarily Hispanic and Native American), communities with neighborhood concentrations of minority populations do not exist in this district like they do in more urban communities. Although most of the Native American population lives in San Juan County, in the non-reservation communities there are not neighborhood concentrations of minority, aging or disabled residents. Rather, most of the cities and neighborhoods in southeastern Utah are a random mix of races, ethnic origins, and housing types and value. However, because economic conditions limit housing choice, an inadequate supply of decent affordable housing in the southeast Utah district is the primary obstacle to fair housing.

In the southeast Utah district the protected class that is most affected by impediments to fair housing is "people with disabilities." Because there is so little multi-family rental housing available in southeastern Utah, renters with physical disabilities have an especially difficult time obtaining housing that has been adequately modified to remove mobility barriers. People with mental disabilities also lack housing choice because of the lack of units affordable to very low income citizens in general, coupled with the inadequate level and availability of supportive services.

The housing programs operated by the housing authorities and SEUALG emphasize improving both the quality and quantity of units adapted to residents with disabilities.

## **Narrative 5 - Method of Distribution**

*Provide a description of the methods of distributing funds to local governments and nonprofit organizations to carry out activities or the activities the state will undertake, using funds expected to be received during the program year under the formula allocations (and related program income) and other HUD assistance. Explain how the proposed distribution of funds will address the priority needs and objectives described in the Consolidated Plan.*

The Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments determines funding criteria only for the CDBG program. The SEUALG Rating and Ranking committee uses the information provided by the Consolidated Planning and Annual Plan Update process to determine the region's rating and ranking policies. The actual rating and ranking policies are finalized in July/August of each year. Based on priorities identified in the 2010-2015 Consolidated Plan and this update, projects will be awarded funding based on the amount of direct benefit to income qualified residents, how mature the project is, and the following priorities:

### **1. HOUSING AND HOMELESS PROJECTS**

Housing and homeless projects that increase the number of units or rehabilitate the existing housing/units for income qualified households and homeless individuals and families.

### **2. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS**

Projects that directly provide economic development or job creation benefit to income eligible residents.

### **3. COMMUNITY AND HUMAN SERVICES FACILITIES**

Projects that increase or improve facilities that provides human services (food banks, daycare centers, senior centers, medical clinics, improved access (beyond basic ADA compliance) for people with disabilities, etc.). Applicants will be required to document how the project provides or improves access to a direct benefit or service for income qualified clients rather than primarily providing benefit to the agency or facility itself:

### **3. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS**

Projects that provide general community development benefit to income qualified communities or neighborhoods will be rated and ranked under the following priorities:

A. Culinary water projects

B. Sewer projects

C. Waste water projects

D. General ADA compliance projects (curb cuts, ramping government buildings, parking lot striping, park restroom adaptations, etc.); multi-purpose community center projects (not including sports facilities)

E. Public safety projects (fire protection, emergency and ambulance service)

F. Public service projects (within the limits set by both the federal and state governments and the rating and ranking committee) that provide a direct benefit to the targeted client group:

G. Recreation projects (parks & park improvements, playground equipment, sports centers/skate parks/ball courts, etc.

H. Basic public facilities such as sidewalk curb & gutter, street signage, etc.

I. General planning for communities such as water system master planning, community master planning, capital facilities master planning, etc.

The design and engineering services needed for CDBG eligible construction projects will be considered for funding under the actual construction or project category.

In the past, applications for the southeastern Utah housing rehabilitation programs funded with HOME and CDBG money have not been at a level that a wait list needed to be developed, or that

the district's prioritization system (disabled, elderly, children under 6 yrs of age, etc.) be implemented to determine who receives funding and when. Likewise, restrictions on how many housing rehabilitation applications can or will be accepted from any community have not been necessary. It is not anticipated that either wait listing or priority restrictions will become necessary during the period covered by this Consolidated Plan update.

## **Narrative 6 - Sources of Funds**

*Identify the resources from private and public sources, including those amounts allocated under HUD formula grant programs and program income that are reasonably expected to be made available to address the needs identified in the Consolidated Plan. Explain how Federal funds made available will leverage resources from private and non-federal public sources and describe how matching requirements of HUD programs will be satisfied. Where deemed appropriate, indicate publicly owned land or property that may be utilized to carry out the plan.*

### **Housing Development Projects**

CDBG = \$550,000 to fund rehabilitation of 21 units of public housing, rehabilitation of up to 12-15 owner-occupied homes, provide program delivery and technical assistance services to approximately 33 housing rehabilitation clients, and update the Consolidated Plan.

OWHLF = \$100,000 for single-family rehabilitation projects

HOME = \$783,000 for multi-family rehabilitation projects and \$100,000 for single family self-help acquisition/rehab projects.

LIHTC = \$5,000,000 for a multi-family project

USDA-Rural Development = \$700,000 for single family housing rehabilitation (504), the 502 home purchase program, and 14 units of mutual self-help single family housing

HUD Homeless/CoC funding - \$150,000 to fund ongoing homeless supportive services and housing projects.

TANF Funding = \$28,200 to provide housing and homeless prevention assistance to income qualified clients with dependent children.

USDA-RD 523 Grant = \$279,000 to use starting January 2013, to provide administration of Self-Help Acquisition/Rehabilitation Housing Program in Carbon/Emery Counties for 12 homes

### **Community Development Projects**

Because housing projects are such a high priority in southeast Utah, very little CDBG/HUD funding is available for general community development projects. While district entities are always willing to apply for CDBG funding to provide the infrastructure needed for housing development, almost all community development projects are funded by loans and grants from the state's Community Impact Board (mineral lease monies). It is expected that cities and counties in southeastern Utah will apply for approximately \$72,000,000 in CIB grants and loans to fund their listed community development projects. Also, many of the Special Service Districts are eligible to apply for the Water Quality and Wastewater State Revolving Fund Loan Program.

District communities also apply for USDA-Rural Development funding for many of their community development needs.

## **Economic Development Projects**

The primary source of funding for economic development is the district's revolving loan fund programs and the local funding provided to the Business Expansion and Retention Program (BEAR). Again, because housing projects are such a high priority in southeastern Utah, economic development projects are rarely funded with HUD monies. Occasionally funding from the Economic Development Administration is applied for to help fund the expansion of infrastructure for a specific economic development project.

## **Narrative 7 – Monitoring**

*Briefly describe actions that will take place during the next year to monitor housing and community development activities and to ensure long term compliance with program requirements and comprehensive planning requirements. Program requirements include appropriate regulations and statutes of the programs involved, steps being taken to review affordable housing activities, efforts to ensure timeliness of expenditures, on-site inspections to determine compliance with applicable housing codes, and actions to be taken to monitor sub-recipients.*

Monitoring of HUD programs is the responsibility of the State of Utah. However, the SEUALG can fill a partnership role by ensuring that all the activities it operates with HUD funding are conducted according to the required regulation. The SEUALG also provides local technical assistance in the areas of environmental assessments, Davis/Bacon regulations, pre-construction conferences, pre-monitoring reviews, etc., to the district's communities to ensure that projects are in compliance with program regulations and requirements.

## **Narrative 8 - Specific HOME Submission Requirements**

*The plan must briefly describe specific HOME actions proposed. Describe the resale or recapture policy that applies for the use of HOME funds.*

The State of Utah is responsible for compliance with HUD's HOME program regulations. The SEUALG operates the owner-occupied single family rehabilitation program in southeastern Utah with funding provided by the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund. The SEUALG complies with the *RURAL UTAH SINGLE FAMILY 2011-2012 Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund Program Guidance & Rules* developed and published by the State of Utah. These documents can be found at: <http://housing.utah.gov/owhlf/programs.html>

## **Narrative 9 - Specific HOPWA Submission Requirement**

*HIV/AIDS Housing Goals – For areas receiving these funds, identify methods of selecting project sponsors (including providing full access to grass-roots faith-based and other community organizations) and annual goals for the number of households to be provided with housing through activities that provide short-term rent, mortgage and utility assistance payments to*

*prevent homelessness of the individual or family, tenant-based rental assistance; and units provided in housing facilities that are being developed, leased or operated.*

Because fewer than one or two persons with HIV/AIDS are identified each year within southeastern Utah, HOPWA funded housing is not considered a need at this time.

Because the numbers of HIV/AIDS residents in southeastern Utah are so small, housing issues for this group can be resolved by regular community projects and funding.

## **Narrative 10 - Homeless and other Special Needs (including ESG)**

*Describe activities to address emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless individuals and homeless families (especially extremely low income) to prevent them from becoming homeless, to help homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, specific action steps to end chronic homelessness, and to address the special needs of persons who are not homeless that were identified in the strategic plan as needing housing or housing with supportive services. Describe the status of the homeless coordinating council(s) serving the area covered by the Consolidated Plan. Describe any actions being taken to achieve objectives listed in Table 2C.*

### **Homeless**

Two major projects were completed in Carbon County during 2010. One was the rehabilitation of the emergency shelter located in Helper City which included converting that facility into transitional housing. This rehabilitation brought the 100 year old building up to code and solved serious ADA and energy efficiency problems. However, with the conversion of this building from emergency shelter to transitional housing there are now no emergency shelter facilities in southeastern Utah. The new transitional housing facility will target the chronically homeless individual and very small families. However, residents will be required to pay a minimal rent and pass back-ground/criminal reviews. Homelessness is an issue in southeastern Utah, but it often takes the form of families and individuals being forced to double up and/or live in housing units that do not meet basic safety and habitability standards (especially older mobile homes). However, housing for the people who are chronically mentally ill and/or substance abusers and who also have criminal records that prevent them from living in housing authority or other traditional housing units has been identified as a particular need.

There are three domestic violence shelters operating in the district, but stays at these shelters are usually limited to 30 days. There are no transitional housing programs or units geared toward families, so often shelter clients have to choose between continuing to live with their abusers and becoming homeless. Options for emergency shelter for single men and families that are not the victims of domestic violent are generally limited to short-term (2 to 30 days) motel or rent payments. The emergency assistance provided by the Community Services Block Grant funding (available in Carbon, Emery & Grand Counties), United Way, Salvation Army, and through the Department of Workforce Services is limited by funding availability. All of these programs have

sustained significant funding cuts in the last 36 months and have had to reduce elements of the services they provide.

### **Other Special Needs Housing**

Service providers identify housing adapted to people with disabilities, including senior citizens as a special need. Besides generally not having enough affordable units with ADA adaptations to meet the need, funding for in-home support and care-giver services, minor ADA adaptations and assistive devices has been almost eliminated in the last few years. This funding and the programs they supported allowed people to remain in their own homes and helped prevent homelessness.

Specific projects identified in the capital improvements lists are:

1. 60 Unit of multi-family rental housing for low income families in Grand County
2. 10 additional units/ 12 beds added to an existing facility that provides permanent supportive housing to people who are homeless and mentally ill.
3. 75 units of multi-family rental housing for very low-income families in Carbon
4. Replacement of the spouse abuse shelter building in Carbon
5. Other needs identified are increases in the number of rental vouchers administered through the housing authorities, and other rent subsidy programs, and restoration of funds that provide services to people with disabilities.
6. Rehabilitation of a residential treatment facility (11 units) for substance abuse clients.

### Homeless Implementation Plan

The regional homeless coordinating and continuum of care committees continue to coordinate their strategies and implementation plans with the Utah Balance of State Homeless Coordinating Committee. While resources for implementation of projects that address the homeless needs in the district are scarce, continued coordination of services and information continues to be the goal of the district's homeless providers.

Goal: Reduce the number of homeless individuals and families and improve services

1. Provide resource and referral for Services by maintaining lines of communication between service agencies.
2. Coordinate services by training staff to be familiar with services offered by other agencies.
3. Increase the supply of housing by identifying needs and gaps, assisting housing developers and supportive service providers to partner in new projects, assist developers to include very low income units in their projects.
4. Provide short and long term resources to homeless persons by providing supplemental food, utility and rent payments (CSBG, rental assistance, etc.)
5. Increase participation in mainstream support programs by providing assistance to clients to access food stamp programs, disability support programs, and health (mental and physical) programs.

In general the overall priorities to address homelessness and special housing needs in southeastern Utah continue to be:

1. Develop additional permanent, supportive and ADA adaptive housing units for the very low income household
2. Continue to rehabilitate existing housing units including ADA adaptations
3. Develop transitional housing units
  
4. Develop additional units for senior citizens and people with disabilities.
5. Develop emergency (including winter shelter) shelters in at least two counties.

Recognizing the importance for safe, decent, affordable housing plays in both healthy communities and healthy economies, the Southeastern Utah Association of Governments Board has taken an active role in housing development, rehabilitation, and planning and technical assistance programs on a region-wide basis. For over 20 years the Rating and Ranking Committee has dedicated a significant portion of the region's CDBG allocation to affordable housing activities and projects. Further, the SEUALG Board has directed that the CDBG funds be coordinated with HOME and other HUD funding, Rural Development programs, and Weatherization/HEAT programs in order to maximize the limited available resources.

## **Narrative 11 - Discharge Coordination Policy**

*Every jurisdiction receiving McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG), Supportive Housing, Shelter Plus Care, or Section 8 SRO Program funds should develop and implement a "Discharge Coordination Policy, to the maximum extent practicable. Such a policy should include "policies and protocols for the discharge of persons from publicly funded institutions or systems of care (such as health care facilities, foster care or other youth facilities, or correction programs and institutions) in order to prevent such discharge from immediately resulting in homelessness for such persons." The jurisdiction should describe its planned activities to implement a cohesive, community-wide Discharge Coordination Policy and how the community will move toward such a policy.*

During 2012-2013 the SEUALG has been working with the district's continuum of care committees to develop formal discharge plans that reflect local needs. However, several barriers to implementation of a formal plan have been identified. These barriers are mostly related to lack of funding and regulations that prevent many people from obtaining housing and supportive services once they leave jail, mental or medical facilities.

These barriers include:

### **CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH SYSTEMS**

1. Clients have no income and are not employable
2. Clients have lost their eligibility to qualify for SSI or SSDI
3. Clients also lose their Medicaid or Medicare coverage when they are incarcerated
4. Criminal or mental health histories of clients are such that they cannot qualify for housing in any of the district's housing authority, LIHTC or transitional housing units
5. Because the communities in southeastern Utah are small and close-knit a history of problems with previous landlords often means other landlords won't rent to clients.

6. Because clients have no income or other resources they aren't able to obtain the necessary supportive mental health or substance abuse treatment.
7. Even when clients have families and housing they are often unable to maintain themselves in the housing because of the lack of other resources.

#### MEDICAL AND LONG TERM CARE FACILITIES

1. Resources to provide senior and disabled residents in-home services are inadequate and sustained further cuts in the last 2 years. Hospitals and nursing care facilities are reluctant to discharge patients when they know they are going to face inadequate care.
2. Lack of disability adaptations in the district's housing units often prevents patients from returning to their homes. Resources that previously provided equipment and adaptive technology have been eliminated.
3. Lack of transportation; frequently patients could be discharged to their homes, but there are no human services transportation programs in the district anymore and very often the patients cannot drive and have no family member that can drive.

While planning for formal discharge coordination is continuing, the biggest barrier to achieving a comprehensive system is lack of funding. District human services agencies and housing organizations are not able to commit to actions and services for which they do not have funding. Because there is not enough funding to provide the necessary mental health and substance abuse services, in home services (i.e. Medicaid Waiver) and long-term housing subsidies, a formal discharge coordination plan has yet to be adopted.

In the meantime, informal systems to provide services and obtain housing have been implemented by the continuum of care committees and the interagency coordinating councils.

### **Narrative 12 - Allocation Priorities and Geographic Distribution**

*The action plan must describe the reasons for the allocation priorities and identify the geographic areas (including areas of low-income and minority concentration and specific communities, by name, with distressed and disadvantaged populations) in which it will direct focus and assistance during the program year. For each of these named communities, include a brief explanation of how needs will be met and resources focused. For programs in which the funds are distributed through a competitive process and cannot predict the ultimate geographic distribution of the assistance, a statement must be included in the action plan indicating that fact. In instances where areas receiving funds have already been identified by the time the Consolidated Plan is submitted, the geographic areas where assistance will be provided (including identification of areas of minority concentration) must be described in the action plan. Where the method of distribution includes an allocation of resources based on geographic areas, the rationale for the priorities for such allocation must be provided. Identify any obstacles to addressing underserved needs. Where appropriate, estimate the percentage of funds to be awarded to targeted areas. Key indicators for measuring performance should be included in table 2C.*

## **ALLOCATION PRIORITIES AND GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION**

The only HUD program the SEUALG has the responsibility to allocate is the CDBG program. Because there are no concentrations of poverty, minority populations, and deteriorated neighborhoods within the district, and all but 2 of the communities in this district can be identified as disadvantaged, the SEUALG has not developed a geographic distribution or allocation plan for the CDBG funding.

Rather, based on the needs identified by the annual updates to this Consolidated Plan and the capital improvements planning process SEUALG Rating and Ranking Committee has determined that CDBG funding will be targeted to projects according to the following priorities:

### **1<sup>ST</sup> PRIORITY - HOUSING:**

- a. New permanent low income housing units
- b. Rehabilitation of existing permanent housing units
- c. New supportive and ADA adaptive units
- d. Transitional housing units
- e. Emergency shelter units

### **2<sup>ND</sup> PRIORITY – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:**

- a. Projects that provide permanent jobs to low and very low income residents

### **3<sup>rd</sup> PRIORITY – COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:**

- a. Culinary water projects
- b. Sewer projects
- c. Storm drainage projects
- d. Public safety
- e. Facilities that provide services to income qualified clients
- f. ADA Access
- g. Multi-purpose community centers
- h. Transportation
- i. Recreation projects
- j. Public facilities (sidewalk/curb/gutter)
- k. General community, facility, or master planning.

When there is competition for funds within a particular category, the level of low-income benefit drives the decision of which project is funded.

## **Narrative 13 - Community Development (CDBG)**

*Other Actions -- Describe the CDBG-supported actions plans to be taken during the next year to: address obstacles to meeting underserved needs, foster and maintain affordable housing (including the coordination of Low-Income Housing Tax Credits with the development of affordable housing), remove barriers to affordable housing, evaluate and reduce lead based paint hazards, reduce the number of poverty level families, develop institutional structure, and enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies, and*

*foster public housing resident initiatives. The CDBG narrative must also describe steps taken to minimize the amount of displacement due to acquisition, rehabilitation or demolition of occupied real property. Economic development needs and actions can also be described.*

## **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

Rating and ranking for 2014-2015 CDBG projects will not take place until after this action plan has been submitted. The following projects and activities have been applied for and may receive funding at some level. All of the community development projects have an LMI benefit of at least 60%. The projects related to housing have an LMI benefit of 100%

1. Coordinate CDBG, OWHLF, Rural Development and Weatherization Funds to rehabilitate up to 15 owner occupied homes of low-income residents (district-wide) and provide closing cost assistance to 12 homebuyers participating in the Self-help acquisition/rehab program. Home owners will also received program delivery services in the form of assistance to fill out application and obtain needed documentation, assessment of their housing rehabilitation needs (including lead-based paint testing and assessments), development of scopes of work (including Energy Star standards), supervision of the actual construction, coordination of work and payment of contractors, suppliers, etc.
2. Construct expanded public infrastructure needed to develop a 60 unit low-income multi-family rental housing project (Grand County). This project will be financed with a combination of HOME, LIHTC and other public and private funding.
3. Rehabilitate 21 units of public housing including new roofing, insulation and replacement of windows to improve energy efficiency. (Carbon County)
4. Replace 657 feet, manholes, 4 lateral connections, and a lateral to the main sewer line in an LMI neighborhood.
6. Complete the 2014 update to this Consolidated Plan, coordinate with the districts homeless coordinating and continuum of care committees to update their plans and conduct the homeless point in time count. Provide project development assistance to the district's entities, with an emphasis on benefit to the region's low and very low income residents.

While citizens affected by these projects may experience some minor disruption and inconvenience during some stages of construction, none of the planned projects is anticipated to have any displacement effect on individuals or businesses.

The southeastern Utah CDBG rating and ranking policies for the 2014-2015 funding year can be found at: [www.seualg.utah.gov](http://www.seualg.utah.gov)

## **Narrative 14 - Economic Development (CDBG)**

*Describe plan to assist businesses in creating jobs for low income persons, enhance coordination with private industry, businesses, developers, and social service agencies, particularly with regard to the development of the region's economic development strategy.*

While economic development activities are a high priority in the district's CDBG Rating and Ranking system, no economic development projects have been applied for and no economic

development projects have been funded in more than a decade. Because the level of CDBG funding is low and because housing projects are so highly rated, like general community development projects, economic development projects are generally not competitive.

Should an outstanding economic development project be submitted it, would need to provide a 100% LMI benefit in order to earn enough points to be awarded funding.

## **Narrative 15 - Energy Efficiency**

*Describe how capital improvement projects and structures funded with HOME, CDBG, ESG, and HOPWA dollars will receive cost effective energy upgrades for long-term utility cost savings and for a healthier environment. Please note that any projects funded through the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund Board and Private Activity Bond Board are required to be ENERGY STAR-qualified..*

The SEUALG single-family housing rehab program, which uses Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund, Rural Development, and CDBG funding in its projects, follows Energy Star standards or HERS score of at least 60 on all homes that undergo major rehabilitation. The housing rehabilitation program also coordinates with the district's weatherization program so that the maximum improvements in energy efficiency can be achieved in each project. All replacement unit projects are designed to achieve the full Energy Star designation or HERS score of 60 or better. All individual components replaced during rehabilitation must have an Energy Star label. Where possible all general community development projects include energy efficiency components in their design and construction.

## **Narrative 16 - Sustainability and Green Projects**

*Describe how capital improvement projects and structures funded with HOME, CDBG, ESG, and HOPWA dollars meet nationally recognized levels of sustainability or "greenness" such as the Rural Community Assistance Council (RCAC) "mid green" level, the Enterprise Green Community's Checklist, or the LEED Silver rating.*

Because of economic distress, lack of population growth, and the relative remoteness of the southeastern Utah district there has not been community-wide or neighborhood-wide development in southeastern Utah like there has been in the more urban areas of the state. Most of the small towns in southeastern Utah haven't updated their general plans in many years. However, as these plans are updated sustainability and energy efficiency is included as a component of new development regulations, including allowing residential retrofitting of solar and wind generated electrical systems.

Two of the district's cities have been able to achieve a more active and advanced sustainability approach.

Moab City has been designated a "Blue Sky" community and a Green Power Community Partner. The city has also joined the Community Clean Energy Challenge program. All public building/structures developed in the city during the last 5yrs have earned at least the LEED Silver rating. Moab City has also adopted policies that encourage new homes and business to

use sustainable wind generated electric power. About 4% of the electrical demand in the area is met with wind power.

Price City participates in the Alliance to Save Energy Program which provides information and education to business and households on energy conservation. Price City has expanded its' recycling program for paper and aluminum and completed approximately 2 miles of a community trails system.

SEUALG CDBG staff serves on the Resource Conservation and Development board and participates in the development of projects that promote sustainable energy sources such as bio-mass, wind power and solar energy production.

## **Narrative 17 - Section 3**

*Describe how capital improvement projects and structures funded with HOME, CDBG, ESG, and HOPWA dollars achieve compliance to the federal Section 3 requirements to ensure that economic opportunities generated from HUD funded projects, to the greatest extent feasible, will be directed to low and very low-income persons - particularly those receiving assistance from housing, and the businesses that provide them economic opportunities.*

Section 3 regulations require that the employment and other economic opportunities (sub-contracting and providing materials) created by federal financial assistance for housing and community development programs should, as much as possible, be targeted toward low- and very-low income persons, particularly those who are recipients of government assistance for housing.

People who meet the Section 3 requirements

1. Public housing residents
2. Low and very-low income persons who live in the metropolitan area or Non-metropolitan County where a HUD-assisted project for housing or community development is located.

The southeastern Utah district rarely receives enough HUD funding for any one project that compliance and reporting for Section 3 requirements becomes necessary. However, because most of the projects are small, local contractors who hire local residents are usually the only contractors who bid on the projects.

## Narrative 18 - Other

### 2014FY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT LIST (possibly HUD funded)

Entity	County Area Priority	Description	Total Costs	Funding Sources
<b>CARBON COUNTY</b>				
Carbon County MBA	A	SITLA Road Easement Purchase	\$354,000	CIB/Local
Carbon County MBA	A	Jail Expansion	\$10,000,000	CIB/Local
Carbon County MBA	A	Nine Mile Canyon Road Improvements	\$16,000,000	CIB
USU—Eastern	B	Mesozoic Gardens	\$10,000,000	Land/Fed/State/Local/Other/CIB
East Carbon City	B	Equipment and Recreation	\$449,000	CIB/Fed/Local
East Carbon City	A	Water Transfer Lines	\$650,000	CIB/CDBG
East Carbon City	B	Industrial Park Improvements	\$250,000	CIB /CDBG
East Carbon City	B	New Cemetery	\$200,000	CIB
Helper City	A	River Restoration Project	\$6,000,000	CIB/Fed/State/Other
Helper City	A	Storm Water Management Upgrade	\$500,000	CIB/Other
Helper City	A	Water Tank Repair	\$520,000	CIB/Other
Helper City	A	Replace Sewer Lines	\$600,000	CIB/Other
Helper City	A	Replace Various Water Lines	\$600,000	CIB/Other
Helper City	A	Repair Underground Tank	\$1,000,000	CIB/Other
Helper City	A	City Hall/Public Works Building	\$1,500,000	CIB/Other
Helper City	B	Main Park/Playground/Pavilion	\$400,000	CIB/Other
Scotfield Town	A	Wastewater System Improvements	\$250,000	CIB
Scotfield Town	A	Fire Station/Town Hall Building & Fire Engine	\$1,500,000	County/CIB
Scotfield Town	B	Street Improvements	\$600,000	CIB

Sunnyside	B	Backhoe/Mower	\$75,000	CIB
Sunnyside	B	Sidewalk, Curb & Gutter	\$600,000	CIB/CDBG
Wellington City	A	Sewer Main Upgrades	\$1,500,000	CIB/CDBG/Other
<b>EMERY COUNTY</b>				
Emery Town	A	Water Source Development	\$1,500,000	CIB/CDBG
Emery Town	B	Culinary Water Improvements	\$1,000,000	CIB/CDBG/Other
Ferron City	A	Curb, gutter, and sidewalk	\$300,000	CIB/Other/CDBG
Clawson Town	B	Ball field improvements	\$40,000	CIB/CDBG/Other
Elmo Town	B	Sidewalk Construction	\$200,000	CIB/CDBG/Other
Ferron City	B	Mayor's Park improvements	\$25,000	CIB/Other/CDBG
Green River City	A	Fire station	\$1,500,000	CIB/Other/CDBG
Green River City	A	Flood/drainage control	\$500,000	CIB/CDBG/Other
Orangeville City	A	Curb, gutter & sidewalks	\$500,000	CIB/CDBG
Orangeville City	A	City Water Main Replacement	\$400,000	CIB/CDBG/Other
Orangeville City	A	Ball complex improvements	\$50,000	CIB/Other/CDBG
<b>GRAND COUNTY</b>				
Moab Valley Fire District	A	New Fire Rescue Truck	\$350,000	Local, CIB
Canyonlands Field Airport	B	Expansion of Main Terminal Secured Area	\$600,000	CIB
Grand County Cemetery Maintenance District	A	Pressurized Irrigation and Water Drainage Systems for 2 cemeteries	\$200,000	CIB
Grand County	A	EMS & Jail Expansion Feasibility & Concept Study	\$150,000	CIB, Local/Other
Grand County	A	Jail Locks/Security Systems and Courthouse Capital Improvements for ADA Compliance on Entire Building	\$1,750,000	Local, CIB

Grand County MBA	A	Building for Emergency Medical Services	\$2,900,000	Other/USDA, Grand County Land, Grand County/EMS, CIB
Grand County MBA	A	Comprehensive Public Facilities Plan	\$75,000	CIB, Local
Grand County MBA	B	New Jail Facility	\$10,000,000	CIB
Spanish Valley Water & Sewer Improvement District	B	Fire Flow Pump for Navajo Ridge Area	\$150,000	CIB
Grand County/city of Moab/Utah State University	A	Road Infrastructure for USU Campus. Completed Comprehensive rate plan - 40 ac + 340 ac SITLA for mixed /Student housing analysis	\$2,500,000	USU, CIB, State Small Urban Road Fund
Grand County	A	Class B and D Road Easement Perfection on SITLA Land	\$349,500	CIB
Grand County	A	Storm Drain Master Plan Conveyance System T and Pond 50	\$3,500,000	CIB, Local
Grand County	A	Storm Drain Master Plan Conveyance System T and Pond 50 (Jackson Street)	\$1,200,000	Grand County, CIB
Canyonlands Field Airport	B	Installation of CCTV Security System	\$75,000	CIB
Grand County	B	Information Technology Upgrades in County Building	\$300,000	CIB/Local
Grand County	B	Development Costs for North Lions Park	\$2,000,000	CIB
Moab City	B	North Water & Area Sewer Service	\$1,000,000	CIB, Local
Moab City	A	Waste Water Facilities	\$7,000,000	Local, CIB
Moab City	A	Highway 191 Gateway Plan/Storm Drainage Improvements along Highway	\$1,200,000	Local, State parks/Scenic Byway, Federal, UDOT, CIB

Grand Water & Sewer Agency (GWSSA)	A	Building Extension and Landscaping Improvements	\$300,000	CIB, Local
GWSSA	A	Security Upgrades to Water Facilities	\$100,000	Local, CIB
<b>SAN JUAN COUNTY</b>				
San Juan Health SSD	A	Lab Equipment	\$200,000	CIB
San Juan Health SSD	B	Portable X-Ray	\$78,000	CIB
San Juan Health SSD	A	Surgery Equipment	\$230,000	CIB
San Juan Health SSD	A	Nursing Equipment	\$450,000	CIB
San Juan County MBA	A	Library Remodel-Monticello	\$1,000,000	USDA, CIB, State
San Juan County MBA	A	Monticello Senior Citizen Center	\$500,000	CIB, Other
San Juan County	A	Ambulance & Aging Vehicles	\$232,000	CIB
Utah Education Network		Microwave Communications System Improvements	\$1,360,000	CIB, UEN
Bluff Service Area		Study for Storm/flood water removal in West Bluff	\$30,000	CIB, Local
Bluff Service Area		Detention Basin & Channel Remediation @ Calf Canyon	\$900,000	CIB

*Page Left Blank Intentionally*

## Table 1- Housing, Homeless and Special Needs Assessment

Using the local Affordable Housing Plan(s) and other available data, please complete the HUD-required Table I in the attached EXCEL-based document. Once you are within the EXCEL-based version of this table, HUD information for completing Table 1 is available by clicking on the box labeled "Table 1 Housing, Homeless and Special Needs Assessment". Software for projecting affordable housing needs is available through the Division of Housing and Community Development at:

<http://housing.utah.gov/owhlf/reports.html> Information on homeless populations can be derived from local homeless coordinating committee's projections and data.

<b>Table 1 Housing, Homeless and Special Needs Assessment (Required for Consolidated Plan)</b>							
<b>A. Table I – Housing Needs</b>							
<b>Household Type</b>	<b>Elderly</b> <i>(1&amp;2 person household, either person 62 years old or older)</i>	<b>Small</b> <i>(2-4 members)</i>	<b>Large</b> <i>(5+ members)</i>	<b>All Other</b>	<b>Total Renter</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Total Households</b>
<b>0 –30% of MFI</b>	<b>878</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>607</b>			<b>2305</b>
%Any housing problem	38.09	29.28	6.29	26.33			
%Cost burden > 30%	17.34	13.33	2.86	11.99			
%Cost Burden > 50%	22.78	17.51	3.76	15.75			
<b>31 - 50% of MFI</b>	<b>1209</b>	<b>785</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>376</b>			<b>2615</b>
%Any housing problem	46.23	30.02	9.37	14.38			
%Cost burden > 30%	23.87	15.50	4.84	7.42			
%Cost Burden > 50%	31.36	20.36	6.36	9.75			
<b>51 - 80% of MFI</b>	<b>1389</b>	<b>1260</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>721</b>			<b>3945</b>
%Any housing problem	35.21	31.94	14.58	18.28			
%Cost burden > 30%	27.43	24.88	11.35	14.24			
%Cost Burden > 50%	36.03	32.68	14.92	18.70			
<b>B. Table I – Homeless Continuum of Care: Housing Gap Analysis Chart</b>							

		Current Inventory	Under Development	Unmet Need/Gap
Beds	Emergency Shelter	49	-	75
	Transitional Housing	8	-	10
	Permanent Supportive Housing	8	-	65
	Total	65	-	150

**Persons in Families With Children**

Beds	Emergency Shelter	49	-	15
	Transitional Housing	8	-	15
	Permanent Supportive Housing	-	-	65
	Total	57	-	95

**C. Table I - Continuum of Care: Homeless Population and Subpopulations Chart**

	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
<b>Part 1: Homeless Population</b>				
Number of Families with Children (Family Households)	6	-	3	9
1. Number of Persons in Families with children	6	-	3	9
2. Number of Single Individuals and Persons in Households without Children	7	-	5	12
<b>(Add lines Numbered 1 &amp; 2 Total Persons)</b>	13	-	8	21
<b>Part 2: Homeless Subpopulation</b>				
a. Chronically Homeless	1	-	n/a	1
b. Seriously Mentally Ill	4	-	n/a	4
c. Chronic Substance Abuse	4	-	n/a	4
d. Veterans	0	-	n/a	0
e. Persons with HIV/AIDS	0	-	n/a	0
f. Victims of Domestic Violence	3	-	n/a	3
g. Unaccompanied Youth (Under 18)	0	-	n/a	0

**D. Table 1 - Housing, Homeless and Special Needs**

<b>Special Needs (Non-Homeless) Subpopulations</b>	<b>Unmet Need (renters and owners)</b>
1. Elderly	35
2. Frail Elderly	95
3. Severe Mental Illness	75
4. Developmentally Disabled	35
5. Physically Disabled	50
6. Persons w/Alcohol/Other Drug Addictions	80
7. Persons w/HIV/AIDS	0
8. Victims of Domestic Violence	15
9. Other	5

## Table 2A – State Priority Housing Activities/Investment Plan

Using the data from Table 1 and local housing plans please prioritize the populations for activities and allocation of funds using EXCEL-based Table 2A.

<b>State Priority Housing Activities/Investment Plan</b>			
<b>PART 2 PRIORITY HOUSING NEEDS</b>		<b>Income Level</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
		<b>Household AMI</b>	<b>Indicate High (3), Medium (2), Low (1)</b>
<b>Household Size</b>	<b>Small (5 persons or less with 2 related persons)</b>	0-30%	<b>3</b>
		31-50%	<b>2.5</b>
		51-80%	<b>2</b>
	<b>Large (5 persons or larger with at least 2 related persons)</b>	0-30%	<b>2.5</b>
		31-50%	<b>2.5</b>
		51-80%	<b>2</b>
<b>Rental Units</b>	<b>Elderly</b>	0-30%	<b>2</b>
		31-50%	<b>1</b>
		51-80%	<b>1.5</b>
	<b>All Other</b>	0-30%	<b>2.5</b>
		31-50%	<b>2</b>
		51-80%	<b>1.5</b>
<b>Owner Occupied Units</b>	0-30%	<b>2.5</b>	
	31-50%	<b>2</b>	
	51-80%	<b>2.5</b>	
<b>PART 2</b>		<b>Priority Level</b>	
<b>PRIORITY SPECIAL NEEDS</b>		<b>Indicate High (3), Medium (2), Low (1)</b>	
<b>Elderly</b>		<b>2</b>	
<b>Frail Elderly</b>		<b>1.5</b>	
<b>Severe Mental Illness</b>		<b>2.5</b>	
<b>Developmentally Disabled</b>		<b>1.5</b>	
<b>Physically Disabled</b>		<b>2.5</b>	
<b>Persons w/ Alcohol/Other Drug Addictions</b>		<b>1.5</b>	
<b>Persons w/HIV/AIDS</b>		<b>1</b>	
<b>Victims of Domestic Violence</b>		<b>2.5</b>	
<b>Youth Aging Out of Foster Care</b>		<b>1.5</b>	
<b>Other:</b>		<b>1</b>	

<b>PART 3 PRIORITY</b>	<b>Priority Level</b>
<b>HOUSING ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>Indicate High (3), Medium (2), Low (1)</b>
<b>CDBG Priorities</b>	
1. Acquisition of existing rental units	<b>1</b>
2. Production of new rental units	<b>2.5</b>
3. Rehabilitation of existing rental units	<b>1.5</b>
4. Rental assistance	<b>1</b>
5. Acquisition of existing owner units	<b>1</b>
6. Production of new owner units	<b>2</b>
7. Rehabilitation of existing owner units	<b>2.5</b>
8. Homeownership assistance	<b>1</b>
<b>HOME Priorities</b>	
1. Acquisition of existing rental units	<b>1</b>
2. Production of new rental units	<b>2.5</b>
3. Rehabilitation of existing rental units	<b>2.5</b>
4. Rental assistance	<b>2</b>
5. Acquisition of existing owner units	<b>2</b>
6. Production of new owner units	<b>2.5</b>
7. Rehabilitation of existing owner units	<b>3</b>
8. Homeownership assistance	<b>1</b>
<b>HOPWA Priorities</b>	
1. Rental assistance	<b>1</b>
2. Short term rent/mortgage utility payments	<b>1</b>
3. Facility based housing development	<b>1</b>
4. Facility based housing operations	<b>1</b>
5. Supportive services	<b>1</b>
6. Other	<b>1</b>
<b>Other Populations</b>	
1. Unaccompanied youth	<b>1</b>
2. Other discharged individuals (incarceration, etc.)	<b>1</b>
3. Homeless populations	<b>2</b>
<b>Other Community Needs</b>	
1. Community Facilities (libraries, community halls, etc.)	<b>2</b>

2. Culinary Water	<b>3</b>
3. Planning	<b>2.5</b>
4. Economic Development	<b>1.5</b>
5. Removal of Barriers for the Disabled	<b>2</b>
6. Sewer Systems	<b>3</b>
7. Transportation	<b>2</b>
8. Streets	<b>2</b>
9. Parks and Recreation:	<b>1.5</b>
10. Public Safety	<b>2</b>
11. Public Services	<b>2</b>
12. Other:	<b>1.5</b>
13. Other:	<b>1</b>

## Table 2C – Summary of Specific Objectives (Actions)

Based upon overall area and local needs and funding preferences, please list specific measurable objectives and fund allocations that help meet the prioritized needs from Table 2A. Additional information from HUD about Table 2C is available by clicking on the box below labeled "Table 2C Summary of Specific Objectives". Agencies should include an expected number of measurable units to be accomplished for each of the five years. Future projections can be revised each year during the annual update and action plan. Actual numbers accomplished are assembled by the state for the annual CAPER. Objectives should align with the HUD Strategic goals (see attached comment box) and address the impediments identified in Utah's latest "Analysis of Impediments" (AI).

Table 2C Summary of Specific Objectives										
Specific Obj. #	2010-15 Strategic Objective met with proposed action	AI goal met with proposed action	Priority	Sources of Funds	Proposed Allocation of HUD \$	Performance Indicators	State Fiscal Year (July 1 to June 30)	Goal	For Annual CAPER Reporting	
			Indicate High (3), Medium (2), Low (1)						Actual Number (for State use only)	Percent Completed (for State use only)
<b>DH-1</b>	<b>Availability of Affordable Housing</b>									
<b>DH-1.1</b>	<b>Provide fully-accessible housing</b>									
	Goal #3	#1 - Lack of Afford. Housing	2	HOME & State Match	348,983	Households assisted (new SF and MF units also serving persons having physical disabilities)	2010-11	93	36	39%
			2	HOME & State Match	506,000		2011-12	40	58	145%
			3	HOME & State Match	506,000		2012-13	38		
			3	HOME & State Match	315,000		2013-14	35		
			3	HOME & State Match	315,000		2014-15	35		
<b>DH-1.2</b>	<b>Provide housing for households with special needs (mental illness, seniors, etc.)</b>									
	Goal #3	#1 - Lack of Afford. Housing	3	HOME & State Match	2,032,500	Number of new units funded (not otherwise included)	2010-11	58	54	93%
			2	HOME & State Match	1,264,000		2011-12	100	43	43%

			3	HOME & State Match	1,264,000		2012-13	100		
			3	HOME & State Match	750,000		2013-14	90		
			3	HOME & State Match	750,000		2014-15	90		
<b>DH-2 Affordability of Decent Housing</b>										
<b>DH-2.1 Develop more affordable rental housing</b>										
	Goal #2	#1 - Lack of Afford. Housing & #2 Incongruity of Wages/Rents	3	HOME & State Match	1,980,000	Households assisted (total new units)	2010-11	110	603	548%
			3	HOME & State Match	2,530,000		2011-12	200	307	153%
			3	HOME & State Match	2,530,000		2012-13	200		
			3	HOME & State Match	1,500,000		2013-14	175		
			3	HOME & State Match	1,500,000		2014-15	175		
<b>DH-2.2 Provide housing solutions to end chronic homelessness</b>										
	Goal #3	#1 - Lack of Afford. Housing	2	HOME & State Match	inc. in above	Number of new units funded	2010-11	63	97	154%
			2	HOME & State Match	1,580,000		2011-12	125	49	39%
			3	HOME & State Match	1,580,000		2012-13	125		
			3	HOME & State Match	1,000,000		2013-14	110		
			3	HOME & State Match	1,000,000		2014-15	110		
<b>DH-2.3 Increase homeownership opportunities for low income families</b>										
	Goals #1 & 3	#1 - Lack of Afford. Housing	3	CDBG/HOME & State Match	1,605,596	Number of new homes created (IDA, Self Help, etc.)	2010-11	125	34	27%
			3	CDBG/HOME & State Match	772,000		2011-12	120	368	306%

			3	CDBG/HOME & State Match	772,000		2012-13	120		
			3	CDBG/HOME & State Match	475,000		2013-14	110		
			3	CDBG/HOME & State Match	475,000		2014-15	110		
<b>DH-2.4</b>	<b>Provide housing for households with HIV/AIDS (through Tenant Based Rental Assistance; Facility-based Housing Assistance; and Short-term Rent, Mortgage and Utility Assistance).</b>									
	Goals #2,3, and 4	#1 Lack of Afford. Housing	1	HOPWA	117,707	# of households served with rental assistance	2010-11	80	52	65%
			2	HOPWA	114,000		2011-12	50	48	96%
			2	HOPWA	114,000		2012-13	50		
			2	HOPWA	122,755		2013-14	55		
			2	HOPWA	122,755		2014-15	55		
<b>DH-2.5</b>	<b>Increase capability of local agencies to plan and develop housing projects</b>									
	Goals #1,2,3,4 and 5	#1 Lack of Afford. Housing & #3 Community Nimbysim	2	CDBG/HOME	104,000	Number of local agencies attending workshops and formal trainings	2010-11	3	47	1567%
			3	CDBG/HOME	25,000		2011-12	18	113	627%
			3	CDBG/HOME	25,000		2012-13	18		
			3	CDBG/HOME	22,000		2013-14	45		
			3	CDBG/HOME	22,000		2014-15	45		
<b>DH-2.6</b>	<b>Prevent homelessness through rental assistance</b>									
	Goal #3	#1 Lack of Afford. Housing	3	HOME & State Match	new goal '11	# of households served with TBRA rental assistance	2010-11	new goal '11	17	100%
			3	HOME & State Match	120,000		2011-12	20	17	85%
			3	HOME & State Match	120,000		2012-13	20		
			3	HOME & State Match	120,000		2013-14	20		
			3	HOME & State Match	120,000		2014-15	20		
<b>DH-3</b>	<b>Sustainability of Decent Housing</b>									

<b>DH-3.1 Preserve more affordable housing</b>										
Goals #1,2,3,4 and 5	#1 - Lack of Afford. Housing & #2 Incongruity of Wages/Rents	3	CDBG/HOME & State Match	1,305,000	Households assisted (MF and SF units preserved and rehabilitated including lead based paint abatement)	2010-11	162	129	80%	
		3	CDBG/HOME & State Match	2,476,392		2011-12	280	432	154%	
		3	CDBG/HOME & State Match	2,476,392		2012-13	280			
		3	CDBG/HOME & State Match	1,527,493		2013-14	180			
		3	CDBG/HOME & State Match	1,527,493		2014-15	180			
<b>SL-1 Availability/Accessibility of Suitable Living Environment</b>										
<b>SL-1.1 Upgrade and provide more public facilities primarily benefiting low-income citizens</b>										
Goal #4	NA	3	CDBG	1,322,185	(LMI) persons served through increased number of facilities and services	2010-11	7,573	1,161	15%	
		3	CDBG	567,000		2011-12	4,100	4,130	100%	
		3	CDBG	500,000		2012-13	3,500			
		3	CDBG	310,000		2013-14	2,200			
		3	CDBG	310,000		2014-15	2,200			
<b>SL-2 Sustainability of Suitable Living Environment</b>										
<b>SL-2.1 Provide safe and clean water, primarily to low income persons, to improve the sustainability of the community.</b>										
Goals #3 and 4	#1 Lack of Afford. Housing	3	CDBG	1,200,000	(LMI) persons being served	2010-11	8,600	1,252	15%	
		3	CDBG	352,000		2011-12	2,200	2,018	91%	
		3	CDBG	300,000		2012-13	2,000			
		3	CDBG	185,000		2013-14	1,150			
		3	CDBG	185,000		2014-15	1,150			
<b>SL-2.2 Provide warm and safe shelter for the homeless</b>										
Goal #3	#1 Lack of Afford. Housing & #3	2	ESG and match	70,000	Shelter nights	2010-11	45,000	86,880	193%	
		3	ESG and match	50,000		2011-12	45,000	90,752	202%	

		Community Nimbyism	3	ESG and match	200,000		2012-13	45,000		
			3	ESG and match	545,892		2013-14	100,000		
			3	ESG and match	545,892		2014-15	100,000		
<b>SL-2.3 Remove barriers to disabled persons utilizing public facilities</b>										
	Goal #4	NA	2	CDBG	300,000	Disabled persons being served	2010-11	3,200	10,811	338%
			3	CDBG	-		2011-12	100	280	280%
			3	CDBG	100,000		2012-13	100		
			3	CDBG	60,000		2013-14	60		
			3	CDBG	60,000		2014-15	60		
<b>SL-2.4 Provide other public infrastructure improvements</b>										
	Goal #4		2	CDBG	1,170,000	(LMI) persons being served	2010-11	23,525	3,480	15%
			2	CDBG	600,000		2011-12	4,600	2,113	45%
			2	CDBG	500,000		2012-13	4,000		
			2	CDBG	310,000		2013-14	2,600		
			2	CDBG	310,000		2014-15	2,600		
<b>EO-1 Availability/Accessibility of Economic Opportunity</b>										
<b>EO-1.1 Create economic opportunity</b>										
	Goal #1	NA	3	CDBG/HOME	250,000	Number of jobs created (includes OWHLF total production)	2010-11	1,034	1,298	126%
			2	CDBG/HOME	100,000		2011-12	1,250	840	67%
			2	CDBG/HOME	100,000		2012-13	1,250		
			2	CDBG/HOME	100,000		2013-14	1,250		
			2	CDBG/HOME	100,000		2014-15	1,250		
<b>EO-1.2 Support services to increase self sufficiency for the homeless</b>										
	Goal #3	#1 Lack of Afford. Housing & #3 Community Nimbyism	2	ESG and match	858,808	Hours of case management	2010-11	29,252	48,665	166%
			3	ESG and match	180,750		2011-12	15,000	23,832	159%
			3	ESG and match	180,750		2012-13	15,000		

			3	ESG and match	500,000		2013-14	40,000		
			3	ESG and match	500,000		2014-15	40,000		
<b>EO-2</b>	<b>Affordability Economic Opportunity</b>									
<b>EO-2.1</b>	<b>Increase available affordable units of workforce housing</b>									
	Goals #1,2,3 and 4	#2 Incongruity Wages/Rents	3	HOME	inc. in above	Number of new units created - also see DH 2.1 (duplicated)	2010-11	22	197	895%
			3	HOME	inc. in above		2011-12	65	242	372%
			3	HOME	inc. in above		2012-13	65		
			3	HOME	inc. in above		2013-14	65		
			3	HOME	inc. in above		2014-15	65		
<b>EO-3</b>	<b>Sustainability of Economic Opportunity</b>									
<b>EO3.1</b>	<b>Insure that projects support LMI populations</b>									
	Goal #4	All	3	HOME	inc. in above	Average AMI served through projects	2010-11	0.4	0.39	103%
			3	HOME	inc. in above		2011-12	0.4	0.32	120%
			2	HOME	inc. in above		2012-13	0.4		
			2	HOME	inc. in above		2013-14	0.4		
			2	HOME	inc. in above		2014-15	0.4		
<b>CR-1</b>	<b>Community Revitalization</b>									
<b>CR-1.1</b>	<b>Plan for better communities and utilization of funds</b>									
	Goals #4 and 5	All	3	CDBG	200,000	Number of LMI persons benefiting	2010-11	5,275	3,480	66%
			3	CDBG	0		2011-12	1,000	0	0%
			3	CDBG	100,000		2012-13	1,000		
			3	CDBG	60,000		2013-14	600		
			3	CDBG	60,000		2014-15	600		

*Page Left Blank Intentionally*