

State of Utah

Consolidated Plan 2025-2029

Prepared by the Department of Workforce Services, Housing and Community Development Division

DRAFT

Executive Summary

ES-05 Executive Summary - 91.300(c), 91.320(b)

1. Introduction

This Consolidated Plan has been prepared by the Utah Department of Workforce Services (DWS), Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) and Office of Homeless Services (OHS) to document the goals and priorities of the Utah Small Cities Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME), National Housing Trust Fund (HTF) and Housing Opportunities for Persons with Aids (HOPWA) programs for the program years 2025 through 2029. Funding is allocated to Utah from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) through formula block grants. Community development, homeless services and housing needs are determined at the state and local levels.

- CDBG awards are determined by a collaborative process that involves the seven regional associations of governments determining local priorities and working with the state to fund applications in compliance with Federal requirements.
- ESG and HOPWA funding requests are prioritized by 13 Local Homeless Councils (LHCs) throughout the state, and by the HOPWA Steering Committee.
- HOME and HTF funding have prioritized the funding of new affordable housing. Funding decisions are reviewed, scored and prioritized by a Review Committee.

This plan summarizes the types of projects that will be carried out to meet state and regional goals, objectives, and priorities.

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

HCD's and OHS's objectives are the creation of safe, affordable housing and the promotion of sustainable communities throughout Utah. They include a focus on the funding of new affordable housing projects, an investment in community infrastructure and services, and various efforts targeting homelessness, including making homelessness brief, rare, and non-recurring.

3. Evaluation of past performance

The efforts outlined in this plan are a continuation of efforts HCD and OHS have undertaken since their inception, including the creation of affordable housing, livable communities, and opportunities for individuals of low to moderate means. The past five years have been filled with change and opportunity

across all programs, including the opportunity to be able to address the growing housing and community development needs in Utah. Over the duration of the last Consolidated Plan, the State of Utah was able to accomplish the following with CDBG funding, we are able to support some 200 separate and distinct projects throughout the state, ranging from water and sewer line improvements, to supporting community development needs through the purchase of fire trucks and park equipment, and through housing rehabilitation programs to ensure low- to moderate-income families can have safe and decent housing. Additionally, COVID response efforts were undertaken to help alleviate the economic and health impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. With HOME and HTF funding, around 330 individual housing units were able to be created and reserved for use by those who are low- to moderate-income. With HOPWA and ESG funding, approximately 39,600 individuals received assistance with services aimed at making homelessness rare, brief, and non-recurring, as well as support for housing needs for those with HIV/AIDS. For a full account of past projects and activities, please refer to the CAPER documents for the applicable years of 2020 to 2024.

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

To be completed with a citizen participation plan

5. Summary of public comments

No comments were received in the initial public comment period or public hearing, as well as in the second public comment period and hearing.

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

All comments and views were accepted and given appropriate weight.

7. Summary

Note about data tables: The Consolidated Plan used the best available default data as of January 2025.

The Process

PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies 24 CFR 91.300(b)

1. Describe agency/entity responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source

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

| Agency Role | Name | Department/Agency |
|---------------------|------|--|
| | | |
| CDBG Administrator | UTAH | DWS/Housing and Community Development Division |
| HOPWA Administrator | UTAH | DWS/Office of Homeless Services |
| HOME Administrator | UTAH | DWS/Housing and Community Development Division |
| ESG Administrator | UTAH | DWS/Office of Homeless Services |
| HTF | UTAH | DWS/Housing and Community Development Division |

Table 1 – Responsible Agencies

Narrative

The Utah Department of Workforce Services (DWS), Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) is the lead agency responsible for the CDBG, HOME, and HTF programs. The Utah Department of Workforce Services, Office of Homeless Services (OHS) is the lead agency responsible for the ESG and HOPWA programs.

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

The DWS staff member responsible for receiving public comments regarding the update to the 2025 Utah Consolidated Plan is Zach Leavitt. He can be reached by email at zleavitt@utah.gov.

PR-10 Consultation – 91.100, 91.110, 91.200(b), 91.300(b), 91.200(l) and 91.315(l)

1. Introduction

The State CDBG program staff met with the representatives of the seven regional associations of governments on September 18, 2025. This training provided guidance in regard to the requirements, goals and resources available to prepare the Consolidated Plan. The state also consulted with the Utah Department of Health regarding lead-based paint hazards. Local governments in each region are represented by an elected official on the CDBG Policy Committee which determines the Method of Distribution (MOD) of funding under the CDBG program. There are nine housing authorities located in the non-entitlement areas. Four of these housing authorities manage public housing units. The state is aware of their ongoing needs and they are invited to apply for CDBG funding every year. The other five housing authorities only administer Housing Choice Vouchers.

Homeless services in the State of Utah are coordinated through the Office of Homeless Services (OHS), overseen by both the Governor-appointed State Coordinator and the Utah Homeless Services Board, required by state code. Funding is coordinated through the 13 Local Homeless Councils throughout the state and presented to the Utah Homeless Services Board (UHSB), which is made up of eleven board members outlined in Utah state code 35A-16-204.

The UHSB brings together representatives from various sectors, including government, private industry, philanthropy, and organizations dedicated to addressing statewide homelessness. The mission of the UHSB is to coordinate comprehensive support for individuals experiencing homelessness across the state. They develop strategies aimed at tackling the root causes of statewide homelessness while fostering collaboration among stakeholders to amplify impact. The UHSB convenes quarterly, at a minimum, to deliberate on initiatives, establish operational procedures, and set strategic goals to make homelessness in Utah rare, brief and non-recurring.

Provide a concise summary of the state's activities to enhance coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies (91.215(l))

The HOME and HTF programs are coordinated by a Review Committee with the goal of providing safe, decent, and affordable housing in the state of Utah. HCD is the lead staffing agency supporting the Review Committee.

- The Review Committee is chaired by the Director of the HCD and is comprised of voting members representing local governments, mortgage lending, real estate sales, home builders, rental housing, housing advocacy, manufactured housing, transit-oriented development and

rural interests. The Review Committee approves the funding of multi-family projects with HOME and HTF funds.

- The Commission on Housing Affordability is chaired by a senator and is comprised of voting members representing state representatives, the Department of Workforce Services, the Governor's Office of Economic Development, Utah Transit Authority, Utah Housing Corporation, Salt Lake Chamber, land development, real estate, banking, public housing authorities, redevelopment agencies, and rural interests. The commission provides recommendations for affordable housing.

The state undertakes various initiatives to enhance coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health, and service agencies. These efforts typically include:

Interagency Collaboration – Establishing partnerships that bring together housing authorities, health departments, and service agencies to align policies and resources.

Integrated Service Delivery – Implementing programs that connect housing residents with healthcare, mental health, and supportive services, such as case management and crisis intervention.

Funding and Grants – Allocating state and federal funds to support housing stability programs that incorporate healthcare and social services.

Data Sharing and Planning – Utilizing data systems to track service needs and outcomes, ensuring informed decision-making and strategic planning.

Policy Development – Promoting regulations that encourage collaboration, including incentives for housing providers to integrate supportive services.

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

A Continuum of Care (CoC) is a geographically based area identified to carry out the planning responsibilities of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) CoC funding. The CoC Program is designed to promote community-wide commitment to the goal of ending homelessness. The State coordinates directly with all three CoCs through the Utah Homeless Network (UHN) Steering Committee. This UHN is codified in state statute with representation from the 13 Local Homeless Councils. In addition, the UHN has one member with a seat on the Utah Homeless Services Board (UHSB) which is a public body outlined in Utah Code. The three Utah CoCs are further divided geographically and consist of 13 Local Homeless Councils (LHCs). To enhance homeless services coordination, LHCs include elected officials, housing providers, health care providers, mental health providers, youth and veteran

service providers, community advocates, homeless or formerly homeless individuals with lived experience, and other homeless service agencies. Additionally, the State coordinates directly with all three CoCs by leading strategic planning and support efforts aligned with Utah's newly adopted Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness (Strategic Plan) with the goals of making homelessness in Utah rare, brief and non-recurring. <https://jobs.utah.gov/homelessness/homelessnessstrategicplan.pdf>

The Strategic Plan was adopted by the Utah Homeless Council, now the UHSB, in February 2023. It is a result of, in part and through cooperation with the Utah State Legislature and State Audits, feedback gathered through statewide focus groups regarding local structure and services, gaps, and needs in all 13 LHC areas. The Strategic Plan is focused on local accountability in the administration and alignment of funding, data quality, and program services as defined by the CoC, HUD guidance and regulations, as well as the nationally implemented System of Performance Measures. OHS supports the CoC funding priorities and administers a single statewide Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). Additionally, the State partnership with the CoCs provides ad hoc, ongoing and quarterly training opportunities to enhance the response of service providers addressing the needs of all those experiencing or at risk of homelessness. OHS staff are assigned to support specific LHCs within CoCs, by attending monthly LHC meetings, allocation committees, supporting data collection efforts, and providing monitoring and technical assistance in order for funded projects to be successful. The State coordinates the prioritization of funding for projects that meet the unique needs of families with children, transition-aged youth, single men or single women, veterans, survivors of domestic violence, individuals and families with a disability, behavioral health disorders, including mental health or substance use disorders, those who are medically frail or terminally ill, including individuals and families experiencing chronic homelessness, individuals exiting prison or jail, or, individuals who suffer from other serious challenges to employment and self-sufficiency. The grant process for state-funded programs engages communities through CoC and LHC leadership and coordination. The UHN, in collaboration with the OHS, developed a funding formula, using factors including Point-in-Time Count and poverty demographics to support appropriate funding to communities. CoC and LHC leadership are then able to focus on distribution of state funding that is appropriate to each unique community, addressing program performance, gaps and service needs.

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

The State engages in ongoing consultation with the Continuum(s) of Care (CoCs) to ensure effective allocation and administration of Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) funds. This collaboration typically includes:

1. ESG Fund Allocation – The State consults with CoCs to identify priority needs, assess gaps in homeless services, and determine funding distribution to maximize impact. Stakeholder meetings, public hearings, and data analysis guide these decisions.

2. Performance Standards Development – The State and CoCs work together to establish performance benchmarks for ESG-funded programs, ensuring alignment with federal and state goals. These standards focus on housing stability, reducing homelessness, and improving service delivery efficiency.
3. Outcome Evaluation – CoCs provide data and feedback to assess the effectiveness of ESG-funded projects. This includes analyzing program performance metrics, client success rates, and overall impact on reducing homelessness, leading to data-driven policy adjustments.
4. HMIS Administration – The State collaborates with CoCs to develop funding strategies, policies, and procedures for the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). This includes ensuring compliance with data quality standards, supporting training for service providers, and enhancing data-sharing practices to improve coordination across agencies.

Through these consultations, the state ensures that ESG funding decisions and policies are responsive, data-informed, and aligned with local needs, ultimately enhancing service delivery for individuals experiencing homelessness.

2. Describe Agencies, groups, organizations and others who participated in the process and describe the jurisdictions consultations with housing, social service agencies and other entities

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Agency/Group/Organization | BEAR RIVER ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Regional organization Planning organization |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Community Development Needs |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | HCD has asked BRAG to assist in gathering information on community needs including housing and market needs. They are required to submit a plan to HCD which includes many components of the State plan. |
| 2 | Agency/Group/Organization | SIX COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Regional organization Planning organization |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Community Development |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | HCD has asked 6-County AOG to assist in gathering information on community needs including housing and market needs. They are required to submit a plan to HCD which includes many components of the State plan. |
| 3 | Agency/Group/Organization | SOUTHEASTERN UTAH ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Regional organization Planning organization |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Community Development |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | HCD has asked SEUALG to assist in gathering information on community needs including housing and market needs. They are required to submit a plan to HCD which includes many components of the State plan. |
| 4 | Agency/Group/Organization | UINTAH BASIN ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Regional organization Planning organization |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Community Development |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | HCD has asked UABOG to assist in gathering information on community needs including housing and market needs. They are required to submit a plan to HCD which includes many components of the State plan. |
| 5 | Agency/Group/Organization | Five County Associations of Governments |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Regional organization Planning organization |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Community Development |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | HCD has asked 5-County AOG to assist in gathering information on community needs including housing and market needs. They are required to submit a plan to HCD which includes many components of the State plan. |
| 6 | Agency/Group/Organization | Mountainland Association of Governments |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Regional organization Planning organization |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Community Development |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | HCD has asked MAG to assist in gathering information on community needs including housing and market needs. They are required to submit a plan to HCD which includes many components of the State plan. |
| 7 | Agency/Group/Organization | Wasatch Front Regional Council |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Regional organization Planning organization |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis Community Development |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | HCD has asked WFRC to assist in gathering information on community needs including housing and market needs. They are required to submit a plan to HCD which includes many components of the State plan. |
| 8 | Agency/Group/Organization | Utah Department of Health |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Health Agency |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Lead-based Paint Strategy |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | Utah Department of Health was involved in developing HCDs lead based paint strategy. |
| 9 | Agency/Group/Organization | Dept. of Environmental Quality |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Other government - State |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Lead-based Paint Strategy Market Analysis |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | We utilized data from their environmental quality data and asked about trends that they were seeing in Environmental Health |
| 10 | Agency/Group/Organization | Utah Broadband Commission |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Services - Broadband Internet Service Providers Services - Narrowing the Digital Divide Other government - State |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment Economic Development Market Analysis |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | We utilized data from their Broadband deployment data and asked about trends that they were seeing in Broadband deployment |

| | | |
|--------|--|---|
| 1 1 | Agency/Group/Organization | Utah Division of Emergency Management |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Agency - Managing Flood Prone Areas Agency - Emergency Management Other government - State |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Hazards |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | We utilized data from their Hazard Mitigation Plan and asked about trends that they were seeing in Hazard Mitigation |
| 1 2 | Agency/Group/Organization | State of Utah State Community Development Black Grant Policy Committee |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Other government - State Civic Leaders |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment Economic Development Market Analysis |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | The State Policy Committee is made up of local elected leaders from across the state. Questions were asked about their views on what the community development needs were in their areas. We received good feedback that informed future plans. |
| 1 3 | Agency/Group/Organization | Review Committee |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Housing Other government - State Business Leaders Civic Leaders Business and Civic Leaders |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment Market Analysis |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | The Review Committee is made up of locally elected officials, business leaders, housing advocates, and others interested in developing affordable housing. We consulted with the Review Committee for trends that they saw in housing development and needs in housing that helped inform strategies. |

| | | |
|--------|--|---|
| 1 4 | Agency/Group/Organization | CEDAR CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | PHA Other government - Local |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Public Housing Needs |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | Public Housing authorities across the state were invited to provide feedback on the Consolidated Plan. Their feedback was instrumental in helping to understand and develop housing strategies. |
| 1 5 | Agency/Group/Organization | Housing Authority of Southeastern Utah |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | PHA Other government - Local |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Public Housing Needs |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | Public Housing authorities across the state were invited to provide feedback on the Consolidated Plan. Their feedback was instrumental in helping to understand and develop housing strategies. |
| 1 6 | Agency/Group/Organization | HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE COUNTY OF SALT LAKE |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | PHA Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Other government - County Other government - Local |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Public Housing Needs HOPWA Strategy |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | Public Housing authorities across the state were invited to provide feedback on the Consolidated Plan. Their feedback was instrumental in helping to understand and develop housing strategies. Additionally, this housing authority (which has rebranded as Housing Connect) was invited to provide feedback due to the nature of the grants that have been deployed through them. Their feedback helped to inform sections related to the use of HOPWA funds. |

| | | |
|--------|--|---|
| 1 7 | Agency/Group/Organization | Utah Community Action |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS Neighborhood Organization |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | HOPWA Strategy |
| | How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination? | Utah Community Action was invited to provide feedback due to the nature of the grants that have been deployed through them. Their feedback helped to inform sections related to the use of HOPWA funds. |

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

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

The Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) consulted all agencies which were considered important partners in developing our plan.

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

| Name of Plan | Lead Organization | How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan? |
|------------------------|--|---|
| Continuum of Care | Utah Homeless Services Board | The Utah Homeless Services Board is the body in charge of leading the planning and administering of Utah Homeless efforts. The three Continuum of Care, which include 13 Local Homeless Councils, align local strategic plans with the goals of the state strategic plan. |
| WFRC Consolidated Plan | Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) | Wasatch Front Regional Council was required by HCD to write a Consolidated Plan. This plan informed HCDs plan. This is especially true for the CDBG Program. |
| MAG Consolidated Plan | Mountainlands Association of Governments | Mountainlands was required by HCD to write a Consolidated Plan. This plan informed HCDs plan. This is especially true for the CDBG Program. |
| BRAG Consolidated Plan | Bear River Association of Governments | BRAG was required by HCD to write a Consolidated Plan. This plan informed HCDs plan. This is especially true for the CDBG Program. |

| Name of Plan | Lead Organization | How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan? |
|--|--|--|
| SEUALG Consolidated Plan | Southeastern Utah Association of Governments | SEUALG was required by HCD to write a Consolidated Plan. This plan informed HCDs plan. This is especially true for the CDBG Program. |
| R6 Consolidated Plan | Six County Basin Association of Governments | 6-County was required by HCD to write a Consolidated Plan. This plan informed HCDs plan. This is especially true for the CDBG Program. |
| Five County Consolidated Plan | Five County Association of Governments | 5-County was required by HCD to write a Consolidated Plan. This plan informed HCDs plan. This is especially true for the CDBG Program. |
| UBAG Consolidated Plan | Uintah Basin Association of Governments | UBAG was required by HCD to write a Consolidated Plan. This plan informed HCDs plan. This is especially true for the CDBG Program. |
| The State of Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness | Utah Homeless Services Board | The Utah Homeless Services Board is the body in charge of leading the planning and administering of Utah Homeless effort. The plans outlined by the ESG and HOPWA Programs use this plan to inform their efforts. |
| 2019 Utah Affordable Housing Report | Utah Affordable Housing Committee | The Utah Legislature requested the creation of this plan to analyze the need for affordable housing in Utah. This has in part been HCDs need assessment and market study. |
| Utah Enhanced State Hazard Mitigation Plan | Utah Department of Public Safety | The Utah Department of Public Safety, Division of Emergency Management, puts together a FEMA-compliant Hazard Mitigation plan regularly that details what the hazards are for potential items like flooding, fires, changing climate, and other potential hazards in Utah. We consulted with the sections to help facilitate planning and response plans. The plan can be found at https://hazards.utah.gov/state-of-utah-hazard-mitigation-plan/ |
| Utah Digital Access Plan | Utah Broadband Commission | The Utah Broadband Commission has put together a plan and presented data that shows Utah's level of internet connectivity. These plans were consulted to help inform the relevant sections of the Consolidated Plan. |

Table 3 – Other local / regional / federal planning efforts

Describe cooperation and coordination among the State and any units of general local government, in the implementation of the Consolidated Plan (91.315(l))

The Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) and Office of Homeless Services (OHS) have taken strides to engage with the community, including local government and leaders. A public hearing was held in January 2025 for the Citizen Participation Plan in alignment with the Consolidated Plan to ensure the outlined guidelines met the needs of all those throughout the state.

Since 2022, HCD and OHS have engaged in monthly collaborative meetings with Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County to discuss funding coordination efforts that align with the Consolidation Plan. These efforts include routine funder coordination meetings with local government partners. This space has allowed leaders at a state, county and city level to outline needs for each community in productive and collaborative space.

DWS and OHS has also worked with each Local Homeless Council (LHC) to confirm the most current Consolidated Plan was shared and reviewed to its members, and validation of these efforts is outlined in LHC quarterly reports. By ensuring this consistent review, efforts Statewide to align with the Consolidation plan.

In the 2024 Legislative session, House Bill 298 changed the former Utah Homelessness Council into the Utah Homeless Services board, which includes both county and city leaders. Within this space, DWS and OHS have collaborated, recommended, and received approval to utilize funds for homeless services, deeply affordable housing projects, and shelter for organizations throughout the State that align with the Consolidated Plan. Additionally, the UHSB's Guiding Principles to End Homelessness was incorporated where applicable into the 2023 Utah's Plan to Address Homelessness.

Narrative (optional):

PR-15 Citizen Participation – 91.105, 91.115, 91.200(c) and 91.300(c)

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

To be added once the comment period is completed.

DRAFT

Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

Needs Assessment Overview

The State of Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness (Strategic Plan), provides an in-depth analysis of the extent of needs for homeless resources and provides a plan for addressing those needs. The target outcomes, goals, and strategies included in the strategic Plan are based on the findings of a state-level needs assessment of resources for and needs of people experiencing homelessness across the state of Utah, as directed by the Utah Homeless Services Board, supported by the Office of Homeless Services. The referenced Strategic Plan can be found at <https://jobs.utah.gov/homelessness/homelessnessstrategicplan.pdf>.

The 2022-2024 edition of the Kem C. Gardner Institute's State of the State's Housing Market provides a detailed analysis of current housing market conditions in Utah. The report provides information on five areas: (1) residential construction activity, (2) existing home sales, (3) the housing shortage, (4) prices and affordability, and (5) a 2023 and 2024 forecast. The report can be found at <https://d36oiwf74r1rap.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/State-Of-Housing-Sep2023.pdf?x71849>.

The Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute developed the Utah Housing Affordability Dashboard in partnership with the Utah Department of Workforce Services. As part of House Bill 462, passed in 2022, the dashboard tracks moderate and affordable housing needs and supply across Utah communities. The information identifies the number of lower-income renter households who cannot find a moderate or affordable residence in the current market by comparing the number of renter households with the number of moderate, affordable, and available rental homes. The dashboard measures home purchase affordability by area at various income levels and tracks existing, deed-restricted, affordable housing supply. Please see the dashboard referenced at <https://gardner.utah.edu/affordable-housing-dashboard/.2020>

CDBG community needs are determined locally by Regional Associations of Governments, who on an annual basis, visit and discuss community needs with rural communities throughout Utah.

NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment - 24 CFR 91.305 (a,b,c)

Summary of Housing Needs

Utah has seen substantial growth and a need for more housing units in recent years. With a growing economy and expanding population, there is a need to ensure that housing is accessible to all individuals at all levels.

| Demographics | Base Year: 2009 | Most Recent Year: 2020 | % Change |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------|
| Population | 2,903,381 | 2,993,941 | 3% |
| Households | 906,265 | 938,365 | 4% |
| Median Income | \$0.00 | \$65,325.00 | |

Table 5 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2016-2020 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Number of Households Table

| | 0-30% HAMFI | >30-50% HAMFI | >50-80% HAMFI | >80-100% HAMFI | >100% HAMFI |
|---|----------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Total Households | 92,230 | 99,065 | 169,685 | 113,700 | 463,685 |
| Small Family Households | 30,450 | 34,230 | 65,740 | 47,465 | 229,745 |
| Large Family Households | 9,400 | 15,595 | 32,690 | 24,735 | 91,765 |
| Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age | 15,300 | 16,925 | 28,370 | 19,990 | 90,960 |
| Household contains at least one person age 75 or older | 12,625 | 15,380 | 19,465 | 9,535 | 28,975 |
| Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger | 20,025 | 25,135 | 47,285 | 31,495 | 76,700 |

Table 6 - Total Households Table

Data Source: 2016-2020 CHAS

Housing Needs Summary Tables

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

| | Renter | | | | | Owner | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-5 0% AMI | >50-8 0% AMI | >80-1 00% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-5 0% AMI | >50-8 0% AMI | >80-1 00% AMI | Total |
| NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities | 1,425 | 1,145 | 915 | 345 | 3,830 | 375 | 185 | 455 | 215 | 1,230 |
| Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing) | 1,120 | 1,160 | 1,185 | 240 | 3,705 | 160 | 310 | 570 | 175 | 1,215 |
| Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems) | 3,470 | 3,955 | 3,915 | 1,760 | 13,100 | 595 | 1,670 | 2,730 | 1,650 | 6,645 |
| Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems) | 33,840 | 11,240 | 2,290 | 230 | 47,600 | 18,250 | 11,500 | 7,875 | 1,800 | 39,425 |

| | Renter | | | | | Owner | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | >80-100% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | >80-100% AMI | Total |
| Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems) | 6,665 | 23,815 | 21,330 | 3,840 | 55,650 | 5,095 | 12,595 | 30,790 | 14,605 | 63,085 |
| Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems) | 4,765 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,765 | 3,385 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,385 |

Table 7 – Housing Problems Table

Data Source: 2016-2020 CHAS

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

| | Renter | | | | | Owner | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | >80-100% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | >80-100% AMI | Total |
| NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Having 1 or more of four housing problems | 39,860 | 17,495 | 8,305 | 2,570 | 68,230 | 19,380 | 13,670 | 11,635 | 3,840 | 48,525 |
| Having none of four housing problems | 14,200 | 34,800 | 59,100 | 30,340 | 138,440 | 10,640 | 33,100 | 90,650 | 76,945 | 211,335 |

| | Renter | | | | | Owner | | | | |
|---|-----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------|-----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50 % AMI | >50-80 % AMI | >80-10 0% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50 % AMI | >50-80 % AMI | >80-10 0% AMI | Total |
| Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems | 4,765 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,765 | 3,385 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,385 |

Table 8 – Housing Problems 2

Data Source: 2016-2020 CHAS

3. Cost Burden > 30%

| | Renter | | | | Owner | | | |
|----------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|---------|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | Total |
| NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS | | | | | | | | |
| Small Related | 18,960 | 17,575 | 9,845 | 46,380 | 6,160 | 8,005 | 16,390 | 30,555 |
| Large Related | 5,330 | 5,695 | 3,650 | 14,675 | 2,520 | 5,475 | 9,090 | 17,085 |
| Elderly | 6,855 | 5,075 | 3,250 | 15,180 | 10,655 | 8,635 | 8,400 | 27,690 |
| Other | 14,275 | 10,960 | 8,410 | 33,645 | 4,695 | 3,070 | 5,785 | 13,550 |
| Total need by income | 45,420 | 39,305 | 25,155 | 109,880 | 24,030 | 25,185 | 39,665 | 88,880 |

Table 9 – Cost Burden > 30%

Data Source: 2016-2020 CHAS

4. Cost Burden > 50%

| | Renter | | | | Owner | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|--------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|--------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80 % AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80 % AMI | Total |
| NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS | | | | | | | | |
| Small Related | 16,330 | 5,005 | 620 | 21,955 | 5,155 | 3,960 | 3,025 | 12,140 |
| Large Related | 4,165 | 1,120 | 200 | 5,485 | 2,215 | 1,875 | 1,035 | 5,125 |
| Elderly | 4,930 | 2,175 | 940 | 8,045 | 7,535 | 4,160 | 2,495 | 14,190 |
| Other | 12,055 | 3,910 | 875 | 16,840 | 3,830 | 1,735 | 1,355 | 6,920 |
| Total need by income | 37,480 | 12,210 | 2,635 | 52,325 | 18,735 | 11,730 | 7,910 | 38,375 |

Table 10 – Cost Burden > 50%

Data 2016-2020 CHAS
Source:

5. Crowding (More than one person per room)

| | Renter | | | | | Owner | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------|--------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | >80-100% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | >80-100% AMI | Total |
| NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Single family households | 3,965 | 4,340 | 4,445 | 1,615 | 14,365 | 645 | 1,660 | 2,500 | 1,375 | 6,180 |
| Multiple, unrelated family households | 210 | 295 | 460 | 275 | 1,240 | 125 | 325 | 795 | 465 | 1,710 |
| Other, non-family households | 475 | 500 | 275 | 125 | 1,375 | 10 | 4 | 35 | 29 | 78 |
| Total need by income | 4,650 | 5,135 | 5,180 | 2,015 | 16,980 | 780 | 1,989 | 3,330 | 1,869 | 7,968 |

Table 11 – Crowding Information – 1/2

Data 2016-2020 CHAS
Source:

| | Renter | | | | Owner | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------|
| | 0-30 % AMI | >30-5 0% AMI | >50-8 0% AMI | Total | 0-30 % AMI | >30-5 0% AMI | >50-8 0% AMI | Total |
| Households with Children Present | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 12 – Crowding Information – 2/2

Data Source

2016-2020 CHAS

Comments:

Describe the number and type of single person households in need of housing assistance.

During Federal Fiscal Year 2024, 11,373 single adult households and 508 single child households in the State of Utah accessed shelter and housing programs for people experiencing homelessness as recorded by the Utah Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). This is an undercount of the actual number of single person households in need of housing assistance as it does not include those served by Survivors of Domestic Violence service providers, non-HMIS participating homeless service providers, and those accessing homeless prevention projects.

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

Domestic Violence (DV): On the night of the 2024 Point-in-Time Count, 716 individuals in Utah, 294 of which were minors, reported being homeless because they were currently fleeing some form of domestic violence. Ninety-six of those individuals were staying in a place not meant for human habitation. In 2024, Utah’s Domestic Violence Coalition Linkline Hotline received over 45,000 calls from survivors needing assistance. On the night of the 2024 Housing Inventory Count, the state had 578 emergency shelter beds, 379 transitional housing beds, and 220 Rapid Re-housing beds dedicated to survivors of domestic violence. There is a delay in housing survivors of domestic violence and turning over available beds in DV shelters because these clients often have no income, no or poor credit, and often have traumatic stress experiences that complicates progress toward self-sufficiency goals. Survivors of Domestic Violence service providers are also facing funding cuts that having impacted the support available for survivors in finding and maintaining housing. Disabilities: Estimates from the Utah Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) from 2019-2021 indicate that 25% of the state’s population reports having a disability.

<https://d36oiwf74r1rap.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/DiversityData-Disability-May2024.pdf> The Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute reports that “Utahns with a disability are more likely to have less income, lower education attainment, higher housing cost-burdens, lower access to health coverage, and poor health” (Statement found at the following link <https://d36oiwf74r1rap.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/DiversityData-Disability-May2024.pdf>). An analysis of HMIS data from 2016 to 2022 found that 49% of those recorded as accessing the

homeless response system reported having a disabling condition. The most common disability was a mental health or substance use disorder, with 36% reporting one of these two conditions, followed by 20% reporting a chronic health condition, and 15% reporting a physical disability.

What are the most common housing problems?

The State of Utah, despite ongoing efforts to preserve and develop housing projects, have many housing issues to combat. According to the National Housing Preservation Database in 2023, Utah is on track to lose 3,351 publicly supported rental homes within the next five years as a result of affordability restrictions coming to a close on a number of projects (data found at https://preservationdatabase.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/PD-Profile_2023_MERGED-UT.pdf). This equates to 11% of all such projects. In a ten-year span, this number jumps to 5,769. The State of Utah has worked tirelessly to help alleviate this potential unit loss through the Office of Homeless Services (OHS)'s programs, such as the Deeply Affordable Housing Fund (DAHF) and the Attainable Housing Grant (AHG). Both funding sources require that recipients have affordability restrictions of at least 25 years, ensuring that these projects remain affordable for the foreseeable future.

Another common housing problem within Utah is the lack of affordable housing development in alignment with the state's growing population. In a 2022 study conducted by the Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute, every county in Utah had a shortage of deeply affordable units (those at 30% of the Area Median Income, also known as AMI), while the majority of counties lacked affordable housing at 60% AMI. The total deficit of deeply affordable units totals to an estimated 69,541, and total deficit of units at 60% AMI is at an estimated 74,565 according to the 2022 Affordable Housing Dashboard (found at <https://gardner.utah.edu/affordable-housing-dashboard/>). A large contributor to this deficit is the minimal funds available in combination with the financial burden developers and organizations take on. Without support from resources such as tax credits or grant funds, the longevity of affordable housing projects is a growing challenge.

Both the OHS and the Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) have made extensive strides to combat this housing crisis. Since 2022, the DAHF has provided over \$100 million towards the acquisition, construction, and rehabilitation of housing projects for households at 30% AMI, and the AHG has provided \$5 million in rental subsidies for those of the same population. The combination of these efforts, alongside additional funding support through additional outlets at the city, county and state levels, help reduce the financial gaps developers face to ensure the long-term viability of affordable housing projects.

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

Housing problems, including being cost-burden, are more likely to affect households within the 0% to 50% AMI income range. Households within this range struggle to find safe, decent and affordable housing and often spend a high proportion of their income on housing. These households have limited resources for other basic essentials, including food, healthcare, childcare and transportation. Housing problems also significantly impact households in the 50% to 80% AMI income range, elderly households and single-parent households. The high rate of housing cost-burden and other housing problems points to the need to expand affordable housing opportunities. Healthcare costs have been rising and are projected to do so in the near term. This can add significantly to the burden of rising housing costs and reduce a household's ability to save for retirement, further their education, access good childcare and even impact basic needs such as good nutrition.

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

Across Utah, there is a shortage of affordable rental homes that are available to extremely low-income households, whose incomes are at or below the poverty guideline or 30% of their area median income (AMI). Many of these households are severely cost-burdened, spending more than half of their income on housing. Severely cost-burdened, poor households are more likely than other renters to sacrifice necessities like healthy food and healthcare to pay rent, and to experience unstable housing situations which may result in eviction. According to the https://schools.utah.gov/eseastateinitiatives/_esea_state_initiatives/_homeless/_resources/_2023EDFactsHomelessStudentsCounts.pdf, Utah State Board of Education, in the school year 2023, 10,830 school-age students in Utah were living with another family or in a “doubled-up” situation compared to 9,960 in 2022. An additional 656 students were living in a hotel or motel compared to 617 in 2022. In total, 13,049 students met the definition under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Act (Section 725) in 2023 compared to 11,897 in 2022; this is nearly a 10% increase in one year. (Data found at https://schools.utah.gov/eseastateinitiatives/_esea_state_initiatives/_homeless/_resources/_2023EDFactsHomelessStudentsCounts.pdf) Formerly homeless families and individuals who are receiving Rapid Re-Housing that are nearing the termination of that assistance need appropriate and flexible supportive services, including connections to ongoing case management, additional income stability through employment support and job training, access to mainstream benefits including child care assistance and Medicaid, landlord mediation, and community support. Every community must have the capacity to: quickly identify and engage people at risk of and experiencing homelessness, intervene to prevent people from losing their housing and divert people from entering the homelessness services system, provide people with immediate access to shelter and crisis services without barriers to entry if homelessness does occur, and quickly connect people experiencing homelessness to housing assistance, employment support, job training, and other supportive and mainstream services.

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

Operational definition - Utah utilizes the criteria for defining “at risk of homelessness” provided by HUD in determining risk of homelessness in three categories:

1. Individuals and families
2. Unaccompanied children and youth, and
3. Families with children and youth.

Detailed criteria for these categories can be found at https://files.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/AtRiskofHomelessnessDefinition_Criteria.pdf.

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

In 2024, the federal poverty guideline for a family of three was \$26,650. At a state level, the poverty guideline is measured “at or below 150% of the United States poverty level,” bringing the Utah limit for a family of three to \$39,975 (definition found in the memo at https://www.utcourts.gov/content/dam/resources/poverty_guidelines.pdf). According to the MIT Living Wage Calculator (found at <https://livingwage.mit.edu/states/49>), a living annual wage for a household of two working adults and one child adult is estimated at \$47,548.80, which is about 16% above Utah’s poverty guideline. This gap increases significantly if only one adult in a two-adult household is employed, and if the number of children increases. According to the Department of Workforce Services (DWS)’s 2024 Report on Intergenerational Poverty (found at <https://jobs.utah.gov/edo/intergenerational/igp24.pdf>), the percent of Utah children and adults experiencing intergenerational poverty (IGP) saw minimal change between 2022 and 2023. Additional work needs to be done to begin the decrease of IGP families to ensure Utahns can be financially stable.

A contributing factor to this gap includes the ever-increasing costs of both rental units and homeownership. Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute’s Utah Rental Market fact sheet (found at <https://d36oiwf74r1rap.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/SLTribRenters-Feb2023.pdf>) outlines a rental increase of 37.1% in Salt Lake County, and only an 18.5% income increase. This equates to 57,449 households that are cost-burdened, and could easily be at risk of homelessness if trends continue.

To reiterate from Utah’s previous Consolidated Plan, one continuing factor of increased risk of homelessness is children’s prolonged experience of IGP. Challenges include heightened exposure to trauma and toxic stress as a minor. This exposure is reflected by high rates of abuse and neglect in the child population. Although it is unclear that this exposure of trauma and toxic stress is leading to risky

behaviors such as drug use and teen pregnancy, research demonstrates that children experiencing IGP have higher levels of engagement in the juvenile justice system and higher rates of health challenges. In connection with the impacts of trauma and toxic stress, one other foundational challenge identified are ongoing struggles with educational outcomes and low levels of educational attainment. Education plays a vital role in setting the groundwork for financial stability; in turn, these aforementioned challenges must continue to be acted on to minimize the impact and reduce the overall rate of households experiencing IGP.

Discussion

Rising housing costs and stagnating real wages are the primary causes of worsening housing affordability in Utah. From 2009 to 2016, real income only grew at 0.31% per year while rent and mortgage burdens crept upward at a rate of 1.03% per year in 2017 constant dollars.

Additional Information about Housing Data (with Covered Funds) for persons with HIV/AIDS (aggregated).

Twenty-four persons were supported with permanent vouchers (Permanent Housing voucher) with 18 persons supported in the form of downpayment assistance or utility assistance. This is in line with the overall strategy of the state is to provide funds to eligible grantees who are already working with persons with HIV/AIDS and help them secure stable housing.

Special note: The majority of the data tables available within this report and plan were provided by HUD as a default data source. While every effort has been made to utilize the most up-to-date data sources that were available, certain discrepancies do exist where a data source was not as up to date as could be due to the nature of how HUD release their data through the Consolidated Plan generate (no blame meant to be levied towards them, just a nature of the game played by all). That being said, the true intent of all data contained within this Consolidated Plan is to provide illumination and guidance on frontline problems and provide metrics for future goals to achieve.

NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems - 91.305 (b)(2)

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

Introduction

While reviewing the data, a few groups of people popped up as disproportionately burdened when compared with the whole group at the 0-30% (Black/African American), 30%-50% (Black/African American, Pacific Islander, and Hispanic), and 50%-80% (Black/African American.) The State remains committed to ensuring that all funds remain available to serve any and all people, regardless of race or ethnicity.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 77,714 | 23,388 | 0 |
| White | 55,640 | 18,064 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 2,324 | 342 | 0 |
| Asian | 2,382 | 798 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 1,161 | 697 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 396 | 75 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 13,914 | 2,771 | 0 |

Table 13 - Disproportionately Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2016-2020 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

30%-50% of Area Median Income

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 73,949 | 38,143 | 0 |
| White | 52,529 | 31,254 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 1,277 | 394 | 0 |
| Asian | 1,547 | 631 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 1,007 | 446 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 1,095 | 157 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 14,506 | 4,769 | 0 |

Table 14 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI

Data 2016-2020 CHAS
Source:

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

50%-80% of Area Median Income

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 74,487 | 120,511 | 0 |
| White | 57,110 | 98,025 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 876 | 813 | 0 |
| Asian | 1,220 | 2,162 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 434 | 1,069 | 0 |

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Pacific Islander | 700 | 1,087 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 12,657 | 15,709 | 0 |

Table 15 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI

Data 2016-2020 CHAS
Source:

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

80%-100% of Area Median Income

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 20,843 | 107,464 | 0 |
| White | 17,255 | 88,871 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 232 | 772 | 0 |
| Asian | 604 | 2,277 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 137 | 763 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 133 | 611 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 2,240 | 12,275 | 0 |

Table 16 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI

Data 2016-2020 CHAS
Source:

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

Discussion

While these metrics are helpful to ensure that all racial and ethnic groups are able to receive the benefit of the spending of funds meant to help alleviate burdens, the State of Utah remains committed to ensuring that all programs remain open and available to all who qualify, regardless of income level, race, or ethnicity.

DRAFT

NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems – 91.305(b)(2)

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

Introduction

While reviewing the data, a few groups of people popped up as disproportionately burdened when compared with the whole group at the 0-30% (Black/African American and Pacific Islander), 30%-50% (Asian, Native American/Alaska Native, and Pacific Islander), and 50%-80% (Pacific Islander.) The State remains committed to ensuring that all funds remain available to serve any and all people, regardless of race or ethnicity.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

| Severe Housing Problems* | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 63,216 | 37,913 | 0 |
| White | 44,925 | 28,747 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 2,175 | 492 | 0 |
| Asian | 2,014 | 1,163 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 918 | 935 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 376 | 90 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 11,076 | 5,580 | 0 |

Table 17 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2016-2020 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

30%-50% of Area Median Income

| Severe Housing Problems* | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 33,737 | 78,221 | 0 |
| White | 23,425 | 60,317 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 481 | 1,189 | 0 |
| Asian | 882 | 1,294 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 682 | 769 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 708 | 559 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 6,993 | 12,263 | 0 |

Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI

Data 2016-2020 CHAS
Source:

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

50%-80% of Area Median Income

| Severe Housing Problems* | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 18,802 | 176,142 | 0 |
| White | 13,171 | 141,948 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 189 | 1,506 | 0 |
| Asian | 420 | 2,942 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 235 | 1,267 | 0 |

| Severe Housing Problems* | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Pacific Islander | 409 | 1,378 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 4,069 | 24,286 | 0 |

Table 19 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI

Data 2016-2020 CHAS
Source:

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

80%-100% of Area Median Income

| Severe Housing Problems* | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 5,975 | 122,280 | 0 |
| White | 4,216 | 101,844 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 127 | 873 | 0 |
| Asian | 218 | 2,676 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 108 | 792 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 104 | 640 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 1,087 | 13,427 | 0 |

Table 20 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI

Data 2016-2020 CHAS
Source:

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

Discussion

While these metrics are helpful to ensure that all racial and ethnic groups are able to receive the benefit of the spending of funds meant to help alleviate burdens, the State of Utah remains committed to ensuring that all programs remain open and available to all who qualify, regardless of income level, race, or ethnicity.

DRAFT

NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens – 91.305 (b)(2)

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

Introduction

While reviewing the data, a one group of people popped up as disproportionately cost burdened when compared with the whole group (Black/African American) at over 50% of housing cost burden. The State remains committed to ensuring that all funds remain available to serve any and all people, regardless of race or ethnicity.

Housing Cost Burden

| Housing Cost Burden | <=30% | 30-50% | >50% | No / negative income (not computed) |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|-------------------------------------|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 749,773 | 147,499 | 97,082 | 8,612 |
| White | 635,274 | 113,803 | 72,954 | 5,871 |
| Black / African American | 4,524 | 2,116 | 2,473 | 128 |
| Asian | 15,846 | 2,950 | 2,585 | 636 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 5,512 | 1,053 | 996 | 195 |
| Pacific Islander | 4,671 | 940 | 734 | 10 |
| Hispanic | 71,833 | 23,247 | 15,057 | 1,417 |

Table 21 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Data Source: 2016-2020 CHAS

Discussion

While these metrics are helpful to ensure that all racial and ethnic groups are able to receive the benefit of the spending of funds meant to help alleviate burdens, the State of Utah remains committed to ensuring that all programs remain open and available to all who qualify, regardless of income level, race, or ethnicity.

NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion – 91.305 (b)(2)

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

At extremely low- or very low-income levels, the need for affordable housing is critical, regardless of racial or ethnic makeup. However, certain populations face a greater need than others due to specific barriers they encounter. These groups are often those without strong institutional knowledge, a clear understanding of available community resources, or the means to effectively access them. As a result, they may experience more difficulty securing housing and other essential services compared to the general population. To advance fairness, the jurisdiction implements culturally competent services that address cultural barriers and include language support. This is complemented by a focus on policy development, staff training, and data collection to better understand and meet community needs. The jurisdiction builds strategic partnerships and ensures effective resource allocation to support communities. To proactively ensure access and engagement in services, the jurisdiction employs affirmative marketing and outreach strategies, including targeted efforts to reach underserved communities, providing multilingual marketing materials, and collaborating with local organizations. These actions aim to reach as many communities as possible. Additionally, the jurisdiction promotes fairness through key strategies such as using data to identify service gaps, developing policies with community input, offering staff training to serve varied populations effectively, and advocating for systemic changes. Regular evaluation of these efforts ensures an ongoing focus on creating a more effective system for addressing homelessness across all communities. The jurisdiction also requires federal and state Fair Housing legislation to be followed, ensuring broad access through targeted outreach and marketing strategies, multilingual materials, community events in all neighborhoods, and partnerships with local organizations. By proactively addressing barriers and promoting effective practices, the jurisdiction supports fair housing opportunities for all.

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

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

As a whole, the population of the State of Utah is primarily concentrated in the following counties: Cache, Weber, Davis, Salt Lake, Utah, and Washington. These counties contain the vast majority of the population and have the most varied population makeup, particularly along racial and ethnic lines. Additionally, Uintah, Duchesne, and San Juan counties contain large populations of Native American residents due to the presence of Reservations (Uintah and Ouray Reservations in Uintah and Duchesne and Navajo Nation in San Juan).

NA-35 Public Housing – (Optional)

Introduction

Totals in Use

| | Program Type | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|----------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Vouchers | | | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | Total | Project-based | Tenant-based | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | Disabled * |
| # of units vouchers in use | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Table 22 - Public Housing by Program Type

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

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Characteristics of Residents

| Program Type | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| | Certificat e | Mod-Re hab | Public Housing | Vouchers | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Project -based | Tenant -based | Special Purpose Voucher | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program |
| # Homeless at admission | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | Program Type | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------|----------------|----------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Vouchers | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Project-based | Tenant-based | Special Purpose Voucher | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program |
| # of Elderly Program Participants (>62) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| # of Disabled Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 0 |
| # of Families requesting accessibility features | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 0 |
| # of HIV/AIDS program participants | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # of DV victims | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 23 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Race of Residents

| Program Type | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|----------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Race | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Vouchers | | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Project-based | Tenant-based | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | Disabled * |
| White | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 55 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

| Race | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Program Type | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| | | | | Vouchers | | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Project-based | Tenant-based | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | Disabled * |
| Black/African American | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

Table 24 – Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Ethnicity of Residents

| Ethnicity | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Program Type | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| | | | | Vouchers | | | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | Total | Project-based | Tenant-based | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | Disabled * |
| Hispanic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Hispanic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 59 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

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

Table 25 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Section 504 Needs Assessment: Describe the needs of public housing tenants and applicants on the waiting list for accessible units:

The state does not operate a public housing agency.

What are the number and type of families on the waiting lists for public housing and section 8 tenant-based rental assistance? Based on the information above, and any other information available to the jurisdiction, what are the most immediate needs of residents of public housing and Housing Choice voucher holders?

The state does not operate a public housing agency.

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

The state does not operate a public housing agency.

Discussion:

NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment – 91.305(c)

Introduction:

The Utah Homeless Services Board (UHSB) acts as the lead convener and facilitator of all homeless services in Utah. The UHSB outlines overarching policies and planning for the state including implementing the State of Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness (Strategic Plan). The UHSB then directs leadership of all three Utah Continuums of Care (CoC) and Utah's thirteen Local Homeless Councils (LHC) to enact effective policies and procedures statewide via the Utah Homeless Network (UHN). The State of Utah Department of Workforce Services, Office of Homeless Services (OHS) contracts with organizations in each CoC and acts as the lead agency for the Utah Homeless Management Information system, a statewide HMIS implementation serving all three of the state's CoCs. Homelessness data is utilized to assess local needs through coordination with the CoCs and LHCs. As of January 2024, there were an estimated 3,869 Utahns experiencing homelessness on any given day, as reported by CoCs to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Of that total, 946 were in households of adults and children, 121 were Veterans, 240 were unaccompanied young adults (aged 18-24), and 906 were individuals experiencing chronic homelessness. Public school data from the Utah State Board of Education for the school year 2023 shows that an estimated 13,049 public school students experienced homelessness over the course of the year. Of that total, 83.0% were doubled up, 5.0% were staying in hotels or motels, 6.2% were in emergency shelter and transitional housing, and 5.7% were in unsheltered situations. According to the 2024 Point-In-Time Count: Utah's homelessness rate is approximately 11 per 10,000 people 24% of Utah's homeless population live in family groups of parents and children 6% of Utah's homeless population are unaccompanied youth under the age of 25 11% of Utah's homeless population are fleeing domestic violence 24% of Utah's homeless population is experiencing chronic homelessness 63% of Utah's homeless population is white.

Homeless Needs Assessment

| Population | Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night | | Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year | Estimate the # becoming homeless each year | Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year | Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness |
|--|--|-------------|--|--|---|--|
| | Sheltered | Unsheltered | | | | |
| Persons in Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren) | 14 | 929 | 3,466 | 214 | 2,328 | 0 |

| Population | Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night | | Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year | Estimate the # becoming homeless each year | Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year | Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness |
|--|--|-------------|--|--|---|--|
| | Sheltered | Unsheltered | | | | |
| Persons in Households with Only Children | 0 | 17 | 453 | 23 | 411 | 0 |
| Persons in Households with Only Adults | 994 | 1,904 | 10,684 | 270 | 5,715 | 0 |
| Chronically Homeless Individuals | 362 | 646 | 1,970 | 92 | 793 | 0 |
| Chronically Homeless Families | 6 | 51 | 160 | 19 | 87 | 0 |
| Veterans | 15 | 106 | 606 | 39 | 330 | 0 |
| Unaccompanied Child | 71 | 168 | 1,348 | 46 | 897 | 0 |
| Persons with HIV | 12 | 54 | 30 | 0 | 36 | 0 |

Table 26 - Homeless Needs Assessment

While some data is available for the Homeless Needs Assessment and Rural Homeless Needs Assessment tables, data regarding column 'Estimate the number of days persons experience homelessness' is available only by the HMIS generated System Performance Measure (SPM) report. The SPM only generates data in an aggregate format and cannot be broken down into the subcategories identified within the table. Total data was calculated for these categories, and is presented below: Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year: 14,741. This is the number of people experiencing homelessness statewide in emergency shelter, street outreach, and transitional housing programs between 1/1/24 - 10/31/24 as reported in the Utah Homeless Management Information System. This is an undercount as it does not include people in shelters or transitional housing that do not participate in UHMIS, including survivors of domestic violence service providers. It also does not include people experiencing unsheltered homelessness. In addition, the data available for this report does not include a full 12 months of data, likely contributing to an undercount. The 2024 Point-in-Time Count showed 1,008 Utahns were unsheltered on a single night and it seems reasonable to assume not all of them will enter a shelter or transitional housing project over the course of the year. Estimate the # becoming homeless each year: 507. This is the number of people entering emergency shelter, transitional housing, or permanent housing projects who had not been enrolled in one of those projects in the prior 24 months as recorded in UHMIS between 1/1/22 - 10/31/24. This is an undercount as it does not include people in shelters or transitional housing that do not participate in UHMIS, including survivors of domestic violence service providers, or those only experiencing unsheltered homelessness. Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year: 8,510. This is the number of people who exited homelessness between 1/1/24 - 10/31/24 as reported in the Utah Homeless Management Information System. This is an undercount as it does not include people in shelters or transitional housing that do not participate in UHMIS, including survivors of domestic violence service providers. Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness: 66.07. This is the average number of days people spent homeless in emergency shelter or transitional housing projects in 2023 as reported by UHMIS. This is an undercount as it does not include people in shelters or transitional housing that do not participate in UHMIS, including survivors of domestic violence service providers, or time spent unsheltered.

Data Source Comments:

Indicate if the homeless population is: Partially Rural Homeless

Rural Homeless Needs Assessment

| Population | Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night | | Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year | Estimate the # becoming homeless each year | Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year | Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness |
|--|--|-------------|--|--|---|--|
| | Sheltered | Unsheltered | | | | |
| Persons in Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren) | 11 | 167 | 512 | 24 | 254 | 0 |
| Persons in Households with Only Children | 0 | 6 | 47 | 6 | 30 | 0 |
| Persons in Households with Only Adults | 375 | 170 | 1,249 | 36 | 687 | 0 |
| Chronically Homeless Individuals | 90 | 23 | 122 | 6 | 46 | 0 |
| Chronically Homeless Families | 6 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veterans | 7 | 3 | 67 | 4 | 36 | 0 |
| Unaccompanied Youth | 24 | 37 | 176 | 9 | 113 | 0 |
| Persons with HIV | 2 | 3 | 5 | 66 | 4 | 0 |

Table 27 - Homeless Needs Assessment

While some data is available for the Homeless Needs Assessment and Rural Homeless Needs Assessment tables, data regarding column 'Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness' is available only by the HMIS generated System Performance Measure (SPM) report. The SPM only generates data in an aggregate format and cannot be broken down into the subcategories identified within the table. Total data was calculated for these categories, and is presented below: Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year: 14,741. This is the number of people experiencing homelessness statewide in emergency shelter, street outreach, and transitional housing programs between 1/1/24 - 10/31/24 as reported in the Utah Homeless Management Information System. This is an undercount as it does not include people in shelters or transitional housing that do not participate in UHMIS, including survivors of domestic violence service providers. It also does not include people experiencing unsheltered homelessness. In addition, the data available for this report does not include a full 12 months of data, likely contributing to an undercount. The 2024 Point-in-Time Count showed 1,008 Utahns were unsheltered on a single night and it seems reasonable to assume not all of them will enter a shelter or transitional housing project over the course of the year. Estimate the # becoming homeless each year: 507. This is the number of people entering emergency shelter, transitional housing, or permanent housing projects who had not been enrolled in one of those projects in the prior 24 months as recorded in UHMIS between 1/1/22 - 10/31/24. This is an undercount as it does not include people in shelters or transitional housing that do not participate in UHMIS, including survivors of domestic violence service providers, or those only experiencing unsheltered homelessness. Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year: 8,510. This is the number of people who exited homelessness between 1/1/24 - 10/31/24 as reported in the Utah Homeless Management Information System. This is an undercount as it does not include people in shelters or transitional housing that do not participate in UHMIS, including survivors of domestic violence service providers. Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness: 66.07. This is the average number of days people spent homeless in emergency shelter or transitional housing projects in 2023 as reported by UHMIS. This is an undercount as it does not include people in shelters or transitional housing that do not participate in UHMIS, including survivors of domestic violence service providers, or time spent unsheltered.

Data Source Comments:

For persons in rural areas who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, describe the nature and extent of unsheltered and sheltered homelessness with the jurisdiction:

Individuals and families in Rural Utah face limited access to shelters, services, and affordable housing options. Homelessness in rural Utah presents unique challenges, particularly due to the state's expansive public lands. Utah encompasses approximately 83,000 square miles, with approximately 71% of this area—about 38,578,390 acres—designated as public lands. The distribution of public lands varies significantly across Utah's counties. For instance, San Juan County in the Balance of State CoC, the largest county by area, spans approximately 7,820 square miles, with a substantial portion designated as public lands. While urban areas like Salt Lake City face visible homelessness, rural areas often have less infrastructure to address the issue. Public lands, which make up a significant portion of the state's landscape, can sometimes provide temporary shelter for those without homes, but these areas are not equipped with the necessary services or support systems to help individuals transition out of homelessness. The vastness of these lands means that many people are isolated, making access to resources like food, healthcare, and social services difficult. Additionally, the sparse population in rural counties can lead to fewer outreach programs and limited community support networks. Without public transportation or nearby shelters, homeless individuals often face harsh environmental conditions, especially in colder months. As a result, addressing homelessness in rural Utah requires a balance of increasing service accessibility and managing the challenges posed by expansive, remote public lands.

Rural areas in Utah that border neighboring states present additional challenges for addressing homelessness. The proximity to states like Colorado, Arizona, Wyoming, and Idaho can make it even harder to track and serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness. Many of these regions are vast and sparsely populated, which means that homeless individuals can be spread across large areas, making it difficult for outreach programs to locate and reach them.

On the night of the 2024 Point-in-Time (PIT) Count, 570 individuals or 17% of the individuals experiencing homelessness in Utah were in rural counties. Rural counties accounted for 11% of Utah's individuals in households of adults and children, 21% of individuals in households of only children, and 18% of individuals in households of only adults. The 2024 PIT Count does reveal that chronic homelessness, veteran homelessness, and homelessness among individuals with HIV/AIDS, mental illnesses, and individuals with substance use disorders in Utah is less common in rural areas than in urban counties. Due to the difficulties of counting in rural areas, it is likely that homelessness is more prevalent in rural counties in Utah than these numbers indicate.

If data is not available for the categories "number of persons becoming and exiting homelessness each year," and "number of days that persons experience homelessness," describe these categories for each homeless population type (including chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth):

DRAFT

Nature and Extent of Homelessness: (Optional)

| Race: | Sheltered: | Unsheltered (optional) |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------------------|
| White | 0 | 0 |
| Black or African American | 0 | 0 |
| Asian | 0 | 0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 |
| Ethnicity: | Sheltered: | Unsheltered (optional) |
| Hispanic | 0 | 0 |
| Not Hispanic | 0 | 0 |

Data Source
Comments:

Data unavailable in such narrow demographic categories

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance for families with children and the families of veterans.

Utah had 297 households of adults and children containing 946 individuals experiencing homelessness on the night of its 2024 PIT Count. One of these households included a veteran. A recent analysis of data from Utah's Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) found that 12,336 individuals in households of adults and children accessed the homeless response system in calendar year 2024. Of these individuals, 7,872 were under the age of 18.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Homelessness by Racial and Ethnic Group.

The 2024 PIT Count reported the following racial and ethnic demographics for Utah's experiencing homelessness.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.

There were 3,869 individuals experiencing homelessness in Utah on the night of the 2024 Point-in-Time (PIT) Count. A total of 2,861, or 74%, were sheltered in either emergency shelter or transitional housing projects and 1,108 or 26% were unsheltered. Unsheltered homelessness was experienced almost exclusively by individuals in households of only adults, with only three individuals in households of adults and children and no individuals in households of only children counted in a place not meant for human habitation on that night. Despite being more visible in urban areas and Salt Lake County specifically, homelessness is spread broadly across the entire state. The majority of individuals experiencing homelessness were counted in Salt Lake County, which reported 66% total of the statewide PIT count, including 69% of the sheltered count and 47% of the unsheltered count. Utah, Summit, and Wasatch counties, comprising the Mountainland CoC, reported 6% of the statewide PIT count, including 4% of the sheltered count and 15% of the unsheltered count, with 91% of that total and 100% of the unsheltered count coming from Utah County. The rest of the state's counties, which comprise the Balance of State CoC, reported 28% of the statewide count, including 27% of the sheltered and 37% of the unsheltered counts.

Discussion:

While data is available for 'number of persons becoming and exiting homelessness each year,' and 'number of days that persons experience homelessness,' it is only available by manipulating reports from the System Performance Measure submission for each of the Utah CoCs. The System Performance Measures do not calculate the distinct population subcategories identified in the Homeless needs assessment and the Rural Homeless needs assessment tables. A reliable method of identifying what percentage of each subpopulation is not established, therefore data was calculated for the state in total, but not delineated by subpopulation.

NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment – 91.305 (b,d)

Introduction

HOPWA

| Current HOPWA formula use: | |
|--|---|
| Cumulative cases of AIDS reported | 0 |
| Area incidence of AIDS | 0 |
| Rate per population | 0 |
| Number of new cases prior year (3 years of data) | 0 |
| Rate per population (3 years of data) | 0 |

| Current HIV surveillance data: | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Persons living with HIV (PLWH) | 290 |
| Area Prevalence (PLWH per population) | 400 |
| Number of new HIV cases reported last year | 0 |

Table 28 – HOPWA Data

Data Source: CDC HIV Surveillance

HIV Housing Need (HOPWA Grantees Only)

| Type of HOPWA Assistance | Estimates of Unmet Need |
|--|-------------------------|
| Tenant based rental assistance | 0 |
| Short-term Rent, Mortgage, and Utility | 0 |
| Facility Based Housing (Permanent, short-term or transitional) | 0 |

Table 29 – HIV Housing Need

Data Source: HOPWA CAPER and HOPWA Beneficiary Verification Worksheet

Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

The special needs population that can be served with Housing Opportunities for Person with AIDS (HOPWA) funds include individuals and families with an HIV/AIDS diagnosis. This population is at high risk of other housing instability factors as healthcare costs are higher than the overall population and they may face differentiation based on common personal characteristics attributable to their medical diagnosis that may be at odds with the overall population.

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

The housing and supportive service needs for special needs populations in Utah are tenant based rental assistance (TBRA) and short term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance (STRMU). The State of Utah HOPWA program is designed to assist statewide HOPWA-eligible households living with HIV/AIDS who are under 80% Area Median Income (AMI) with well-coordinated housing, establish or maintain a stable, safe, and affordable living, with a sanitary environment free from discrimination while waiting for permanent housing placement or Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) Housing. The federal HOPWA program funds housing, social services, supportive services, program planning, and development costs. These include, but are not limited to, the acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction of housing units; costs for facility operations; rental assistance; and short-term payments to prevent homelessness. Persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families may require housing that provides emergency, transitional, or long-term affordable solutions.

There are two basic elements of HOPWA eligibility:

1- A low-income household has at least one person who has Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS) or related diseases (Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV)) diagnosis. This client and his/her family is eligible to receive HOPWA assistance. This includes households where the only eligible person is a minor. Medical verification of status is required.

2- Total household income is less than 80 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI), as defined by HUD.

The Office of Homeless Services (OHS) encourages project sponsors to work closely with the University of Utah Infectious Disease clinic, Utah Community Action, the Department of Health and Human Services and UAF Legacy Health to receive referrals to provide eligible HOPWA clients with housing assistance and case management. These entities are the main source of client referrals. The coordination between

referrals and agencies with HOPWA subsidy is proving to be beneficial. Every eligible household referred to HOPWA Project Sponsors receive financial assistance when needed, which allows them to remain in their current housing, pay utilities, or obtain the first month's rent and/or deposit to move into safe, sanitary housing. Needs were determined by the HOPWA Steering Committee taking into consideration available services and data related to HIV/Aids populations.

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

The geographic areas served through project sponsors concentrate on urban areas along the Wasatch Front, and Davis and Weber County serving a total of 47 HOPWA participants. The HOPWA program leverages supportive services such as case management and other mainstream housing services through its sponsors and partners. The Office of Homeless Services (OHS) is working with other areas of the state, encouraging them to apply for HOPWA funding.

During this fiscal year, HOPWA funds were awarded to four agencies to provide direct financial assistance and supportive services to eligible clients' in Salt Lake, Weber and Davis Counties.

If the PJ will establish a preference for a HOME TBRA activity for persons with a specific category of disabilities (e.g., persons with HIV/AIDS or chronic mental illness), describe their unmet need for housing and services needed to narrow the gap in benefits and services received by such persons. (See 24 CFR 92.209(c)(2) (ii))

Not applicable to the State of Utah's programs.

Discussion:

NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs - 91.315 (f)

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Facilities:

Improvements in public facilities remain a priority in Utah's non-entitlement areas. Public facilities such as fire stations, community centers, senior centers, and health facilities are the 2nd biggest priority in the rural areas. Fire trucks and ambulances are also included in this category. The Office of Homeless Services (OHS) encourages project sponsors to work closely with the University of Utah Infectious Disease Clinic and the Utah Aids Foundation (UAF Legacy Health) to receive referrals to provide eligible HOPWA clients with housing assistance and case management. These two entities are a main source of client referral.

How were these needs determined?

The community development needs and priorities are discussed and organized at the local level through the seven regional associations of governments (AOGs), which act as a conduit and forum for the discussion and prioritization of projects. Each AOG has a representative who consults regularly with their local communities to determine community development needs and to provide feedback to the State of Utah to help direct and inform funding and prioritization needs. Additionally, other community partners and state agencies help inform the needs around for projects with feedback and projects funded through their respective programs.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Improvements:

A major priority is Public Improvements. Improvements to aging infrastructure, such as water and sewer systems, are among the most critical needs in rural Utah. In jurisdictions of less than 1,000 people, there is not a sufficient tax base to pay for these types of projects outright, thus necessitating outside investment to remain viable. In many cases, these jurisdictions are replacing and upsizing lines that are over 50 years old to bring them up to the required sizes and standards by regulatory agencies.

How were these needs determined?

The community development needs and priorities funded in part by the State of Utah determined at the local level through the seven regional associations of governments (AOGs). As part of their annual allocation of CDBG Administration/Consolidated Planning grants, each AOG representative consults regularly with their local communities to determine community development needs. The regional CDBG application rating and ranking systems are updated annually to reflect these local needs.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Services:

In the CDBG program, Public Service activities are the third highest priority. Funding for these types of activities are limited to 15% of the annual CDBG allocation. In the Utah CDBG program, the public service priorities can include items such as Meals-on-Wheels vehicles and senior transportation vehicles.

How were these needs determined?

The community development needs and priorities funded by the Utah Small Cities Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program are determined at the local level through the seven regional associations of governments (AOGs). As part of their annual allocation of CDBG Administration/Consolidated Planning grants, each AOG representative consults regularly with their local communities to determine community development needs. The regional CDBG application rating and ranking systems are updated annually to reflect these local needs. The Utah CDBG program receives a very limited amount of funding, approximately \$5,000,000 per year.

Additionally, within the CDBG program, the local governments, in consultation with the regional AOG representatives, have prioritized "brick and mortar" projects above public service projects.

Housing Market Analysis

MA-05 Overview

Housing Market Analysis Overview:

Conducting a thorough market analysis that encompasses all the needs addressed by the Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) and the Office of Homeless Services (OHS) using Community Development and Planning (CPD) funds on a statewide basis is extremely challenging. The HCD and OHS have gone to great lengths to address the need for affordable housing described in the Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute's State of the State's Housing Market, 2022-2024:

<https://d36oiwf74r1rap.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/State-Of-Housing-Sep2023.pdf?x71849>

<https://d36oiwf74r1rap.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/State-Of-Housing-Sep2023.pdf?x71849>

This report details the market conditions within the state and highlights the ongoing crisis of housing affordability. The Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness also facilitated an in-depth look at homeless needs and details the Utah Plan to make homelessness rare, brief and non-recurring. Rural community needs addressed by the CDBG program have been analyzed in seven regional plans compiled by our partner agencies, the seven Associations of Governments.

MA-10 Number of Housing Units – 91.310(a)

Introduction

The housing markets found in Utah are complex and varied. The major population centers in the Wasatch Front have experienced strong population increases, with increases in the cost of housing far outstripping wage growth, and affordability has suffered. In some rural counties, population growth is stagnant, and housing inventory is aging. Other areas in Utah have seen spikes in housing costs as tourism has created hot spots and rentals have eliminated much of the local supply. However, the vast majority of Utahns live in the Wasatch Front area where the primary concern is affordability. This affordability shortage affects all housing types and household types, and is most pronounced at the lowest income levels. More county-by-county information can be found in the Utah Affordable Housing Report: <https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/reports/documents/affordablehousingreport.pdf>

All residential properties by number of units

| Property Type | Number | % |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| 1-unit detached structure | 719,841 | 69% |
| 1-unit, attached structure | 63,425 | 6% |
| 2-4 units | 78,127 | 7% |
| 5-19 units | 81,373 | 8% |
| 20 or more units | 66,132 | 6% |
| Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc | 37,699 | 4% |
| Total | 1,046,597 | 100% |

Table 30 – Residential Properties by Unit Number

Data Source: 2016-2020 ACS

Unit Size by Tenure

| | Owners | | Renters | |
|------------|--------|-----|---------|-----|
| | Number | % | Number | % |
| No bedroom | 1,441 | 0% | 9,876 | 3% |
| 1 bedroom | 7,810 | 1% | 51,286 | 18% |
| 2 bedrooms | 69,870 | 11% | 107,643 | 38% |

| | Owners | | Renters | |
|--------------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| | Number | % | Number | % |
| 3 or more bedrooms | 574,308 | 88% | 116,131 | 41% |
| Total | 653,429 | 100% | 284,936 | 100% |

Table 31 – Unit Size by Tenure

Data 2016-2020 ACS
Source:

Describe the number and targeting (income level/type of family served) of units assisted with federal, state, and local programs.

The Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund (OWHLF) often acts as a "gap financier" in multifamily housing projects. OWHLF funds are highly leveraged and help provide a piece of the funding puzzle to ensure the creation of thousands of affordable housing units. Over the last few years OWHLF has contributed to the creation of more than 5,000 affordable units in conjunction with HOME, HTF, state, and other funds. These projects typically target 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI) or lower households with the average AMI for multi-family projects often being in the mid-50% AMI level. The unit types funded range from Single Resident Occupancy Units to 4 bedroom units. Most units funded with HOME funds are one or two bedroom units. HTF funds target 30% or lower AMI levels. These funds are also highly leveraged with total units constructed being lower but still substantial. These are often smaller units targeting smaller family types.

Provide an assessment of units expected to be lost from the affordable housing inventory for any reason, such as expiration of Section 8 contracts.

The loss of affordable housing inventory is a major concern for HCD. Of particular concern is the loss of large affordable multifamily housing complexes. These units are often at risk as they exit their required period of affordability. HCD does not track which units are nearing the end of their period of affordability but are very supportive of investing in aging projects that desire to maintain affordability. HCD does not fund Section 8 vVouchers and does not track them.

In the overall housing market there has been a large decrease of affordable housing inventory as private housing, both single family and rental units, have gone up in price at a steep rate.

Does the availability of housing units meet the needs of the population?

There is currently a large shortage of affordable housing units. This is especially true of affordable housing units for large families and for very low- and extremely low-income households. Utah as a whole has experienced large population increases, especially in its major metropolitan region along the Wasatch Front.

Describe the need for specific types of housing:

The greatest shortage of housing is at the lowest income levels. Units affordable to extremely low- or very low-income populations are needed. However, as much larger segments of the population exist closer to 80% to 100%AMI the lack of affordable housing even within these income levels impacts the largest overall number of households. This is true for both homeowner and rental units. HCD is primarily interested in providing for 60% or lower AMI households as these populations are the most impacted by unaffordability.

Discussion

From 2019 to 2023, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, Utah increased its supply of housing units by an average of around 31,000 housing units per year. Over the same time period, the average occupancy rate has increased from 90.3% to 92.8%. This indicates a constriction in the supply of housing as increased demand has driven more housing units to be created and occupied.

Those with the greatest resources are able to buy or rent housing, with each income stratum down the ladder buying successively lower-quality housing, notwithstanding the distorting effects of discrimination. Hypothetically, the market should produce enough housing to satisfy the demands of those throughout the socioeconomic spectrum.

Additionally, for efforts related to broadband access and resiliency planning, see MA-60 and MA-65 respectively.

MA-15 Cost of Housing – 91.310(a)

Introduction

Cost of Housing

| | Base Year: 2009 | Most Recent Year: 2020 | % Change |
|----------------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------|
| Median Home Value | 215,900 | 238,300 | 10% |
| Median Contract Rent | 768 | 822 | 7% |

Table 32 – Cost of Housing

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2016-2020 ACS (Most Recent Year)

| Rent Paid | Number | % |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Less than \$500 | 47,208 | 16.6% |
| \$500-999 | 151,837 | 53.3% |
| \$1,000-1,499 | 65,730 | 23.1% |
| \$1,500-1,999 | 14,635 | 5.1% |
| \$2,000 or more | 5,526 | 1.9% |
| Total | 284,936 | 100.0% |

Table 33 - Rent Paid

Data Source: 2016-2020 ACS

Housing Affordability

| Number of Units affordable to Households earning | Renter | Owner |
|--|---------|---------|
| 30% HAMFI | 16,955 | No Data |
| 50% HAMFI | 67,270 | 26,385 |
| 80% HAMFI | 178,235 | 121,655 |

| Number of Units affordable to Households earning | Renter | Owner |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| 100% HAMFI | No Data | 213,430 |
| Total | 262,460 | 361,470 |

Table 34 – Housing Affordability

Data 2016-2020 CHAS
Source:

Monthly Rent

| Monthly Rent (\$) | Efficiency (no bedroom) | 1 Bedroom | 2 Bedroom | 3 Bedroom | 4 Bedroom |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Fair Market Rent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| High HOME Rent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Low HOME Rent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 35 – Monthly Rent

Data Source Comments:

Is there sufficient housing for households at all income levels?

The current housing situation is very much in flux. The housing market is facing uncertainty, especially with inflation, tariffs, and other governmental changes. How this will impact people's income levels and how the housing market will be affected is a critical question with no easy answer as of yet. What is sure is that in the major urban population centers of Utah there is, has been, and will likely remain, a large deficit of affordable housing for low-income and very low-income households due to the increased economic development, population growth, and changes to the current migration patterns of the United States.

How is affordability of housing likely to change considering changes to home values and/or rents?

In the current economic environment, there is no way of knowing how home values and/or rents will change in the near future or long-term during the duration of the five-year plan. However, the changes in home values and rents which have occurred over the course of the last five-year period has caused many to be rent- or housing-burdened and even a correction in the housing market would still leave a large portion of the population unable to find affordable housing. This is particularly true should an economic recession or depression increase the number of very low- or extremely low-income households. If the past trends continue, Utah will face a shortage of affordable housing units.

How do HOME rents / Fair Market Rent compare to Area Median Rent? How might this impact your strategy to produce or preserve affordable housing?

Utah is a large state with many different regions with disparate housing markets. Decisions regarding the production and preservation of affordable housing are based on need as well as the capacity of developers to address that need. In rural areas there is less need for large multifamily housing developments, except in high-end resort destinations where construction costs make the development of affordable housing extremely expensive and difficult. Rural areas instead focus on rehabilitation of affordable single-family homes to preserve affordability for low-income households. In urban areas the method of delivery for the HOME and HTF programs produces many affordable housing units where they are most needed.

Discussion

MA-20 Condition of Housing – 91.310(a)

Introduction:

Describe the jurisdiction's definition of "standard condition" and "substandard condition but suitable for rehabilitation":

The definition for "Standard Condition" is that the condition must be in compliance with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Housing Quality Standards (HQS) and also state and local codes (specifically the International Building code). The definition in use for "Substandard Condition but Suitable for Rehabilitation" is the unit is in poor condition but that it is financially and structurally feasible to rehabilitate.

Condition of Units

| Condition of Units | Owner-Occupied | | Renter-Occupied | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| | Number | % | Number | % |
| With one selected Condition | 131,732 | 20% | 117,630 | 41% |
| With two selected Conditions | 3,503 | 1% | 11,252 | 4% |
| With three selected Conditions | 145 | 0% | 447 | 0% |
| With four selected Conditions | 6 | 0% | 48 | 0% |
| No selected Conditions | 518,043 | 79% | 155,559 | 55% |
| Total | 653,429 | 100% | 284,936 | 100% |

Table 36 - Condition of Units

Data Source: 2016-2020 ACS

Year Unit Built

| Year Unit Built | Owner-Occupied | | Renter-Occupied | |
|-----------------|----------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| | Number | % | Number | % |
| 2000 or later | 189,694 | 29% | 65,435 | 23% |
| 1980-1999 | 196,685 | 30% | 87,909 | 31% |
| 1950-1979 | 201,162 | 31% | 95,714 | 34% |
| Before 1950 | 65,888 | 10% | 35,878 | 13% |

| Year Unit Built | Owner-Occupied | | Renter-Occupied | |
|-----------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| | Number | % | Number | % |
| Total | 653,429 | 100% | 284,936 | 101% |

Table 37 – Year Unit Built

Data 2016-2020 CHAS
Source:

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard

| Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard | Owner-Occupied | | Renter-Occupied | |
|---|----------------|-----|-----------------|-----|
| | Number | % | Number | % |
| Total Number of Units Built Before 1980 | 267,050 | 41% | 131,592 | 46% |
| Housing Units built before 1980 with children present | 141,095 | 22% | 98,450 | 35% |

Table 38 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint

Data 2016-2020 ACS (Total Units) 2016-2020 CHAS (Units with Children present)
Source:

Vacant Units

| | Suitable for Rehabilitation | Not Suitable for Rehabilitation | Total |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| Vacant Units | 98,186 | 0 | 98,186 |
| Abandoned Vacant Units | 0 | | |
| REO Properties | 30 | 0 | 30 |
| Abandoned REO Properties | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 39 - Vacant Units

Data Source Comments:

Data for vacant Units taken from Census Data: Table B25002 set to Utah (2023 ACS 5-Year Estimates) and REO Properties estimate came from market research conducted by HCD staff that found between 8 to 30 housing units listed for sale statewide that came from commercial listing. Determining if a unit is fit for Rehabilitation or not is something that is conducted programatically prior to committing funds to a project, as Utah does not have a statewide database that contains information regarding the suitability of rehabilitation a property for habitation.

Need for Owner and Rental Rehabilitation

Estimated Number of Housing Units Occupied by Low or Moderate Income Families with LBP Hazards

The Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) does not have a good estimate for the number of households statewide that may have lead-based paint hazards. That being said, the HCD does have data that shows trends that can be part of addressing lead-based paint hazards. According to ACS data (table S0201 for Utah), 58.8% of housing units in Utah were constructed prior to 1980, though there is no way to know the hazards that may exist in such housing without individual inspections due to that fact that lead-based paint, regardless if it is in good condition is not, itself, a hazard. But according to estimates provided by the HUD's 's Deteriorated Paint Index (DPI) data set (found at https://hudgis-hud.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/HUD::deteriorated-paint-index-by-tract/explore?filters=eyJTVFEFURSI6Wyl0OSJdfQ%3D%3D&location=38.611801%2C-109.054259%2C7.45&style=AGE_0_5_RA TE), there is a growing risk of lead-based paint exposure due to the deterioration of paint over time. These do tend to be concentrated in areas with greater concentrations of housing built pre-1978 (according to the Utah Department of Environmental Quality Environmental Interactive Map found at <https://enviro.deq.utah.gov/>). As such, there is a danger. That being said, according to the Utah Department of Health and Human Services, levels of lead found in the blood of children have been going down and trending towards zero since the introduction of testing in 1996 (for more info please see Health Indicator Report of Blood Lead in Children at <https://ibis.utah.gov/ibisph-view/indicator/view/BloLeaChild.Year.html>). In short, while there is a risk of lead exposure, the data shows that efforts being made are currently addressing the hazards, though there is always room for improvement.

Discussion:

MA-25 Public and Assisted Housing – (Optional)

Introduction:

Totals Number of Units

| | Program Type | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|------------------|--|----------------------------------|---------------|
| | Certificate | Mod-R ehab | Public Housing | Vouchers | | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Project -based | Tenant -based | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | Disabled * |
| # of units vouchers available | | | | 91 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # of accessible units | | | | | | | | | |

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

Table 40 – Total Number of Units by Program Type

Data PIC (PIH Information Center)
Source:

Describe the supply of public housing developments:

Describe the number and physical condition of public housing units in the jurisdiction, including those that are participating in an approved Public Housing Agency Plan:

The HCD does not fund housing agencies. The HCD has chosen to instead fund the creation of new affordable housing development through the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund, which is a revolving loan fund that provides financing for the acquisition, rehabilitation, and creation of new multifamily housing projects. We consider this to be the best and most efficient use of HOME and HTF funds.

Describe the Restoration and Revitalization Needs of public housing units in the jurisdiction:

The stock of public housing across the state is aging and deteriorating. There is a backlog of capital needs for these properties. Currently, housing authorities receive an inadequate level of funding to make the needed improvements and under current funding levels public housing stock will continue to deteriorate.

Describe the public housing agency's strategy for improving the living environment of low- and moderate-income families residing in public housing:

Efforts are being made in Utah to reinvest and rehabilitate public housing. Improvements to the living environments include upgrades to kitchens and bathrooms, the addition of laundry rooms, new heating and cooling, and infrastructure improvements like sewer and water lines. Properties will also have increased energy efficiency. Community amenities are also being added such as exercise rooms and playgrounds.

Discussion:

DRAFT

MA-30 Homeless Facilities – 91.310(b)

Introduction

Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons

| | Emergency Shelter Beds | | Transitional Housing Beds | Permanent Supportive Housing Beds | |
|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| | Year Round Beds (Current & New) | Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds | Current & New | Current & New | Under Development |
| Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren) | 393 | 0 | 298 | 1,391 | 0 |
| Households with Only Adults | 1,071 | 761 | 238 | 1,947 | 142 |
| Chronically Homeless Households | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,667 | 0 |
| Veterans | 0 | 0 | 92 | 851 | 0 |
| Unaccompanied Youth | 58 | 41 | 24 | 11 | 0 |

Table 41 - Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons

Data Source Comments: Aggregated data from the 2024 PIT count, the 2024 HIC, and the current contracts for units in development in Utah as of May 2025.

Describe mainstream services, such as health, mental health, and employment services to the extent those services are used to complement services targeted to homeless persons

Child Care Development Fund - Child care assistance (CCDF)

Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP)

Community based mental health services

Community based substance use and addiction services

Drug court

Housing Choice Vouchers (Section 8)

Job training and employment services

Low-Income Housing Tax Credit

Medicare

Medicaid (for families)

Mental Health Court for adults and juveniles

Public Housing

Refugee financial assistance

Social Security

Social Security Disability (SSDI)

Supplemental Security Income (SSI)

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)

Supportive Housing (Housing Authorities of Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County and SLCo Department of Behavioral Health Services)

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

Time limited cash assistance and case management for single adults and married couples with no dependent children (General Assistance)

Unemployment

Veteran's Benefits

Vocational Rehabilitation

Worker's Compensation

Youth Services (including Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act)

Other low-cost housing options

<https://jobs.utah.gov/employer/business/htc.html>

List and describe services and facilities that meet the needs of homeless persons, particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth. If the services and facilities are listed on screen SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure or screen MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services, describe how these facilities and services specifically address the needs of these populations.

Listed as an attachment

MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services – 91.310(c)

Introduction

HOPWA Assistance Baseline Table

| Type of HOPWA Assistance | Number of Units Designated or Available for People with HIV/AIDS and their families |
|--------------------------|---|
| TBRA | 0 |
| PH in facilities | 0 |
| STRMU | 0 |
| ST or TH facilities | 0 |
| PH placement | 0 |

Table 42 – HOPWA Assistance Baseline

Data HOPWA CAPER and HOPWA Beneficiary Verification Worksheet
Source:

To the extent information is available, describe the facilities and services that assist persons who are not homeless but who require supportive housing, and programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing

There are a variety of programs to assist special needs non-homeless populations throughout the State of Utah. Utah is committed to ensuring there is a wide array of supportive housing and programs for Utahns experiencing mental and physical illness. Facilities and services listed in MA-30 are committed to providing safe, decent and affordable housing options and resources for Utahns experiencing mental and physical illness. Through Medicaid expansion, Utah continues to explore expanded funding options for supportive services related to supportive housing. The Utah Continuum of Care and Local Homeless Coordinating Committees (LHCCs) are committed to providing a continuum of housing options for individuals they serve, whether these individuals are leaving institutional settings or currently living in the community. LHCCs partner with local Aging Services organizations to connect older adults to supportive housing and resources. The State of Utah partners with local Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) for ongoing funding opportunities and alignment on best practices for serving low-income and special needs populations. The State of Utah has appropriated \$5,000,000 in annual subsidies for extremely low-income (at or below 30% of the Area Median Income) households. This funding was prioritized for organizations that will serve individuals experiencing homelessness but will also serve extremely low-income populations who are exiting mental, physical and behavioral health institutions.

The State of Utah has also prioritized the generation of deeply affordable housing through ARPA and state-matched dollars, totaling over \$105,000,000. The funding formula gave priority to housing and service providers who assist individuals and families experiencing homelessness but will also serve households exiting institutionalized settings. Both State of Utah funding sources for ongoing subsidy and construction require organizations to provide ongoing supportive services through a deed restriction period of no less than 15 years and up to 50 years.

Describe programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing

Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. 91.315(e)

Utah's Department of Workforce Services Office of Homeless Services (OHS) administers the HOPWA grant which assists individuals with an HIV or AIDS diagnosis through TBRA, STRMU and PHP activities. The OHS has been awarded funds by HUD for the Section 811 Project Rental Assistance (PRA) program, which will provide rental subsidies to extremely low-income, non-elderly disabled Utahns in integrated housing settings across the state. Utah's approach to addressing homelessness and housing needs related to homelessness have been decentralized in order for coordination to be done on the local level through the Local Homeless Councils (LHCs). This allows for communities to address their needs at the local level through planning and program implementation. For many special populations whose needs vary from person to person, this approach allows communities the flexibility to develop solutions appropriate to their situation. The state will evaluate progress annually and work collaboratively with local communities to develop performance improvement plans and hold them accountable for making progress. LHCs are the designated local oversight bodies that are responsible to:

- Develop a common agenda and vision for reducing homelessness in their respective regions;
- Develop a spending plan that coordinates the funding supplied to local stakeholders;
- Monitor the progress toward achieving state and local goals; and
- Align local funding to projects that are improving outcomes and targeting specific needs in the community.

For entitlement/consortia grantees: Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. (91.220(2))

DRAFT

MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing – 91.310(d)

Negative Effects of Public Policies on Affordable Housing and Residential Investment

Rising housing costs and stagnating real wages are the primary causes of worsening housing affordability in Utah. From 2022 to 2023, average monthly income (<https://jobs.utah.gov/wi/data/library/wages/annualprofilewages.html>) grew by 4.3% while rent (<https://d36oiwf74r1rap.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/SLTribRenters-Feb2023.pdf>) crept upward at a rate of 11.0% between 2020 and 2022 (most recent data available).

Wages for the vast majority of Utahns have lagged far behind growth in productivity. This is the primary explanation for the rise of income inequality over the past generation. The disappointing living-standards growth preceded the Great Recession and continues to this day. The dismal wage-growth is the result of a larger nationwide upward redistribution of wealth and income, which can be attributed to a governmental failure to adhere to full employment objectives, fiscal austerity, and various labor market policies and business practices allowing the higher social strata of a professional class to capture ever larger shares of economic growth. The distributive share of total income between labor and capital has moved towards property wealth, leading to weak wage gains. This is the result of institutional transformations that have exposed workers to the vulnerability of higher turnover, resulting in higher averages of unemployment, as defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Providing governmental support to create an atmosphere where socially equitable forms of shelter are accessible is a challenge, but not an insurmountable one. Ignoring the issue of housing affordability from an institutional point of view will only contribute to the slippery slope vulnerable that Utahns continually risk, toward housing instability, homelessness and social detachment.

If policy makers are dedicated to increasing access to affordable housing, they must identify the concrete arrangements through which economic forces that impact housing insecurity are actively manifested.

Growth control policies can serve as tools to control and direct development or as regulatory barriers to prevent additional development. Tools communities might use are zoning policies, building codes, limiting the number of building permits, impact fees, density, and subdivision designs. These barriers often are the results of a not-in-my-backyard (NIMBY) mentality.

MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets -91.315(f)

Introduction

Economic Development Market Analysis

Business Activity

| Business by Sector | Number of Workers | Number of Jobs | Share of Workers % | Share of Jobs % | Jobs less workers % |
|---|-------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction | 9,909 | 9,699 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations | 40,982 | 37,596 | 14 | 18 | 4 |
| Construction | 27,810 | 21,497 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| Education and Health Care Services | 43,938 | 30,836 | 15 | 15 | 0 |
| Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate | 16,323 | 10,284 | 6 | 5 | -1 |
| Information | 6,092 | 2,649 | 2 | 1 | -1 |
| Manufacturing | 38,692 | 25,036 | 14 | 12 | -2 |
| Other Services | 8,897 | 6,429 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Professional, Scientific, Management Services | 23,907 | 12,285 | 8 | 6 | -2 |
| Public Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail Trade | 43,070 | 32,379 | 15 | 16 | 1 |

| Business by Sector | Number of Workers | Number of Jobs | Share of Workers % | Share of Jobs % | Jobs less workers % |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Transportation and Warehousing | 14,143 | 9,770 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Wholesale Trade | 11,513 | 6,470 | 4 | 3 | -1 |
| Total | 285,276 | 204,930 | -- | -- | -- |

Table 43- Business Activity

Data 2016-2020 ACS (Workers), 2020 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (Jobs)
Source:

Labor Force

| | |
|--|---------|
| Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force | 525,041 |
| Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over | 506,300 |
| Unemployment Rate | 3.44 |
| Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24 | 10.85 |
| Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65 | 1.90 |

Table 44 - Labor Force

Data 2016-2020 ACS
Source:

| Occupations by Sector | Number of People |
|--|------------------|
| Management, business and financial | 135,054 |
| Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations | 17,442 |
| Service | 48,084 |
| Sales and office | 115,557 |
| Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair | 49,782 |
| Production, transportation and material moving | 31,596 |

Table 45 – Occupations by Sector

Data 2016-2020 ACS
Source:

Travel Time

| Travel Time | Number | Percentage |
|--------------------|----------------|-------------|
| < 30 Minutes | 322,068 | 71% |
| 30-59 Minutes | 103,892 | 23% |
| 60 or More Minutes | 28,191 | 6% |
| Total | 454,151 | 100% |

Table 46 - Travel Time

Data 2016-2020 ACS
Source:

Education:

Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

| Educational Attainment | In Labor Force | | Not in Labor Force |
|---|-------------------|------------|--------------------|
| | Civilian Employed | Unemployed | |
| Less than high school graduate | 18,930 | 1,106 | 9,837 |
| High school graduate (includes equivalency) | 93,009 | 3,519 | 33,376 |
| Some college or Associate's degree | 145,444 | 3,321 | 44,182 |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 138,199 | 2,020 | 27,062 |

Table 47 - Educational Attainment by Employment Status

Data 2016-2020 ACS
Source:

Educational Attainment by Age

| | Age | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| | 18–24 yrs | 25–34 yrs | 35–44 yrs | 45–65 yrs | 65+ yrs |
| Less than 9th grade | 1,290 | 1,794 | 2,498 | 3,804 | 2,727 |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 12,545 | 6,916 | 5,500 | 9,402 | 5,304 |
| High school graduate, GED, or alternative | 37,982 | 37,495 | 34,597 | 57,893 | 35,629 |
| Some college, no degree | 36,524 | 36,618 | 37,084 | 62,839 | 39,560 |
| Associate's degree | 8,050 | 16,563 | 16,712 | 24,181 | 11,413 |
| Bachelor's degree | 5,010 | 32,450 | 39,237 | 45,166 | 25,143 |
| Graduate or professional degree | 245 | 8,517 | 17,212 | 25,437 | 16,255 |

Table 48 - Educational Attainment by Age

Data 2016-2020 ACS
Source:

Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

| Educational Attainment | Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months |
|---|--|
| Less than high school graduate | 0 |
| High school graduate (includes equivalency) | 0 |
| Some college or Associate's degree | 0 |
| Bachelor's degree | 0 |
| Graduate or professional degree | 0 |

Table 49 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Data Source Comments:

Based on the Business Activity table above, what are the major employment sectors within the state?

According to the Economic Development Market Analysis Table, the major employment sectors within the State of Utah are Retail Trade, Manufacturing, Arts, Entertainment and Accommodations, and Education and Healthcare.

Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of business in the state.

Utah is fortunate to have a well-developed workforce located along the Wasatch Front and in other parts of the State. Between a highly-educated workforce and business-friendly policies, the State has attracted investment and business development opportunities, resulting in a low unemployment rate and continued wage growth across the state, though there are some notable exceptions, particularly in rural Utah. The largest challenge in rural Utah continues to be the decline in jobs related to natural resource extraction and agriculture. This is, however, offset in part due to the growth in jobs related to tourism and entertainment.

As for infrastructure across the State, while continued growth has created pressures on infrastructure systems, particularly along the Wasatch Front (from South Utah County to Box Elder County along the I-15 Interstate), those challenges are being addressed with a combination of state and local investment, supplemented by federal funding. The State also ensures that there is funding to help rural communities maintain a basic level of infrastructure. While many of these rural systems need significant upgrades and repairs, there are resources available from state and local resources, along with federal funding for supplementing.

Describe any major changes that may have an economic impact, such as planned public or private sector investments or initiatives that have affected or may affect job and business growth opportunities during the planning period. Describe any needs for workforce development, business support or infrastructure these changes may create.

The governor recently announced a new initiative targeting public and private investments in the economic, infrastructure, and business community called "Built Here." It is a vision document guiding the State Government's goals through the second term of the sitting governor. The plan outlines a series of lofty goals that include items related to developing the economy and citizens of the state and outlining the direction that the state would like to go. Such investments focus on building transportation systems across the state to connect people and businesses, building up large energy projects such as power generation stations and transmission lines, and water infrastructure developments to increase conservation and ensure supplies will exist in the future. This visioning document will serve as a guiding principle for state agencies as they engage with potential funding decisions and policies. This, in turn, should encourage private investment in the state, thus increasing job opportunities and business development.

As these investments materialize, both in the public and private space, infrastructure, workforce development, and businesses will need additional support across all sectors.

How do the skills and education of the current workforce correspond to employment opportunities in the state?

The information provided on the *Educational Attainment by Employment Status* table (Table 47) indicates that there is still a large portion of the population without advanced degrees, though the number of those without some form of advanced education is smaller. Fortunately, there is no indication that the current level of educational attainment is leading to high unemployment. Nevertheless, higher employment attainment should result in superior income levels and opportunities.

Describe current workforce training initiatives supported by the state. Describe how these efforts will support the state's Consolidated Plan.

Utah's publicly funded universities have made a concerted effort to build university extensions or campuses in rural communities. These campuses are now found in many regional centers in rural areas and are hugely beneficial to promoting workforce training to populations that previously did not have access to it. The State of Utah is also working to strengthen apprenticeship programs and training opportunities. This training model combines work-based learning with related classroom instruction. Apprenticeships get paid to learn on the job, and employers build a strong, skilled workforce. Additionally, the state has made a concentrated effort to encourage and develop the skills of interested individuals to work remotely through various initiatives. The Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) promotes this effort by funding infrastructure and community services within these

communities that complement this effort. As these training opportunities allow citizens to increase their wages, they are less cost-burdened, and they can live, work, and fully participate in their communities.

Describe any other state efforts to support economic growth.

The Department of Workforce Services has a Workforce Development Division that works with job seekers and employers to align the skills and knowledge of our citizens with the needs of employers. With more than 30 employment centers embedded in communities across the state, services are provided to help job seekers connect with employers and receive the training and skills needed to be prepared for employment. Key initiatives the division participates in include; Utah's Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Plan, Utah's Labor Exchange System, outreach to at-risk job seeker populations, and outreach to individuals experiencing homelessness.

Discussion

DRAFT

MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

Are there areas where households with multiple housing problems are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")

The Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) does not have its own definition of "concentration" in the context of housing problems.

Are there any areas in the jurisdiction where racial or ethnic minorities or low-income families are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")

The entire State of Utah is the jurisdiction relevant to this plan. Racial and ethnic minorities are found more commonly in the major urban centers along the Wasatch Front and especially in the area in and around Salt Lake City. Low-income households are found in more affordable areas including West Valley City and communities in Salt Lake City such as Rose Park and Glendale. These areas have higher than average numbers of racial and ethnic minorities. Overall, Utah has a relatively low minority population and this population has only been present in any statistically relevant numbers in the last couple of decades. However, as with much of the United States, Utah is seeing minority populations increase relative to overall population increases.

What are the characteristics of the market in these areas/neighborhoods?

The housing market within urban areas is very healthy with strong increases in population values. This is not limited to wealthy neighborhoods. Increases in both the cost of homeowner housing and rental rates are widespread and impacting the stability of households. This is true across the urban Wasatch Front and rural Utah and extends into minority-heavy areas and neighborhoods.

Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?

While the HCD has not tracked community assets in areas/neighborhoods on a statewide basis, there has been a concerted effort to place community assets in all areas and neighborhoods, regardless of location.

Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?

The HCD has prioritized the building of new affordable housing. Much of this affordable housing is being constructed along light rail lines used for commuting or along public transit routes to allow access to public transportation. Many low-income areas and neighborhoods are located within reach of these light rail lines or public transportation lines, and new affordable housing is addressing a major concern, which is housing affordability.

DRAFT

MA-60 Broadband Needs of Housing occupied by Low- and Moderate-Income Households - 91.210(a)(4), 91.310(a)(2)

Describe the need for broadband wiring and connections for households, including low- and moderate-income households and neighborhoods.

Utah is very fortunate to have excellent broadband coverage and speeds throughout the state and even in our rural areas. Much of the credit goes to the “Utah way” of doing business, which is transparent and collaborative and utilizes the Utah Broadband Advisory Council (The Council) as a framework.

The Council was formed in June 2011, and meets regularly to coordinate and collaborate on broadband adoption and deployment efforts in the State of Utah. The government is working side-by-side with the private sector and higher education to make sure there is digital fairness and the highest quality service available to all Utahns.

The Council also strives to provide the governor and legislature with recommendations and policy guidance. Members of the Council represent varied interests including legislators, economic development, state and local government, healthcare, education, libraries, public safety and tribal entities. The Council is an active participant and has funded several projects through these partnerships.

For more information regarding the state of broadband in the State of Utah, please visit <https://business.utah.gov/broadband/>

Describe the need for increased competition by having more than one broadband Internet service provider serve the jurisdiction.

According to the Utah Broadband Center, broadband internet is generally available throughout the state. However, in some of the more remote parts of the state, only one or two providers can provide generally acceptable speeds. Additionally, the advent of satellite-based internet providers and the widespread use of said technologies have allowed for additional internet service in these remote areas. However, these are generally slower speeds, but are available to help with demand and provide competition for traditional earth-based technologies.

The only part of the state that is lagging behind is the Navajo Nation, which is located in the far southeast corner of Utah. This area is not eligible for state Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding, but the Utah Broadband Advisory Council is actively working on a project to bring better broadband service to the area. The remoteness and great distances between residents and communities make traditional fiber unattainable, but microwave internet, satellites, radio and other technologies are being put in place to address the problems.

Most multi-family housing units and neighborhoods in Utah are wired for reliable and speedy broadband. Digital fairness has been a top priority for many years.

For more information regarding the state of broadband in the State of Utah, please visit <https://business.utah.gov/broadband/>

DRAFT

MA-65 Hazard Mitigation - 91.210(a)(5), 91.310(a)(3)

Describe the jurisdiction's increased natural hazard risks associated with climate change.

As with many of the Consolidation Plan topics, the State strives to address hazard mitigation alongside local jurisdictions, as resiliency is often addressed best at a regional level. Each of the state's regional planning districts prepares a hazard mitigation plan every five years, and while there are similarities in these plans, there are also significant differences. Additionally, the State of Utah has prepared a statewide Hazard Mitigation Plan that addresses a number of hazards and potential methods to mitigate those hazards. Utah is a very geologically diverse state that covers a significant amount of space. Demonstrating Utah's preparedness and resilience is the fact that Utah is one of the few states, at the time of this writing, to not have received any Disaster Recovery funding through HUD.

Climate change often has complex consequences, many of which are not obvious on an individual basis but noticeable in the aggregate. In Utah, we are not threatened by hurricanes or tropical storms and have historically only rarely dealt with severe flooding, usually related to summer monsoon seasons or in the aftermath of a forest fire. One issue that could be exacerbated by climate change would be an increase in fires, as has been seen in the rising average number and length of wildfires. While Utah has experienced difficult fire seasons in the past, we have not seen an overall increase in the threat of fires beyond the threat posed by wildfires to human development due to recent increases in development in high-threat areas. (In other words, the number, frequency, and intensity of fires have remained relatively stable; the threat is growing because more people live in areas where wildfires and potential secondary threats are located.) Another potential area of concern would be related to rainfall and snowpack patterns. While water needs continue to be met for now and into the predictable future, Utah is an arid state, relying heavily on water resources that come from a stable weather pattern of predictable snowpack and rains. Should this be disrupted, the state would face significant challenges. Climate change could potentially restrict or increase those averages, which would cause the state to struggle.

For more information regarding natural hazards, including those associated with climate change, please consult with Utah's Department of Public Safety, Division of Emergency Management hazard mitigation team and plans found at <https://hazards.utah.gov/>.

Describe the vulnerability to these risks of housing occupied by low- and moderate-income households based on an analysis of data, findings, and methods.

Unlike some states, Utah's affordable housing and lower-income neighborhoods are not necessarily at a higher risk for natural disaster threats. Nevertheless, if such unstable climate situations were to

proliferate, marginalized communities, given their condition, would, unfortunately, bear more of the brunt of the unfolding disaster. The ability of lower-income individuals to pay for protective luxuries, such as air conditioning in case of excessive heat waves, or the necessity of affordable heating, is unfortunately compromised by the extent of income inequality, which is often beyond the scope of our Housing and Community Development Division. Any disaster is going to disproportionately impact low-income households.

DRAFT

Strategic Plan

SP-05 Overview

Strategic Plan Overview

The Utah Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program was designed by executive order to be decentralized. The State has delegated the Method of Distribution (MOD) decision making process and program goals and priorities to the seven-member CDBG Policy Committee and the regional associations of governments. CDBG funds are primarily used for public facilities, infrastructure and single-family rehabilitation.

The HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) and Housing Trust Fund (HTF) programs are focused on the creation of new affordable housing. Funds are awarded by the Review Committee. The majority of projects fund large multifamily housing projects located in the Wasatch Front, many of which are located near transit lines. In these projects, the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund (OWHLF) acts as a gap financier with funds heavily leveraged with private and municipal funds.

Utah's Plan to Address Homelessness was adopted in February 2023. It includes two 'Guiding Principles', five goals, and corresponding strategies to reach goals and measurable outcomes for each goal. The target outcomes, goals, and strategies are based on the findings of a state-level needs assessment of resources for and needs of people experiencing homelessness across the state of Utah, as directed by the Utah Homelessness Council, now the Utah Homeless Services Board, supported by the Office of Homeless Services. The strategic plan can be viewed here:
(<https://jobs.utah.gov/homelessness/homelessnessstrategicplan.pdf>)

SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.315(a)(1)

Geographic Area

Table 50 - Geographic Priority Areas

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Area Name: | Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) |
| | Area Type: | Other |
| | Other Target Area Description: | Other |
| | HUD Approval Date: | |
| | % of Low/ Mod: | |
| | Revital Type: | |
| | Other Revital Description: | |
| | Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area. | This is not a neighborhood, it is a region of Utah consisting of Utah, Summit and Wasatch counties |
| | Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area. | Most of this region is urban and ineligible for state CDBG funds. The CDBG funds in this area are primarily expended in Wasatch and Summit Counties, which are areas that have tourism and leisure as the primary industries. |
| | How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area? | This is a state mandated area for CDBG funds. |
| | Identify the needs in this target area. | Infrastructure development/redevelopment, affordable housing, permanent supportive housing, general emergency shelter bed, mental health services, substance use disorder treatment and healthcare, and case management |
| 2 | What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area? | The CDBG program hopes to make communities sustainable in this target area. |
| | Are there barriers to improvement in this target area? | No |
| | Area Name: | Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) |
| | Area Type: | Other |
| | Other Target Area Description: | Other |
| | HUD Approval Date: | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | % of Low/ Mod: | |
| | Revital Type: | |
| | Other Revital Description: | |
| | Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area. | This is not a neighborhood, it is a region of Utah consisting of Box Elder, Cache, and Rich counties. |
| | Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area. | This is a primarily rural part of Utah with one metropolitan area in Logan, Utah. The main industries in this area are agricultural and manufacturing in nature. |
| | How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area? | This is a state mandated area for CDBG funds. |
| | Identify the needs in this target area. | Infrastructure development/redevelopment, affordable housing, permanent supportive housing, general emergency shelter bed, mental health services, substance use disorder treatment and healthcare, and case management |
| | What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area? | The CDBG program hopes to make communities more sustainable in this target area. |
| | Are there barriers to improvement in this target area? | No |
| 3 | Area Name: | Five County Association of Governments (FCOAG) |
| | Area Type: | Other |
| | Other Target Area Description: | Other |
| | HUD Approval Date: | |
| | % of Low/ Mod: | |
| | Revital Type: | |
| | Other Revital Description: | |
| | Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area. | This is not a neighborhood, it is a region of Utah consisting of Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, and Washington counties |
| | Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area. | The Five County area has one large city St. George and one midsized city Cedar City. The remaining area is very rural in nature. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area? | This is a state mandated area for CDBG funds. |
| | Identify the needs in this target area. | Infrastructure development/redevelopment, affordable housing, permanent supportive housing, general emergency shelter bed, mental health services, substance use disorder treatment and healthcare, and case management |
| | What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area? | The CDBG program hopes to make communities more sustainable in this target area. |
| | Are there barriers to improvement in this target area? | No |
| 4 | Area Name: | Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG) |
| | Area Type: | Other |
| | Other Target Area Description: | Other |
| | HUD Approval Date: | |
| | % of Low/ Mod: | |
| | Revital Type: | |
| | Other Revital Description: | |
| | Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area. | This is not a neighborhood, it is a region of Utah consisting of Daggett, Duchesne, and Uintah counties |
| | Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area. | The Uintah Basin is a rural area of Utah in the north east corner of the state. Communities of note include Vernal, Roosevelt and Duchesne Utah. This area relies primarily on natural resource extraction. |
| | How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area? | This is a state mandated area for CDBG funds. |
| | Identify the needs in this target area. | Infrastructure development/redevelopment, affordable housing, permanent supportive housing, general emergency shelter bed, mental health services, substance use disorder treatment and healthcare, and case management |
| | What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area? | The CDBG program hopes to make communities more sustainable in this target area. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | Are there barriers to improvement in this target area? | No |
| 5 | Area Name: | Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) |
| | Area Type: | Other |
| | Other Target Area Description: | Other |
| | HUD Approval Date: | |
| | % of Low/ Mod: | |
| | Revital Type: | |
| | Other Revital Description: | |
| | Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area. | This is not a neighborhood, it is a region of Utah consisting of Carbon, Emery, Grand and San Juan counties. |
| | Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area. | This region has no large cities but significant communities in this area are Price, Moab and Green River. This area relies primarily on tourism and natural resource extraction. |
| | How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area? | This is a state mandated area for CDBG funds. |
| | Identify the needs in this target area. | Infrastructure development/redevelopment, affordable housing, permanent supportive housing, general emergency shelter bed, mental health services, substance use disorder treatment and healthcare, and case management |
| What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area? | The CDBG program hopes to make communities more sustainable in this target area. | |
| Are there barriers to improvement in this target area? | No | |
| 6 | Area Name: | Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) |
| | Area Type: | Other |
| | Other Target Area Description: | Other |
| | HUD Approval Date: | |
| | % of Low/ Mod: | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Revital Type: | |
| | Other Revital Description: | |
| | Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area. | This is not a neighborhood, it is a region of Utah consisting of Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier and Wayne counties |
| | Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area. | The six county region is a large area in central Utah with many small communities and a few regional centers, consisting of Richfield City and Nephi. |
| | How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area? | This is a state mandated area for CDBG funds. |
| | Identify the needs in this target area. | Infrastructure development/redevelopment, affordable housing, permanent supportive housing, general emergency shelter bed, mental health services, substance use disorder treatment and healthcare, and case management |
| | What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area? | The CDBG program hopes to make communities more sustainable in this target area. |
| | Are there barriers to improvement in this target area? | No |
| 7 | Area Name: | Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) |
| | Area Type: | Other |
| | Other Target Area Description: | Other |
| | HUD Approval Date: | |
| | % of Low/ Mod: | |
| | Revital Type: | |
| | Other Revital Description: | |
| | Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area. | This is not a neighborhood, it is a region of Utah consisting of Salt Lake, Davis, Weber, Tooele and Morgan Counties. |
| | Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area. | This is primarily an urban area of Utah. CDBG funds are primarily expended in the rural areas of Morgan and Tooele counties. |

| | |
|---|---|
| How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area? | This is a state mandated area for CDBG funds. |
| Identify the needs in this target area. | Infrastructure development/redevelopment, affordable housing, permanent supportive housing, general emergency shelter bed, mental health services, substance use disorder treatment and healthcare, and case management |
| What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area? | The CDBG program hopes to make communities more sustainable in this target area. |
| Are there barriers to improvement in this target area? | No |

General Allocation Priorities

Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the jurisdiction (or within the EMSA for HOPWA)

The HOME, HTF, ESG, and HOPWA Programs do not set aside funding based on the geographic location of projects.

The Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) and Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) programs distribute funds according to the needs of the 13 regional Local Homeless Councils (LHCs). LHC priorities for allocating ESG and HOPWA funds are assessed by community members and stakeholders within those areas. The Utah Homeless Network (UHN) is responsible for making recommendations to the Utah Homeless Services Board (UHSB), who oversee the review of applications and approval of funding for the provision of homeless services in the state. Distribution of funds between LHCs are not equal due to disparate needs and subpopulations served within the LHCs.

ESG allocations are determined based on appropriate projects that have applied for funding and follows the 60/40 split required by ESG where no more than 60% of ESG can be used for Street Outreach/Emergency Shelter after funding Homeless Prevention and Administration.

The HOME and HTF programs accept applications statewide and the location of these applications varies year to year. The majority of HOME and HTF funding goes towards large multi-family projects, most of which are located in the major population centers of the Wasatch Front, which extends from Ogden down the I-15 corridor to the Provo/Orem MSA.

CDBG funds are the only funds that are primarily distributed throughout the state through a geographical distribution, following the boundaries of the local Association of Governments (AOGs), at

the direction of the Governor's office. The rationale was to create a system that would allow for prioritization decisions to be made as close as possible to the local level, in line with federal requirements and priorities. Each area in the state is slated to receive a portion of funds to use toward eligible projects so as to ensure that the most needed projects are given priority.

DRAFT

SP-25 Priority Needs – 91.315(a)(2)

Priority Needs

Table 51 – Priority Needs Summary

| | | |
|---|------------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Priority Need Name | New HOME and HTF Affordable Housing |
| | Priority Level | High |
| | Population | Extremely Low Low |
| | Geographic Areas Affected | |
| | Associated Goals | HOME and HTF Affordable Housing |
| | Description | Utah has a lack of affordable housing. There are not enough affordable options for persons who are extremely and very low income. This need is most pronounced among persons who make 50% AMI or lower. |
| | Basis for Relative Priority | Our needs assessment as determined by the 2019 State of Utah Housing Report has shown a need for new affordable housing for low, very low, and extremely low income housing. |
| 2 | Priority Need Name | Make Homelessness Rare |
| | Priority Level | High |
| | Population | Extremely Low Chronic Homelessness Individuals Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS |
| | Geographic Areas Affected | |
| | Associated Goals | Make Homelessness Non-Recurring |
| | Description | Fewer first-time individuals who experience homelessness. |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|
| | Basis for Relative Priority | This is a major focus for the ESG Program. Thirty percent of ESG funding is allocated towards this goal. |
| 3 | Priority Need Name | Make Homelessness Non-Recurring |
| | Priority Level | High |
| | Population | Extremely Low Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth |
| | Geographic Areas Affected | |
| | Associated Goals | Make Homelessness Brief |
| | Description | The lack of available shelter beds contributes to the rising number of transient homeless populations, or those that move from their home community to another in search of shelter. Utah communities share how individuals experiencing homelessness lose their network of social support (i.e., relatives and friends) in their transition, which further challenges their ability to step out of homelessness. This also includes domestic violence shelters. |
| | Basis for Relative Priority | The priorities outlined by the ESG program are all major initiatives and of high priority. |
| 4 | Priority Need Name | Make Homelessness Brief |
| | Priority Level | High |

| | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|
| | Population | Extremely Low Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth |
| | Geographic Areas Affected | |
| | Associated Goals | Make Homelessness Rare |
| | Description | Fewer days spent in emergency beds or shelters. |
| | Basis for Relative Priority | This is a major priority for the ESG Program. |
| 5 | Priority Need Name | HOPWA Support HIV/AIDS housing and case management |
| | Priority Level | Low |
| | Population | Extremely Low Low Moderate Persons with HIV/AIDS Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families |
| | Geographic Areas Affected | |
| | Associated Goals | HOPWA- Assistance for Persons with HIV/AIDS |
| | Description | The HOPWA Program is focused on providing housing subsidies, housing information, permanent placement and case management for persons with HIV/AIDS. |

| | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|
| | Basis for Relative Priority | This is not a well funded priority |
| 6 | Priority Need Name | CDBG Community Capital Improvements |
| | Priority Level | High |
| | Population | Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle |
| | Geographic Areas Affected | Other Other Other Other Other Other Other |
| | Associated Goals | CDBG Administration and Planning |
| | Description | CDBG grants to build public facilities and fund infrastructure projects. |
| | Basis for Relative Priority | By far, the two biggest priorities in the CDBG program are public facilities improvements and infrastructure improvements. Aging infrastructure is an issue throughout the country, but in the small rural areas with little tax base, it is a critical problem. The regional AOG rating and ranking systems reflect these needs by awarding more points to applications for these types of activities |
| 7 | Priority Need Name | CDBG Affordable Housing |
| | Priority Level | High |
| | Population | Extremely Low Low Moderate Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents |

| | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|
| | Geographic Areas Affected | Other Other Other Other Other |
| | Associated Goals | CDBG Other Affordable Housing CDBG Single Family Housing Rehab |
| | Description | Provide rehab assistance to LMI homeowners to maintain housing affordability/livability. CDBG funding is used for infrastructure and/or land acquisition to create affordable housing. |
| | Basis for Relative Priority | In the CDBG program, five of the seven regional associations of governments have chosen to set-aside funding to operate a single-family housing rehab program. The housing stock is limited in rural areas, and maintaining existing housing for LMI homeowners is critical. |
| 8 | Priority Need Name | CDBG Public Services |
| | Priority Level | Low |
| | Population | Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle Families with Children Elderly Elderly Frail Elderly Persons with Mental Disabilities Persons with Physical Disabilities Persons with Developmental Disabilities Victims of Domestic Violence |
| | Geographic Areas Affected | Other Other Other Other Other Other Other |

| | | |
|----|------------------------------------|--|
| | Associated Goals | CDBG Public Services |
| | Description | The CDBG program funds public service activities such as Meals-on-Wheels vehicles, and transportation services for seniors and disabled persons. |
| | Basis for Relative Priority | The two most critical priorities in the CDBG program are public facilities and public infrastructure. These are very costly activities and there is limited funding left to fund the Public Service activities. By statute, public service funding is limited to 15% of the CDBG allocation. |
| 9 | Priority Need Name | CDBG Economic Development |
| | Priority Level | Low |
| | Population | Moderate |
| | Geographic Areas Affected | Other Other Other Other Other Other Other |
| | Associated Goals | CDBG Economic Development |
| | Description | AOGs are eligible to operate revolving loan funds (RLF) to provide working capital to LMI businesses. |
| | Basis for Relative Priority | In the CDBG program, the limited funding allows for an average of less than \$1,000,000 per region to carry out eligible activities. After all the critical infrastructure, public facilities and affordable housing activities are funded, there is little funding left to allocate to economic development projects. |
| 10 | Priority Need Name | CDBG Administration and Planning |
| | Priority Level | Low |
| | Population | Extremely Low Low Moderate Middle |

| | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| | Geographic Areas Affected | Other Other Other Other Other Other Other |
| | Associated Goals | CDBG Administration and Planning |
| | Description | The CDBG program delegates some of the CDBG program administration and consolidated planning responsibilities to the seven regional Associations of Governments. Each region receives \$50,000 to carry out these activities. Per program regulations, the CDBG program limits the planning and administration activities to less than 20% of the annual Utah CDBG program. Additionally, as part of the 20% cap and subject to the 3% cap on state administration funding, the state retains a portion for its administrative needs to ensure that the program is able to function. |
| | Basis for Relative Priority | Administration and planning costs are necessary to properly operate the CDBG program in Utah. However, funding for these activities are limited so that the CDBG allocation is directed to activities that serve the public. |

Narrative (Optional)

SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions – 91.315(b)

Influence of Market Conditions

| Affordable Housing Type | Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) | There is a great need for affordable housing in all its forms. The State of Utah uses the HOPWA grant to fund TBRA projects. Otherwise HCD has determined that TBRA is not the best use of CPD funds and has elected instead to invest in the production, rehabilitation, or acquisition of new affordable housing. |
| TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs | TBRA is a rental subsidy program similar to the Housing Choice Voucher program that grantees can use to help provide low-income households access to affordable housing. TBRA allows tenants to choose where they live to facilitate convenient access to medical services for specialized care or to be closer to work or school. All housing units assisted with TBRA must pass an initial and annual HQS inspection to ensure living conditions are safe, decent and sanitary. |
| New Unit Production | According to the Utah Affordable Housing Report as well as other sources of information such as the "Out of Reach" report created by the National Low Income Housing Coalition, there is a large shortage of affordable housing available to low and very low income households. For this reason, the OWHLF has chosen to focus on the production of new affordable units. |
| Rehabilitation | Many rural communities in Utah have aging housing stock and very slow or no growth. In addition to having a large low-income population, housing prices have jumped in recent years, making housing more difficult. So, for this reason, single-family rehabilitation has become a major focus for CDBG funds in some of the regions of the state as dictated by local prioritization. |
| Acquisition, including preservation | Utah has a large number of aging multi-family housing projects many of which do not generate much profit for their owners and require outside investment to maintain critical systems should the project continue to be able to provide affordable housing to low income households. For this reason, many projects are acquired often for the purpose of rehabilitating them to preserve their ongoing ability to provide affordable housing. Preservation of historic structures has not historically been a major use of funds and HCD does not plan on dedicating efforts or resources towards this category of funding. |

Table 52 – Influence of Market Conditions

SP-35 Anticipated Resources - 91.315(a)(4), 91.320(c)(1,2)

Introduction

The State of Utah's HUD funding has remained relatively stable over the course of the previous few years. As such, we expect to continue to be able to fund activities that support projects as identified in project priorities.

Anticipated Resources

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available Year 1 | | | | Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$ | Narrative Description |
|---------|------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | | Annual Allocation : \$ | Program Income: \$ | Prior Year Resources : \$ | Total: \$ | | |
| CDBG | public - federal | Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services | 5,561,418 | 0 | 1,852,208 | 7,413,626 | 22,000,000 | HCD estimates are based on the assumption that funding levels will remain constant over the duration of the Consolidated Plan 5-year period. Program income and prior year resources fluctuate year to year but HCD can expect prior year resources to be available each year. |

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available Year 1 | | | | Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$ | Narrative Description |
|---------|------------------|---|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|------------|---|--|
| | | | Annual Allocation : \$ | Program Income: \$ | Prior Year Resources : \$ | Total: \$ | | |
| HOME | public - federal | Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA | 3,014,372 | 5,443,522 | 4,398,235 | 12,856,129 | 2,750,000 | HCD estimates are based on the assumption that CPD funding levels will remain constant over the duration of the Consolidated Plan 5-year period. The program income will fluctuate year to year but HCD can expect program income to be available each year of the Con Plan period |

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available Year 1 | | | | Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$ | Narrative Description |
|---------|------------------|---|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | | Annual Allocation : \$ | Program Income: \$ | Prior Year Resources : \$ | Total: \$ | | |
| HOPWA | public - federal | Permanent housing in facilities Permanent housing placement Short term or transitional housing facilities STRMU Supportive services TBRA | 386,403 | 0 | 13,844 | 400,247 | 1,806,735 | OHS estimates are based on the assumption that funding levels will remain constant over the duration of the Consolidated Plan 5-year period. |

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available Year 1 | | | | Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$ | Narrative Description |
|---------|------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | | Annual Allocation : \$ | Program Income: \$ | Prior Year Resources : \$ | Total: \$ | | |
| ESG | public - federal | Conversion and rehab for transitional housing Financial Assistance Overnight shelter Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Rental Assistance Services Transitional housing | 1,383,733 | 0 | 0 | 1,383,733 | 6,919,790 | OHS estimates are based on the assumption that funding levels will remain constant over the duration of the Consolidated Plan 5-year period. |

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available Year 1 | | | | Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$ | Narrative Description |
|---------|------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------|---|---|
| | | | Annual Allocation : \$ | Program Income: \$ | Prior Year Resources : \$ | Total: \$ | | |
| HTF | public - federal | Acquisition Admin and Planning Homebuyer assistance Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership | 3,134,373 | 212,057 | 0 | 3,346,430 | 13,400,000 | HCD estimates are based on the assumption that funding levels will remain constant over the duration of the Consolidated Plan 5-year period. Some funds remain from the prior Con Plan period. HTF does generate program income in very small quantities. |

Table 53 - Anticipated Resources

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

The HCD HOME and HTF programs primarily use HUD allocations to fund multifamily housing developments. HCD also uses State funds to fund multifamily housing projects. These state funds satisfy federal matching requirements for the HOME Program. The State, HOME, and HTF funds are highly leveraged as most of the multifamily projects funded also utilize a combination of LIHTC, private, and municipal funds. In past years leveraging ratios have averaged approximately 23:1, with 23 dollars being spent on projects for each dollar HCD invests.

The CDBG program does not have match requirements, however, applications receive additional points if other funds are contributed to the project. CDBG continues to serve a critical role as gap financing for critical projects throughout the non-entitlement areas of the state.

If appropriate, describe publicly owned land or property located within the state that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

The state does not have publicly owned land or property that can be used to address the needs identified in the plan.

Discussion

In the event that actual allocations do not meet anticipated funding amounts, the state will adjust plans to fund activities that support projects by lowering or raising funding directed towards activities to match actual allocations.

SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure – 91.315(k)

Explain the institutional structure through which the jurisdiction will carry out its consolidated plan including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions.

| Responsible Entity | Responsible Entity Type | Role | Geographic Area Served |
|--|-------------------------|--|------------------------|
| BEAR RIVER ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS | Regional organization | Economic Development Homelessness Ownership Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services | Region |
| Wasatch Front Regional Council | Regional organization | Economic Development Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services | Region |
| SIX COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT | Regional organization | Economic Development Ownership Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services | Region |
| FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS | Regional organization | Economic Development Homelessness Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services | Region |

| Responsible Entity | Responsible Entity Type | Role | Geographic Area Served |
|--|-------------------------|--|------------------------|
| UINTAH BASIN ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS | Regional organization | Economic Development Homelessness Ownership Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services | Region |
| Mountainland Association of Governments | Regional organization | Economic Development Ownership Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services | Region |
| Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments | Regional organization | Economic Development Homelessness Ownership Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services | Region |

Table 54 - Institutional Delivery Structure

Assess of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System

The strengths in the CDBG institutional delivery system are the seven associations of governments (AOGs) representatives that work closely with the local governments in their geographic region. The State has delegated certain regional CDBG administrative and consolidated planning responsibilities to the AOGs, though these activities remain supervised by the state. These AOG representatives provide the much needed technical assistance to evaluate local priorities and develop mature CDBG applications. There are limited experienced consultants in the non-entitlement areas that can manage CDBG projects, and the AOG representatives fill this critical role. The weakness of the system is that, once funded, many grantees need a lot of technical assistance to carry out the projects. The State CDBG staff provide this

technical assistance to ensure that the projects meet CDBG program requirements. The Utah Office of Homeless Services (OHS) strives to work together with communities to make homelessness in Utah rare, brief and non-recurring by providing statewide support of project services, interventions and system performance measures and reporting. The Utah Homeless Services Board (UHSB) brings together representatives from various sectors, including government, private industry, philanthropy, and organizations dedicated to addressing statewide homelessness. The Utah Homeless Network contributes to making homelessness in Utah rare, brief and non-recurring by aligning activities and creating a seamless continuum of services across Utah's three Continuum of Care (CoC) programs. The network is composed of the leadership of each of the three CoCs and LHCs in the state. The network coordinates CoC-related advocacy and educational efforts. The State of Utah has three Continuums of Care - Balance of State (11 LHCs), Salt Lake Valley Coalition to End Homelessness (SLVCEH), and Mountainland CoC. These CoCs are regional systems to assist sheltered and unsheltered people experiencing homelessness and provide the services necessary to help them access housing and obtain long-term stability. The CoCs are actively engaged in community-wide planning, strategic use of resources, and coordination of funding for efforts by nonprofit providers. Through these activities and measures, the CoCs minimize additional trauma and dislocation of individuals and families, promote access of mainstream resources and report system-wide data to determine gaps, needs and measure success. HOME and HTF funds are distributed to eligible applicants and can include private, nonprofit, and other housing organizations through a competitive application process. Potential applicants submit an application for funding to the HCD's Review Committee, which meets quarterly. Applications are scored according to statute and policy. The Review Committee then takes the recommendation from scoring to award HOME and HTF funds at their discretion.

Availability of services targeted to homeless persons and persons with HIV and mainstream services

| Homelessness Prevention Services | Available in the Community | Targeted to Homeless | Targeted to People with HIV |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Homelessness Prevention Services | | | |
| Counseling/Advocacy | X | X | X |
| Legal Assistance | X | X | |
| Mortgage Assistance | X | | |
| Rental Assistance | X | X | X |
| Utilities Assistance | X | X | X |

| Street Outreach Services | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Law Enforcement | X | X | X |
| Mobile Clinics | X | X | |
| Other Street Outreach Services | X | X | X |

| Supportive Services | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Alcohol & Drug Abuse | X | X | X |
| Child Care | X | | |
| Education | X | | |
| Employment and Employment Training | X | | |
| Healthcare | X | X | |
| HIV/AIDS | X | X | X |
| Life Skills | X | X | X |
| Mental Health Counseling | X | X | X |
| Transportation | X | X | |

| Other | | | |
|-------|--|--|--|
| | | | |

Table 55 - Homeless Prevention Services Summary

Describe the extent to which services targeted to homeless person and persons with HIV and mainstream services, such as health, mental health and employment services are made available to and used by homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families and unaccompanied youth) and persons with HIV within the jurisdiction

Mainstream services are targeted to homeless persons and persons with HIV through referrals from case managers, homeless diversion conversations, 211 information and referral, and through a homeless services phone line administered by Utah Community Action in Salt Lake County. Individuals and families are referred to the Department of Workforce Services for mainstream health benefits and employment services. Coordination for mental health services is done through local health departments within each LHC. The State of Utah HOPWA program is designed to assist statewide HOPWA-eligible households

living with HIV/AIDS who are under 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI) with well-coordinated housing, medical and supportive case management services to establish or maintain a stable, safe, affordable, and sanitary living environment. All HOPWA housing referrals for the program come from a waitlist held by the UAF Legacy Health, who collaborates with the University of Utah's Infectious Disease Clinic (ID Clinic) and the Utah Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Prioritization for HOPWA housing assistance is based on health concerns related to housing stability. Case management is offered to clients receiving HOPWA housing assistance to connect to mainstream services. The Office of Homeless Services, HOPWA providers, ID Clinic, UAF Legacy Health, and the Department of Health and Human Services meet monthly to discuss client needs and available resources. Additionally, most LHCs coordinate the prioritization of the demographic of families with children and the subgroups of youth, veterans and chronically homeless to receive services and housing opportunities, matching available resources with individual client/household immediate needs, ensuring that services or resources are not duplicating efforts and that service delivery is complementary and effective.

Describe the strengths and gaps of the service delivery system for special needs population and persons experiencing homelessness, including, but not limited to, the services listed above

The DWS Office of Homeless Services (OHS) relies on resources and services for individuals and families experiencing homelessness and low-income populations to be delivered through intermediary service providers and agencies. This allows for service delivery to be prioritized locally and in coordination with service providers throughout the Continuum of Care (CoCs). In order to address gaps in the service delivery system, the Local Homeless Councils (LHCs) will be conducting local funding and service gap analyses over the next year in alignment with state legislation and the Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness (Strategic Plan). LHCs understand local variations in homeless populations and the specific needs for persons experiencing homelessness. They will be given the authority, resources and responsibility for prioritizing needs and tailoring effective responses to meet the local priorities. This push for local resourcing is a direct response to the broad range of homeless populations throughout Utah. LHCs are identifying gaps that would strengthen community capacity, particularly when it comes to preventing people from becoming homeless as a result of a lack of affordable housing, permanent supportive housing, substance abuse treatment or a lack of mental health treatment. The inadequate number of shelter beds in urban areas and the acute lack of emergency shelter options in rural Utah communities are also areas identified in the Utah plan as needing redress. The LHCs began the gap analysis process in February 2020 and presented initial information to the Utah Homeless Services Board (UHSB). This process is meant to be fluid and continually refined. Utah's special needs populations are largely represented in this process as the agencies providing domestic violence (DV) services or HOPWA programs are often the highly functioning foundation in many LHCs.

Provide a summary of the strategy for overcoming gaps in the institutional structure and service delivery system for carrying out a strategy to address priority needs

In order to overcome gaps in local institutional structures and service delivery systems to address priority needs related to homelessness, the OHS will work collaboratively with local communities to develop performance improvement plans and hold them accountable for making progress. LHCs are the designated local oversight bodies that are responsible to: Develop a common agenda and vision for reducing homelessness in their respective regions; Develop a spending plan that coordinates the funding supplied to local stakeholders; Monitor the progress toward achieving state and local goals; and Align local funding to projects that are improving outcomes and targeting specific needs in the community. The UHSB will prioritize funding in alignment with the priorities identified by the LHCs, using flexible funding mechanisms allowing for local allocation control, and to direct state-controlled funding toward LHCs that are not yet competitive for Federal funding. Utah CoCs will continue to collect data on the HUD performance measures. Collaborative applicants will report performance to HUD. In addition, the Utah Strategic Plan requires benchmark achievement on key performance measures identified as requiring performance improvement over the next five years. Benchmark evaluation will be used to adjust strategies and priorities for funding.

SP-45 Goals Summary – 91.315(a)(4)

Goals Summary Information

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|------------|---------------------------------|------------|----------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | HOME and HTF Affordable Housing | 2025 | 2029 | Affordable Housing | | New HOME and HTF Affordable Housing | HOME: \$16,660,710 HTF: \$15,724,165 | Rental units constructed: 200 Household Housing Unit |
| 2 | Make Homelessness Rare | 2025 | 2029 | Homeless | | Make Homelessness Brief | ESG: \$2,075,937 | Homelessness Prevention: 1530 Persons Assisted |
| 3 | Make Homelessness Brief | 2025 | 2029 | Homeless | | Make Homelessness Non-Recurring | ESG: \$2,906,312 | Homeless Person Overnight Shelter: 5850 Persons Assisted |
| 4 | Make Homelessness Non-Recurring | 2025 | 2029 | Homeless | | Make Homelessness Rare | ESG: \$1,937,541 | Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 750 Households Assisted |

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|------------|---|------------|----------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------|--|
| 5 | HOPWA- Assistance for Persons with HIV/AIDS | 2025 | 2029 | Non-Homeless Special Needs | | HOPWA Support HIV/AIDS housing and case management | HOPWA: \$1,806,735 | Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 100 Households Assisted HIV/AIDS Housing Operations: 120 Household Housing Unit |

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|------------|--|------------|----------|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------|--------------------|--|
| 6 | CDBG Public Infrastructure and Public Facilities | 2025 | 2029 | Non-Housing Community Development | Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Five County Association of Governments (FCOAG) Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG) Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) | | CDBG: \$13,341,809 | Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 57500 Persons Assisted Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 1100 Households Assisted Buildings Demolished: 1 Buildings |

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|------------|----------------------------------|------------|----------|--------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 7 | CDBG Single Family Housing Rehab | 2025 | 2029 | Affordable Housing | Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG) Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) | CDBG Affordable Housing | CDBG: \$3,561,373 | Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 300 Household Housing Unit |

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|------------|-------------------------------|------------|----------|--------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 8 | CDBG Other Affordable Housing | 2025 | 2029 | Affordable Housing | Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG) Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) | CDBG Affordable Housing | CDBG: \$1,000,000 | Rental units constructed: 25 Household Housing Unit Rental units rehabilitated: 25 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Added: 25 Household Housing Unit Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 250 Households Assisted |

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|------------|----------------------------------|------------|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------------|--|
| 9 | CDBG Public Services | 2025 | 2029 | Non-Housing Community Development | | CDBG Public Services | CDBG: \$2,675,000 | Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 17500 Persons Assisted Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 325 Households Assisted |
| 10 | CDBG Administration and Planning | 2025 | 2029 | Admin/Planning | | CDBG Administration and Planning CDBG Community Capital Improvements | CDBG: \$3,825,000 | Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 50,000 Persons Assisted Other: 0 Other |
| 11 | CDBG Economic Development | 2025 | 2029 | Non-Housing Community Development | | CDBG Economic Development | | |

Table 56 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

| | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|
| 1 | Goal Name | HOME and HTF Affordable Housing |
| | Goal Description | Creation of new affordable housing targeting low income individuals with HOME and HTF funds. |
| 2 | Goal Name | Make Homelessness Rare |
| | Goal Description | <p>Support positive tenant and landlord relations. A primary homelessness prevention strategy is mediation, which helps tenants and landlords manage their relationships and resolve disputes before an eviction occurs.</p> <p>Prevent institutional homelessness. A large portion of those at risk of homelessness are currently being housed and cared for by an institution, or are housing-insecure and regularly receiving services in a formal setting. Identifying persons who are at high risk of becoming homeless as they leave hospitals, jails, prisons, group homes or treatment centers, and making sure they do not go from institution to homelessness is a highly effective way to make homelessness in Utah rare, brief and nonrecurring.</p> <p>Understand emerging populations that may experience homelessness. In some parts of the state, it is common for two or more families to live in a single-family home and for significant numbers of youth to be couch surfing. Utah is tracking this population of other homeless individuals and families through the Board of Education of potential individuals stepping into unsheltered homelessness.</p> |
| 3 | Goal Name | Make Homelessness Brief |
| | Goal Description | The lack of available shelter beds contributes to the rising number of transient homeless populations, or those that move from their home community to another in search of shelter. Utah communities share how individuals experiencing homelessness lose their network of social support (i.e., relatives and friends) in their transition, which further challenges their ability to step out of homelessness. |
| 4 | Goal Name | Make Homelessness Non-Recurring |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|
| | Goal Description | Incentivize and develop affordable housing. The state of Utah is in desperate need of affordable housing to drive down the number of first-time homeless and the number of persons who return to homelessness after receiving services. Category Measure: TBRA households assisted/Rapid Rehousing (count of households assisted) rental housing assistance (measure - 100 households annually)COCs implement Coordinated Entry policies and strengthen resources Coordinated Entry effectively identifies the appropriate service is accessible no matter where or how people present. Coordinated Entry processes help communities prioritize assistance based on vulnerability and severity of service needs to ensure that people who need assistance the most can receive it in a timely manner. - Category Measure: TBRA households assisted/Rapid Rehousing (count of households assisted) rental housing assistance (measure - 50 households annually) |
| 5 | Goal Name | HOPWA- Assistance for Persons with HIV/AIDS |
| | Goal Description | The HOPWA Programs provides housing subsidies, housing information, permanent placement services and case management for persons with HIV/AIDS. |
| 6 | Goal Name | CDBG Public Infrastructure and Public Facilities |
| | Goal Description | Funding for water, sewer, roads, or other infrastructure related projects and for the construction or rehabilitation of public facilities such as fire stations (or related firefighting equipment), community centers, senior centers, domestic violence facilities, parks, etc. |
| 7 | Goal Name | CDBG Single Family Housing Rehab |
| | Goal Description | Single Family Housing Rehab activities are carried out by four of the regional Associations of Governments (AOG's) Costs include program delivery, lead-based paint testing and the actual construction costs. |
| 8 | Goal Name | CDBG Other Affordable Housing |
| | Goal Description | Activities to support "Other Affordable Housing" include real property acquisition for affordable housing development, direct homebuyer assistance, infrastructure development for new single-family and multi-family housing and rehab of existing multi-family housing. |
| 9 | Goal Name | CDBG Public Services |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------|---|
| | Goal Description | CDBG funds that will be used to purchase the equipment necessary to carry out public service activities, such as the transportation of seniors or disabled individuals, delivering food through a Meals on Wheels program, or other related activities. |
| 10 | Goal Name | CDBG Administration and Planning |
| | Goal Description | A portion of the annual CDBG allocation is set aside for preparation of the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plans. \$50,000 is allocated to each of the seven regional associations of governments for these planning efforts and also a portion of the costs to administer the Utah Small Cities CDBG program. The state intends to limit the other admin and planning expenses so that funding for essential activities is maximized. |
| 11 | Goal Name | CDBG Economic Development |
| | Goal Description | Funds are limited to the Association of Governments for them to establish funding sources for the support of the creation or retention of local businesses or jobs. While this is an acceptable use of CDBG funds; CDBG has not funded economic development projects for many years. It is possible that economic development projects will be approved and funded during this Consolidated Planning period. |

Estimate the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families to whom the jurisdiction will provide affordable housing as defined by HOME 91.315(b)(2)

The Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) and Office of Homeless Services (OHS) assists in the creation of a large number of affordable housing units. In many cases, the HOME and HTF funds act as a gap financier for large multifamily projects in which a great number of affordable units are created and recorded appropriately. There are times when overall projects may not be financially feasible without HOME and HTF funds. The CDBG program also is used by local governments to run programs that focus on single-family housing rehab and homebuyer assistance to ensure that a stable supply of affordable housing continues to remain in rural Utah. In addition, the ESG and HOPWA programs assist in providing affordable housing through Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) and other programs.

Overall, there is a number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families that HCD and OHS provide assistance towards housing, with an estimate of approximately 1,500 individuals and households per year.

SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement – 91.315(c)

Need to Increase the Number of Accessible Units (if Required by a Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement)

Not applicable

Activities to Increase Resident Involvements

The State of Utah does not administer public housing funds and, therefore, is not involved in the management of any public housing units.

Is the public housing agency designated as troubled under 24 CFR part 902?

No

Plan to remove the ‘troubled’ designation

There are no public housing authorities in Utah that designated as troubled per HUD designations.

DRAFT

SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.315(h)

Barriers to Affordable Housing

Rising housing costs and stagnating real wages are the primary causes of worsening housing affordability in Utah. From 2022 to 2023 average monthly income (<https://jobs.utah.gov/wi/data/library/wages/annualprofilewages.html>) grew at 4.3% while rent¹ (<https://d36oiwf74r1rap.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/SLTribRenters-Feb2023.pdf>) crept upward at a rate of 11.0% between 2020 and 2022 (most recent data available).

Wages for the vast majority of Utahns have lagged far behind growth in productivity. This is the primary explanation for the rise of income inequality over the past generation. The disappointing living-standards growth preceded the Great Recession and continues to this day. The dismal wage growth is the result of a larger nationwide upward redistribution of wealth and income, which can be attributed to a governmental failure to adhere to full employment objectives; fiscal austerity; and various labor market policies and business practices allowing the higher social strata of a professional class to capture ever larger shares of economic growth. The distributive share of total income between labor and capital has moved towards property wealth, leading to weak wage gains. This is the result of institutional transformations that have exposed workers to the vulnerability of higher turnover, resulting in higher averages of unemployment, as defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Providing governmental support to create an atmosphere where socially equitable forms of shelter are accessible is a challenge, but not an insurmountable one. Ignoring the issue of housing affordability from an institutional point of view will only contribute to the slippery slope that vulnerable Utahns continually risk, toward housing instability, homelessness and social detachment.

If policy makers are dedicated to increasing access to affordable housing, they must identify the concrete arrangements through which economic forces that impact housing insecurity are actively manifested.

Growth control policies can serve as tools to control and direct development or as regulatory barriers to prevent additional development. Tools communities might use are zoning policies; building codes; limit the number of building permits; impact fees; density; and subdivision designs. These barriers often are the results of a not-in-my-backyard (NIMBY) mentality.

Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing

The current strategy employed by the HCD is to promote the construction of new affordable housing and to support fair housing efforts. While fair housing is an issue in Utah, affordability is the primary barrier and has a disproportionate impact on many protected classes including racial and ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, large families, among others. HCD in its efforts to fund the creation of affordable housing is ameliorating the financial barrier which is at the heart of the affordability crisis.

The CDBG program continues to promote the development of affordable housing through the regional application rating and ranking systems. Activities that assist in the production of affordable housing units are given extra points in the scoring process. CDBG is prohibited from constructing housing, but often provides the necessary gap funding for infrastructure development for new affordable housing units.

DRAFT

SP-60 Homelessness Strategy – 91.315(d)

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

Homelessness exists throughout all of Utah—all urban and rural areas. Strategies for outreach and assessment vary depending on the area and local needs. A greater emphasis on local prioritization and flexible funding use for LHCs as well as increased investments in street outreach, case management and permanent supportive housing throughout the state will enable service providers to increase outreach and assessment for homeless and unsheltered homeless. Targeted Outreach and Assessment: Expanding outreach efforts, particularly in both urban and rural areas, is essential in connecting with people experiencing homelessness. This includes mobile outreach teams and outreach centers that reach people where they are, rather than expecting them to come to a service center. Tailoring outreach strategies to the unique needs of different regions is crucial—rural areas may require more mobile and remote services, while urban areas might focus on sheltering, rapid re-housing, and connecting to resources for individuals and families in need. Flexible Funding for Local Homeless Coordinating Councils: The jurisdiction has allowed LHCs to have greater control over the allocation and use of funding, and enabled local leaders to adapt their response to homelessness based on their community's specific needs. Street Outreach and Case Management: Emphasizing street outreach provides an essential lifeline to individuals who are unsheltered. Case management is crucial in guiding individuals through the complex process of accessing housing, healthcare, and employment. The jurisdiction has strengthened case management with statewide standardization and required elements. Case Management provides personalized, long-term support to reduce recidivism into homelessness by addressing the underlying causes, such as mental health challenges, substance use, and lack of affordable housing. Data Integration and Collaboration: Data sharing between service providers is a powerful tool to address homelessness. While legal and ethical considerations need to be carefully managed (such as ensuring privacy and consent), there are ways to structure data-sharing systems to address these concerns while still facilitating collaboration. Implementing secure, consent-driven data-sharing platforms will allow service providers to access critical information to improve coordination and prevent duplication of services. In addition, understanding the causes and patterns of homelessness through integrated data could inform more effective policy and resource allocation decisions. Addressing the Causes of Homelessness: It's essential that data integration does not just focus on current service use, but also provides insights into long-term trends and systemic issues that contribute to homelessness. By collecting data from multiple systems (criminal justice, healthcare, foster care, etc.), Utah can identify patterns such as frequent recidivism or a lack of services for specific groups (e.g., youth aging out of foster care or people with mental health issues). Addressing these root causes will reduce the risk of individuals cycling in and out of homelessness. Innovative Solutions for Data Sharing: Obstacles to data integration, including legal and ethical challenges, exist. However, innovative solutions are being implemented in various regions of the state.

Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

The Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness outlines steps for LHCs to take inventory of available housing and collect robust housing data. Effective planning and management of affordable housing development requires adequate and accurate data. The current bed count does not adequately capture the housing need and misrepresents the relationship between the type of housing needed and resources available, particularly in rural Utah. Creating an inventory of occupancy rates, the number of units available, type of housing, the average cost of housing available, and the average cost of living across LHCs is, therefore, necessary. This data collection shall inform and facilitate short- and long-term affordable housing development across Utah. Utah LHCs will collaborate with housing partners to take inventory of available housing resources, report this data annually to the state, and use data in their own strategic priorities to connect available housing resources to individuals experiencing homelessness. The Utah Homeless Services Board (UHSB) will summarize and make the housing inventory data reported by LHCs publicly available. The LHCs will collaborate with local housing partners and municipal governments to find joint solutions to the shortage of affordable housing inventory that will increase opportunities for individuals experiencing homelessness to access housing.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again.

Case management is an essential service and component of health and human service organizations. In homeless services, case management focuses on assessing the individual needs of a client, developing treatment or service goals and plans, monitoring those services and compliance, connecting clients to the homeless service system and providing emotional support to those experiencing homelessness. LHCs are responsible for determining the best and most appropriate resources and strategies for their local communities in helping homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access to affordable housing units, and preventing households from experiencing homelessness again.

Help low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from a publicly funded institution or system of care, or who are receiving assistance from public and private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education or youth needs

Communities widely identify the increasing need to fund services that help divert individuals and families who are at the point of spending a night unsheltered or entering a shelter for housing options.

There is also a need to engage in wider community efforts to prevent housing crises from occurring, and specifically to prevent individuals with such crises from experiencing homelessness. Another distinct, but related, need for diversion and prevention is engaging in street outreach work— finding and connecting with individuals experiencing homelessness and directing them to appropriate services. However, the funding supply for these types of interventions has diminished significantly due to a need to focus on imminent needs. Utah communities highlight the strong connection between prevention, diversion and outreach services and minimizing homelessness, and specifically the need for financial resources to fund this type of service.

DRAFT

SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards – 91.315(i)

Actions to address LBP hazards and increase access to housing without LBP hazards

The major source of lead exposure among U.S. children is lead-based paint and lead-contaminated dust found in deteriorating buildings. Lead-based paints were banned for use in housing in 1978. The older the house, the more likely it is to contain lead-based paint and to have a higher concentration of lead in the paint. Housing built before 1950 poses the greatest risk of exposure to children. The State of Utah has one of the lowest rates in the country for lead poisoning for children under the age of six at only 1%. In Utah, 42% of housing was built prior to 1980, however, only 11% was built prior to 1950. Two-thirds of the population is concentrated along the Wasatch Front which includes Davis, Salt Lake and Utah counties. These are entitlement areas that the Utah Small Cities CDBG program does not serve.

To this end, we require all projects that involve housing in any capacity to go through the required lead remediation programs as part of addressing environmental hazards as described by environmental review regulations.

How are the actions listed above integrated into housing policies and procedures?

The CDBG program does not fund lead-based paint remediation activities directly, though it is an eligible expense on housing rehabilitation projects. Housing rehabilitation programs are carried out by five of the seven regional Association of Governments. However, lead-based paint reduction is not the primary focus of these housing rehab programs. As lead-based paint is encountered in homes targeted for rehab with HUD dollars, it is mitigated by following HUD's lead-based paint regulations. All pre-1978 multifamily and single-family units that are funded with HUD dollars are required to meet all HUD requirements for testing and mitigation of lead-based paint. We encourage partnerships between the Weatherization, CDBG, and HOME programs so that trained staff are available in each of the regions to test the pre-1978 homes of low-income persons. Housing replacement has become more common in the rural areas where rehabilitation of manufactured homes is not cost-effective. This practice will further reduce the number of pre-1978 homes in the state. The challenge for these program managers continues to be 1) limited funding 2) local staff turnover 3) lack of trained contractors in the rural areas and 4) a large geographic area (80,000 square miles) of persons to serve.

DRAFT

SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy – 91.315(j)

Jurisdiction Goals, Programs and Policies for reducing the number of Poverty-Level Families

The Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) and the Office of Homeless Services (OHS) are divisions of the Utah Department of Workforce Services (DWS). The DWS's primary responsibility is to strengthen Utah's economy by supporting the economic stability and quality of the state's workforce. This is accomplished with the following goals:

1. Provide social stability through public assistance programs and administering the unemployment insurance program
2. Providing opportunities to increase employment viability and self-sufficiency of clients
3. Providing opportunities for investment in local communities for infrastructure and housing to support families and businesses

The HCD plays its part by supporting local infrastructure projects, community services, and housing affordability through assistance to local communities, nonprofits, and low-income families. The OHS addresses homelessness through partnerships and collaborative initiatives with state and local leaders, philanthropic partners, service providers, and individuals with lived experience. As state-level entities, the HCD and the OHS support local efforts to address their own local goals, programs, and policies by providing leadership, coordination, and funding.

The CDBG program promotes sustainable communities by funding critical public facilities and infrastructure projects. CDBG grantees are encouraged to contract with Section 3 businesses and residents in the non-entitlement areas whenever possible. These efforts continue to be a challenge in the rural areas where contractors are limited. Poverty is ultimately a measure of income. While none of the programs using Community Planning and Development (CPD) funds directly assist individuals to earn more money, these programs assist in providing the stability needed for individuals and households to improve their income and no longer be impoverished.

How are the Jurisdiction poverty reducing goals, programs, and policies coordinated with this affordable housing plan

The HCD's plan to provide new affordable housing through the use of CPD funds will greatly improve the financial situation of program recipients and will stabilize and benefit their economic situation. In addition to the housing assistance provided in Utah being largely supported by HUD programs (section 8,

ESG, CoC, etc.) the State also uses a great deal of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) and Justice Center Victims of Crime (VOCA) funding to provide housing assistance for clients in crisis, as well as substantial portion of crisis housing needs being supported by religious organizations such as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and Catholic faith among others.

DRAFT

SP-80 Monitoring – 91.330

Describe the standards and procedures that the state will use to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and will use to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements

The HCD and the OHS fully comply with the audit requirements of 2 CFR Part 200. Pre-Award Risk Assessments (PARAs) are completed for every organization and jurisdiction funded with federal dollars. Projects are then scored and the type and frequency of monitoring is determined.

CDBG: The State CDBG staff monitors all projects for compliance with all programmatic regulations such as procurement, Davis-Bacon Labor Standards, Fair Housing & Equal Opportunity (FHEO) and HUD Environmental Review. This is carried out either via desk audit or on-site visit depending on the PARA score. All CDBG recipients submit a closeout report when projects are complete and the beneficiary data is reported in HUD's IDIS system in a timely manner.

HOME/HTF: The HCD maintains a full year schedule of monitoring assignments for property compliance to federal and state program requirements. A checklist used by the HCD monitoring staff ensures that projects continue to target low-income populations for the duration of the loan term (generally 30 years).

ESG: Part of the annual pre-application process is attendance at a mandatory training, provided to familiarize agencies with the requirements of the ESG grant, including monitoring, technical assistance, data reporting and performance expectations.

Once an award is made, subrecipients are required to attend a contract/program training and a data/reporting training where policies and requirements are discussed in detail, as well as agency response expectations to identify program improvement steps. Each agency is evaluated with a PARA to gauge fiscal risk and ability to provide program services in a productive manner. From this process, a regulatory, structured monitoring of the subrecipients grant is determined to be low, medium or high risk for program or fiscal management and informs the depth and breadth of monitoring the agency will endure throughout the contract period. Contract monitoring activity includes: technical assistance, quarterly performance reviews, fiscal audit, claim reviews, and programmatic and fiscal monitoring.

HOPWA contracts receive both desktop and on site reviews during this fiscal year in alignment with the described ESG monitoring process described above.

Expected Resources

AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.320(c)(1,2)

Introduction

The State of Utah's HUD funding has remained relatively stable over the course of the previous few years. As such, we expect to continue to be able to fund activities that support projects as identified in project priorities.

Anticipated Resources

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available Year 1 | | | | Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$ | Narrative Description |
|---------|------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| | | | Annual Allocation: \$ | Program Income: \$ | Prior Year Resources: \$ | Total: \$ | | |
| CDBG | public - federal | Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services | 5,561,418.0 0 | 0.00 | 1,852,208.1 7 | 7,413,626.17 | 22,000,000.0 0 | HCD estimates are based on the assumption that funding levels will remain constant over the duration of the Consolidated Plan 5-year period. Program income and prior year resources fluctuate year to year but HCD can expect prior year resources to be available each year. |

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available Year 1 | | | | Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$ | Narrative Description |
|---------|------------------|---|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|---|--|
| | | | Annual Allocation: \$ | Program Income: \$ | Prior Year Resources: \$ | Total: \$ | | |
| HOME | public - federal | Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA | 3,014,372.26 | 5,443,522.00 | 4,398,235.00 | 12,856,129.26 | 2,750,000.00 | HCD estimates are based on the assumption that CPD funding levels will remain constant over the duration of the Consolidated Plan 5-year period. The program income will fluctuate year to year but HCD can expect program income to be available each year of the Con Plan period |

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available Year 1 | | | | Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$ | Narrative Description |
|---------|------------------|---|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------|---|--|
| | | | Annual Allocation: \$ | Program Income: \$ | Prior Year Resources: \$ | Total: \$ | | |
| HOPWA | public - federal | Permanent housing in facilities Permanent housing placement Short term or transitional housing facilities STRMU Supportive services TBRA | 386,403.00 | 0.00 | 13,844.00 | 400,247.00 | 1,806,735.00 | OHS estimates are based on the assumption that funding levels will remain constant over the duration of the Consolidated Plan 5-year period. |

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available Year 1 | | | | Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$ | Narrative Description |
|---------|------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| | | | Annual Allocation: \$ | Program Income: \$ | Prior Year Resources: \$ | Total: \$ | | |
| ESG | public - federal | Conversion and rehab for transitional housing Financial Assistance Overnight shelter Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Rental Assistance Services Transitional housing | 1,383,733.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,383,733.00 | 6,919,790.00 | OHS estimates are based on the assumption that funding levels will remain constant over the duration of the Consolidated Plan 5-year period. |

| Program | Source of Funds | Uses of Funds | Expected Amount Available Year 1 | | | | Expected Amount Available Remainder of ConPlan \$ | Narrative Description |
|---------|------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| | | | Annual Allocation: \$ | Program Income: \$ | Prior Year Resources: \$ | Total: \$ | | |
| HTF | public - federal | Acquisition Admin and Planning Homebuyer assistance Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership | 3,134,373.20 | 212,057.00 | 0.00 | 3,346,430.20 | 13,400,000.00 | HCD estimates are based on the assumption that funding levels will remain constant over the duration of the Consolidated Plan 5-year period. Some funds remain from the prior Con Plan period. HTF does generate program income in very small quantities. |

Table 57 - Expected Resources – Priority Table

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

The HCD HOME and HTF programs primarily use HUD allocations to fund multifamily housing developments. The HCD also uses state dollars to fund multifamily housing projects. These state funds satisfy federal matching requirements for the HOME Program. The State, HOME, and HTF funds are highly leveraged as most of the multifamily projects funded also utilize a combination of LIHTC, private, and municipal funds. In past years leveraging ratios have averaged approximately 23:1, with 23 dollars being spent on projects for each dollar the HCD invests.

The CDBG program does not have match requirements, however, applications receive additional points if other funds are contributed to the

project. CDBG continues to serve a critical role as gap financing for critical projects throughout the non-entitlement areas of the state.

DRAFT

If appropriate, describe publicly owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

The state does not have publicly owned land or property that can be used to address the needs identified in the plan.

Discussion

In the event that actual allocations do not meet anticipated funding amounts, the state will adjust plans to fund activities that support projects by lowering or raising funding directed towards activities to match actual allocations.

Annual Goals and Objectives

AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives – 91.320(c)(3)&(e)

Goals Summary Information

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|------------|---------------------------------|------------|----------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| 1 | HOME and HTF Affordable Housing | 2025 | 2029 | Affordable Housing | | | HOME: \$13,439,537.00 HTF: \$5,712,553.00 | Rental units constructed: 20 Household Housing Unit Rental units rehabilitated: 10 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Added: 10 Household Housing Unit |
| 2 | Make Homelessness Rare | 2025 | 2029 | Homeless | | Make Homelessness Rare | ESG: \$415,187.00 | Homelessness Prevention: 310 Persons Assisted |
| 3 | Make Homelessness Brief | 2025 | 2029 | Homeless | | Make Homelessness Brief | ESG: \$581,262.00 | Homeless Person Overnight Shelter: 2500 Persons Assisted Overnight/Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing Beds added: 25 Beds |
| 4 | Make Homelessness Non-Recurring | 2025 | 2029 | Homeless | | Make Homelessness Non-Recurring | ESG: \$387,508.00 | Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 150 Households Assisted |

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|------------|---|------------|----------|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---------------------|--|
| 5 | HOPWA- Assistance for Persons with HIV/AIDS | 2025 | 2029 | Non-Homeless Special Needs | | HOPWA Support HIV/AIDS housing and case management | HOPWA: \$361,347.00 | Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 20 Households Assisted HIV/AIDS Housing Operations: 24 Household Housing Unit |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------|------|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 6 | CDBG Public Infrastructure and Public Facilities | 2025 | 2029 | Non-Housing Community Development | Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Five County Association of Governments (FCOAG) Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG) Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) | CDBG Community Capital Improvements | CDBG: \$4,475,360.00 | Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 20100 Persons Assisted |
|---|--|------|------|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---|

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|------------|----------------------------------|------------|----------|--------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 7 | CDBG Single Family Housing Rehab | 2025 | 2029 | Affordable Housing | Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG) Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) | CDBG Affordable Housing | CDBG: \$1,153,033.00 | Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 114 Household Housing Unit |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|------|------|--------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 8 | CDBG Other Affordable Housing | 2025 | 2029 | Affordable Housing | Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Five County Association of Governments (FCOAG) Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG) Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) | CDBG Affordable Housing | CDBG: \$80,000.00 | Rental units constructed: 0 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Added: 5 Household Housing Unit Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 4 Households Assisted |
|---|-------------------------------|------|------|--------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------|--|

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|------|------|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|-------------|--|
| 9 | CDBG Public Services | 2025 | 2029 | Non-Housing Community Development | Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Five County Association of Governments (FCOAG) Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG) Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) | CDBG Public Services | CDBG: \$.00 | Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 0 Persons Assisted Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 0 Households Assisted |
|---|----------------------|------|------|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|-------------|--|

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------|------|------|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------|-------------|--|
| 10 | CDBG Economic Development | 2025 | 2029 | Non-Housing Community Development | Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Five County Association of Governments (FCOAG) Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG) Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) | CDBG Economic Development | CDBG: \$.00 | |
|----|---------------------------|------|------|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------|-------------|--|

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|------|------|----------------|---|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 11 | CDBG Administration and Planning | 2025 | 2029 | Admin/PLanning | Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Five County Association of Governments (FCOAG) Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG) Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) | CDBG Administration and Planning | CDBG: \$849,751.00 | Other: 35800 Other |
|----|--|------|------|----------------|---|--|-----------------------|--------------------|

Table 58 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

| | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|
| 1 | Goal Name | HOME and HTF Affordable Housing |
| | Goal Description | Assist in the creation of more affordable housing units. |
| 2 | Goal Name | Make Homelessness Rare |
| | Goal Description | Fewer first-time individuals who experience homelessness |
| 3 | Goal Name | Make Homelessness Brief |
| | Goal Description | Fewer days spent in emergency beds or shelters |
| 4 | Goal Name | Make Homelessness Non-Recurring |
| | Goal Description | Fewer persons returning to homelessness, and more persons successfully retaining housing. |
| 5 | Goal Name | HOPWA- Assistance for Persons with HIV/AIDS |
| | Goal Description | Assist with Housing supports for persons with HIV/AIDS. |
| 6 | Goal Name | CDBG Public Infrastructure and Public Facilities |
| | Goal Description | Acquisition of land for or construction/rehabilitation of public facilities such as fire stations, senior centers, parks, food banks, shelters, etc. as well as activities that include water/sewer, curb and gutter, streets, storm water removal systems, and sidewalks. |

| | | |
|----|-------------------------|---|
| 7 | Goal Name | CDBG Single Family Housing Rehab |
| | Goal Description | Assist with the rehabilitation of housing units to help maintain housing affordability. |
| 8 | Goal Name | CDBG Other Affordable Housing |
| | Goal Description | Help create opportunities for low to moderate income persons to obtain housing. |
| 9 | Goal Name | CDBG Public Services |
| | Goal Description | Though public services are an eligible category of funding in the state of Utah, there was no funding allocated this particular year for public services. |
| 10 | Goal Name | CDBG Economic Development |
| | Goal Description | Though economic development projects are an eligible category of funding in the state of Utah, there was no funding allocated this particular year. |
| 11 | Goal Name | CDBG Administration and Planning |
| | Goal Description | CDBG Administration and Planning |

AP-25 Allocation Priorities – 91.320(d)

Introduction:

Allocation Priorities are based on the estimated amount of funding that will be allocated towards achieving the aims of each priority.

Funding Allocation Priorities

| | HOME and HTF Affordabl e Housing (%) | Make Homelessnes s Rare (%) | Make Homelessnes s Brief (%) | Make Homelessnes s Non-Recurrin g (%) | HOPWA- Assistanc e for Persons with HIV/AIDS (%) | CDBG Public Infrastructur e and Public Facilities (%) | CDBG Single Family Housin g Rehab (%) | CDBG Other Affordabl e Housing (%) | CDBG Public Service s (%) | CDBG Economic Developmen t (%) | CDBG Administratio n and Planning (%) |
|-------|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|------------------------------------|---|--|
| CDBG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| HOME | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HOPWA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ESG | 0 | 14 | 50 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HTF | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 59 – Funding Allocation Priorities

Reason for Allocation Priorities

These priorities were assigned according to estimates by HCD staff as to the proportion of funding which will be dedicated towards the various priorities identified. CDBG allocation priorities are determined at the regional level by the seven Associations of Governments (AOGs). Each region has a Rating and Ranking Committee (RRC) that is composed of elected officials and community members. These RRCs reviewed local

community needs assessments and determined the 2025 priorities based on local needs. Other funds are allocated according to application to the respective funding oversight Review Committee (HOME and HTF by the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund (OWHLF) program and ESG and HOPWA by the Utah Homeless Services Board), subject to the limitations of each program.

DRAFT

How will the proposed distribution of funds address the priority needs and specific objectives described in the Consolidated Plan?

The distribution of funds between the priorities has been determined by the needs and objectives described in the Consolidated Plan. All funds have been allocated to 2025 program year activities based on the goals and priorities established in the 2025-2029 Consolidated Plan.

DRAFT

AP-30 Methods of Distribution – 91.320(d)&(k)

Introduction:

Distribution Methods

Table 60 - Distribution Methods by State Program

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | State Program Name: | National Housing Trust Fund |
| | Funding Sources: | HTF |
| | Describe the state program addressed by the Method of Distribution. | The National Housing Trust Fund is designed to address the lack of affordable housing for extremely low income households. |
| | Describe all of the criteria that will be used to select applications and the relative importance of these criteria. | As long as a need is identified in the applicants' market study and the project is funding low income units then the applicant becomes eligible to have units bought down to the 30% AMI level through the use of NHTF funds. Applicants must demonstrate financial feasibility and commit to the 30-year affordability period. |
| | If only summary criteria were described, how can potential applicants access application manuals or other state publications describing the application criteria? (CDBG only) | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Describe the process for awarding funds to state recipients and how the state will make its allocation available to units of general local government, and non-profit organizations, including community and faith-based organizations. (ESG only)</p> | |
| <p>Identify the method of selecting project sponsors (including providing full access to grassroots faith-based and other community-based organizations). (HOPWA only)</p> | |
| <p>Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories.</p> | <p>All resources will be used to address the need for additional funding for new affordable housing.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | Describe threshold factors and grant size limits. | The threshold factors and grant size limits are being determined by the Utah Preservation Model. According to this model the maximum per unit subsidy will be determined by calculating the difference of up to 120% of HUD Fair Market Rent and the 30% Area Median Income maximum rent and then calculating a present value of that difference based on a 30-year amortization and the current market interest rate. Current market interest rate will be determined by OWHLF staff and reviewed by the OWHLF Review Committee on a regular basis. Unit subsidy cannot exceed 75% of the total per unit development cost. |
| | What are the outcome measures expected as a result of the method of distribution? | We expect to be able to fund the creation of new affordable housing for very low income housing. |
| 2 | State Program Name: | Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund |
| | Funding Sources: | HOME |
| | Describe the state program addressed by the Method of Distribution. | The Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund (OWHLF) is the HOME grantee for the State of Utah. This fund is part of the Utah Housing and Community Development (HCD) Division. OWHLF partners with public and private organizations to create and preserve quality affordable housing for Utah's very low -income, low-income and moderate-income community. To achieve this goal, OWHLF supports the construction, rehabilitation and acquisition of affordable multi-family and single-family housing units throughout Utah. These programs are based on fair, open and competitive processes for applicant proposals that create and preserve low-income housing units. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Describe all of the criteria that will be used to select applications and the relative importance of these criteria.</p> | <p>The Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund has a system in place for rating funding applications. For multi-family housing applications there are eight criteria each which has a maximum possible score associated with it. The most important criteria are new capacity and loan leveraging. More new affordable units, and a higher leveraging ratio will earn an applicant more points. AMI targeting is the next most valuable criteria. Projects which target a lower income population receive higher scores. Rehabilitation, community support and county population receive additional points. Rural areas receive additional points. For rehab projects staff reviews which building systems will be replaced and awards points accordingly. Scoring for the "community support" criteria reviews whether project is consistent with identified needs and goals of local affordable housing plans. Unit size is also scored. These criteria award additional points to applications which are providing units with more bedrooms to accommodate larger families. The final category is a bonus category in which projects can additional points for incorporating green energy efficiency elements into their projects.</p> |
| <p>If only summary criteria were described, how can potential applicants access application manuals or other state publications describing the application criteria? (CDBG only)</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Describe the process for awarding funds to state recipients and how the state will make its allocation available to units of general local government, and non-profit organizations, including community and faith-based organizations. (ESG only)</p> | |
| <p>Identify the method of selecting project sponsors (including providing full access to grassroots faith-based and other community-based organizations). (HOPWA only)</p> | |
| <p>Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories.</p> | <p>HCD uses federal HOME funds specifically to support our multi-family housing program.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | Describe threshold factors and grant size limits. | OWHLF Review Committee awards Projects in accordance with current Policy. Applicants who are building multi-stage projects are allowed to submit for more funds upon initiation of a new phase of their construction. The OWHLF Review Committee has discretion to award any amount to a single project if they so choose. This is an extremely rare occurrence. |
| | What are the outcome measures expected as a result of the method of distribution? | OWHLF has chosen to promote the creation of new affordable multifamily units for very low income, low-income and moderate income households. Our method of distribution reflects this priority. Funds are also distributed to support HCD's goal to end chronic homelessness. We expect applicants to promote green building standards, large unit sizes and large leveraging as a result of our rating system. |
| 3 | State Program Name: | State of Utah HOPWA Program |
| | Funding Sources: | HOPWA |
| | Describe the state program addressed by the Method of Distribution. | The Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) Program is the only Federal program dedicated to the housing needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families. The HOPWA funds are appropriated annually through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) by formula to eligible states that meet the minimum number of cumulative AIDS cases. As an eligible state (grantee), the State of Utah receives a HOPWA formula grant, administered by the State Community Services Office (SCSO), Office of Homeless Services (OHS), Department of Workforce Services. The HOPWA Program aims to assist HOPWA eligible households to: (1) Increase access to healthcare and other supportive services necessary to focus on managing their disease, (2) Avoid becoming homeless while facing severe challenges in meeting personal and medical needs in addition to their housing costs, (3) Gain more stability, continue case management and have better health options and outcomes. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Describe all of the criteria that will be used to select applications and the relative importance of these criteria.</p> | <p>The selection criteria for awarding of HOPWA funds are based on an analysis of the number of households living with HIV/AIDS and the location of available services. OHS releases a request for grant applications to nonprofits across the state of Utah. Agencies are awarded funds based upon their demonstrated capacity to achieve the following: (1) Identify people living with HIV/AIDS, (2) Increase inventory of affordable units for people living with HIV/AIDS, (3) Provide direct client support to obtain or maintain housing and prevent homelessness, (4) Identify resources for people living with HIV/AIDS. In order to ensure that households being served with HOPWA funds will avoid the threat of homelessness, particular consideration will be given to those agencies that were funded in the previous program year and demonstrated effective use of funds. An HIV/AIDS Housing Steering Committee (a committee of medical care providers, housing agencies and HOPWA project sponsors) remains in direct contact with people living with HIV/AIDS. Their combined knowledge of the medical and supportive services providers ensures that distribution of funds is proportionate among the providers and client needs throughout the state.</p> |
| <p>If only summary criteria were described, how can potential applicants access application manuals or other state publications describing the application criteria? (CDBG only)</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Describe the process for awarding funds to state recipients and how the state will make its allocation available to units of general local government, and non-profit organizations, including community and faith-based organizations. (ESG only)</p> | |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Identify the method of selecting project sponsors (including providing full access to grassroots faith-based and other community-based organizations). (HOPWA only) | <p>Project sponsors are non-profits (including faith-based organizations) or government agencies targeting services to individuals living within the State's metropolitan statistical areas. Project sponsors must demonstrate the ability to manage the HOPWA program and all applicable State and Federal policies and procedures including compliance with Federal and State non-discrimination laws. Project sponsors must have established internal control and fiscal accounting procedures. Project sponsors should demonstrate the ability to coordinate, where appropriate, client services with other services providers and leverage, where possible, other resources toward meeting overall client needs and program goals. Program Sponsors must demonstrate the ability to meet all reporting and record keeping requirements including maintaining the confidentiality of client records. Project Sponsors must demonstrate that they can and will make third party payments without identifying clients as HOPWA recipients or as having HIV or AIDS.</p> <p>The funding allocation is a competitive process that begins with a Request for Grant Application (RFGA). This competitive process includes the review of proposals and funding recommendations offered by an appropriate group of stakeholders: State HOPWA Allocation Committee, Grantee staff, Other State and/or local government representatives, Continuum of Care representatives, Other service providers, and Community members. The HOPWA Allocation Committee reviews and assesses against desired program criteria, and awards are made to individual organizations.</p> <p>The State HOPWA program posts public notice for RFGA in the on the Department of Workforce Services Grant page (https://jobs.utah.gov/departments/rfg/index.html) and the OHS Funding Sources for Homeless Service Providers grant page (https://jobs.utah.gov/homelessness/funding/index.html) to apply for HOPWA funding. Application workshops are held to educate and inform applicants on how to apply for funding. The deadline for application submission is set before the workshop.</p> |
| Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories. | <p>OHS will only use the authorized administrative cost limit of 3% to manage the program. Project sponsors will be limited to the authorized administrative cost of 7%. This will be monitored when OHS processes requests for funds. Other than administration funds, HOPWA has emphasized rental assistance for persons with HIV/AIDS. HUD provides HOPWA grantees the flexibility to determine how best to apportion recipients.</p> |
| Describe threshold factors and grant size limits. | <p>There are no limits or threshold factors in the awarding of HOPWA funds.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | What are the outcome measures expected as a result of the method of distribution? | As a result of HOPWA's method of distribution HOPWA expects to; (1) increase inventory of affordable units for people living with HIV/AIDS, (2) provide direct client support to obtain or maintain housing and prevent homelessness, and (3) identify resources for people living with HIV/AIDS. |
| 4 | State Program Name: | The State of Utah Emergency Solutions Grant Program |
| | Funding Sources: | ESG |
| | Describe the state program addressed by the Method of Distribution. | The Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program provides financial assistance and supportive services to homeless individuals and families. ESG provides housing relocation and stabilization services to align homeless households with affordable housing and activities that promote self-sufficiency and stability. |
| | Describe all of the criteria that will be used to select applications and the relative importance of these criteria. | The state of Utah ESG program awards funding through a competitive Request for Grant Application (RFGA) process. The Office of Homeless Services (OHS) Homelessness Funding application process includes ESG, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and state appropriations in order to coordinate priorities and meet the match requirement for ESG funding. The Utah Homeless Services Board (UHSB) sets state priorities for the competitive grant process based on the HUD Hearth Act, established HUD priorities for assisting chronically homeless individuals, veterans, families and youth, and specific needs identified in collaboration with partners and CoCs. OHS coordinates the review process with the UHSB, CoC leadership, and the Collaborative Applicant Lead Agency in order to align goals and resources. OHS utilizes ESG for applications that support HUD goals and objectives. The Evaluation Committee is given scoring criteria for each section of the application including: General Information, Project Information, Organization Overview, LHC Priorities and System Performance Measures, Project Inventory, Project Budget Narrative and Itemization, and required Application Attachments. OHS follows the HUD direction to allocate no more than 60% of ESG funds for shelter and outreach. The primary focus of ESG funds are funding Emergency Shelter, Homelessness Prevention, and Rapid Re-Housing projects and corresponding supportive service activities. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>If only summary criteria were described, how can potential applicants access application manuals or other state publications describing the application criteria? (CDBG only)</p> | |
| <p>Describe the process for awarding funds to state recipients and how the state will make its allocation available to units of general local government, and non-profit organizations, including community and faith-based organizations. (ESG only)</p> | <p>The State of Utah, Office of Homeless Services (OHS), has consolidated both state and federal sources of homelessness program grants into a single application process referred to as OHS State Homelessness Funding. This competitive RFGA for funding is open to: public or private not-for-profit organizations, faith-based organizations, state departments and agencies, units of local governments and Indian tribal governments. A statewide allocation plan was developed by an allocation committee and approved by the interagency council on homelessness (the Utah Homeless Services Board (UHSB)). The OHS oversees the funding process for proposals from programs statewide that serve homeless persons according to the HUD's definition of homelessness. All organizations that serve households experiencing homelessness with services that fall within state and federal goals are encouraged to apply. Training is provided for the application process as well as training of ESG regulations and requirements. The Evaluation Committee scores and prioritizes funding proposals, then creates recommendations regarding the distribution of ESG funds. The recommendations are presented to the UHSB for final approval.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | Identify the method of selecting project sponsors (including providing full access to grassroots faith-based and other community-based organizations). (HOPWA only) | |
| | Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories. | As per HUD's guidelines: no more than 60% will be allocated to Street Outreach and Emergency Shelter activities. The remaining 40%+ are allocated to Rapid Re-housing and HMIS. |
| | Describe threshold factors and grant size limits. | The ESG Program has no threshold factors or grant size limits. |
| | What are the outcome measures expected as a result of the method of distribution? | By prioritizing Emergency Shelter, Homelessness Prevention, and Rapid Re-Housing projects throughout the state, OHS expects the following outcomes: 1) Reduction in the number of people living in emergency shelters, 2) Reduction in the length of time individuals and households remain homeless, 3) Increase in exits to a permanent housing destination, and 4) Reduction in the number of people who exit homelessness to permanent housing destinations and return to homelessness within 24 months. |
| 5 | State Program Name: | Utah Small Cities Community Development Block Grant Program |
| | Funding Sources: | CDBG |
| | Describe the state program addressed by the Method of Distribution. | The Utah Small Cities Community Development Block Grant Program is dedicated to the promotion of local community development in rural Utah. The CDBG program funds activities such as infrastructure development, affordable housing, and public services. This program is an essential part of promoting sustainability in Utah's rural communities. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Describe all of the criteria that will be used to select applications and the relative importance of these criteria.</p> | <p>The seven-member State of Utah CDBG Policy Committee is composed of one elected official who serves on the local rating and ranking committee from each of the seven Association of Governments (AOG) regions. Annually, this committee determines the method of distribution that the state will use to allocate CDBG funds to the seven AOGs. The 2025 method of distribution (MOD) includes a \$400,000 base amount for each region, with the balance of the funding being allocated based on the following criteria:</p> <p>What is the percentage of LMI population</p> <p>What the average poverty rate is,</p> <p>What the pre-1980 housing stock is,</p> <p>and the number of pre-approved LMI communities in each region.</p> <p>Once the regional allocations are determined, each AOG rates and ranks their regional applications and assigns scores based on capacity to carry out a grant, matching funds, CDBG funds requested per capita served by the project, regional priorities, geographic impact, LMI population served, proactive planning, civil rights compliance, and project maturity, and other local priorities, which can include tax rates, the urgency of the project, or alignment with other regional or state priorities.</p> |
| <p>If only summary criteria were described, how can potential applicants access application manuals or other state publications describing the application criteria? (CDBG only)</p> | <p>The regional Association of Governments (AOG) staff invite all eligible counties, cities, and towns to attend the annual regional How to Apply workshops held in or around October. Nonprofits and special service districts (a local government creation empowered to address specific items for the public benefit) are also invited to attend to potentially apply for funding with the help of a sponsor. In partnership with the State CDBG program staff, AOG representatives conduct around 7 to 12 workshops throughout the state. The CDBG program requirements, application process, and regional rating and ranking criteria are explained in these workshops. The State CDBG Application Policies and Procedures book is updated annually and physically provided to workshop attendees as requested, otherwise the application manual policies and procedures are also posted on the State CDBG website at https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/community/cdbg/publications.html</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Describe the process for awarding funds to state recipients and how the state will make its allocation available to units of general local government, and non-profit organizations, including community and faith-based organizations. (ESG only)</p> | |
| <p>Identify the method of selecting project sponsors (including providing full access to grassroots faith-based and other community-based organizations). (HOPWA only)</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories. | CDBG funding categories include admin, planning, housing, public facilities, public services, public infrastructure, and a catch-all that covers other types of projects. Each AOG has developed its own rating and ranking system according to the needs and goals of its regions. While these rating and ranking systems promote certain project types over others, this system of regional funding priorities reflects the needs of the region. That being said, the local regional rating and ranking policies and scoring criteria are evaluated annually by the state in order to ensure objectivity, transparency, and compliance with federal and state regulations. |
| Describe threshold factors and grant size limits. | The minimum CDBG grant award is \$30,000. Some AOGs have chosen to limit the maximum grant size. However, this varies by region. Most grants range from \$100,000 to \$300,000. |
| What are the outcome measures expected as a result of the method of distribution? | The State expects that the funding distributed to projects through this distribution method will be going to projects that address the highest and best use of the funds according to the outcome of the rating and ranking. Given that CDBG funds can be used more broadly to address community development needs that may not be able to be addressed in any other way with any other outside funding sources. Thus local community needs can be addressed from all angles to create livable and sustainable communities. |

Discussion:

DRAFT

AP-35 Projects – (Optional)

Introduction:

The following projects are areas of high priority for funding in the State of Utah, through the Department of Workforce Services, Housing and Community Development Division, and Office of Homeless Services.

| # | Project Name |
|---|---|
| 1 | CDBG Public Facilities |
| 2 | CDBG Public Infrastructure |
| 3 | CDBG Single Family Housing Rehab |
| 4 | CDBG Other Affordable Housing |
| 5 | CDBG Administration and Planning |
| 6 | CDBG - State Admin |
| 7 | HOME and HTF New Affordable Housing |
| 8 | HESG FY25 - Utah State Homelessness Program |
| 9 | HOPWA FY25 - Utah |

Table 61 – Project Information

Describe the reasons for allocation priorities and any obstacles to addressing underserved needs

AP-38 Project Summary
Project Summary Information

DRAFT

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | Project Name | CDBG Public Facilities |
| | Target Area | Five County Association of Governments (FCOAG) Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) |
| | Goals Supported | |
| | Needs Addressed | CDBG Community Capital Improvements |
| | Funding | CDBG: \$2,675,944.00 |
| | Description | Acquisition of land for or construction/rehabilitation of public facilities such as fire stations, senior centers, parks, food banks, shelters, etc. |
| | Target Date | 12/31/2026 |
| | Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities | We propose that around 17,000 individuals will benefit from the listed activities. |
| | Location Description | Bicknell - Community Garden Greenhouse, Manti - Senior Center Improvements, Salina - Park Improvements, Sevier County - Foodbank Improvements, Levan - Pickleball Court, Wayne County - Ambulance Purchase, Emery - Park Bathroom Improvements, Washington Terrace - Playground Equipment, Five County AOG - Land Purchase - AOG Building in Cedar City for public service programs |
| | Planned Activities | Bicknell - Community Garden Greenhouse, Manti - Senior Center Improvements, Salina - Park Improvements, Sevier County - Foodbank Improvements, Levan - Pickleball Court, Wayne County - Ambulance Purchase, Emery - Park Bathroom Improvements, Washington Terrace - Playground Equipment, Five County AOG - Land Purchase - AOG Building |
| 2 | Project Name | CDBG Public Infrastructure |
| | Target Area | Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG) Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) |
| | Goals Supported | CDBG Public Infrastructure and Public Facilities |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | Needs Addressed | CDBG Community Capital Improvements |
| | Funding | CDBG: \$1,799,416.00 |
| | Description | Activities include water/sewer, curb and gutter, streets, storm water removal systems, and sidewalks. |
| | Target Date | 12/31/2026 |
| | Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities | We propose benefiting some 3,170 persons with the following activities. |
| | Location Description | Brigham City - Senior Center Sidewalk Improvements, Trenton - Cemetery Road Improvements, Lynndyl - Water Pump Installation, Grand County - Arroyo Crossing - Infrastructure, Washington Terrace - Sidewalk Improvements, Grantsville - Apple Street Waterline, Marriot-Slaterville - Sewerline Improvements (multi-year contract), Wallsburg - Stormwater Removal - Infrastructure, Vernal - Housing Infrastructure |
| | Planned Activities | Brigham City - Senior Center Sidewalk Improvements, Trenton - Cemetery Road Improvements, Lynndyl - Water Pump Installation, Grand County - Arroyo Crossing - Infrastructure, Washington Terrace - Sidewalk Improvements, Grantsville - Apple Street Waterline, Marriot-Slaterville - Sewerline Improvements (multi-year contract), Wallsburg - Stormwater Removal - Infrastructure, Vernal - Housing Infrastructure |
| 3 | Project Name | CDBG Single Family Housing Rehab |
| | Target Area | Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG) Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) |
| | Goals Supported | CDBG Single Family Housing Rehab |
| | Needs Addressed | CDBG Affordable Housing |
| | Funding | CDBG: \$1,153,033.00 |
| | Description | Single-Family Housing Rehabilitation programs carried out in the Bear River, Mountainland, Uintah Basin, Six County, and Southeastern Regions. |
| | Target Date | 6/30/2026 |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities | We propose to rehabilitate about 40 housing units to benefit the low to moderate income families living within the homes themselves. |
| | Location Description | Activities will take place throughout the geographical regions of Bear River AOG (Box Elder, Cache, and Rich counties), Mountainland AOG (Summit and Wasatch counties), Uintah Basin AOG (Dagget, Duchesne, and Uintah counties), Six County AOG (Juab, Millard, Sanpete, Sevier, Piute, and Wayne counties), and Southeastern UALG (Carbon, Emery, Grand, and San Juan counties.) |
| | Planned Activities | Single Family Housing Units will be rehabilitated throughout the Bear River, Mountainland, Uintah Basin, Six County, and Southeastern Regions. |
| 4 | Project Name | CDBG Other Affordable Housing |
| | Target Area | |
| | Goals Supported | CDBG Other Affordable Housing |
| | Needs Addressed | CDBG Affordable Housing |
| | Funding | CDBG: \$80,000.00 |
| | Description | Activities include land acquisition or construction of infrastructure for the development of housing and also multi-family housing rehabilitation. Home Buyer assistance programs are also included in these types of Projects. |
| | Target Date | 6/30/2026 |
| | Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities | We propose helping around 25 households with Homeownership supports and assistance in the Bear River and Uintah Basin Regions |
| | Location Description | Homeownership support and assistance will occur in the Bear River and Uintah Basin Regions. |
| | Planned Activities | Homeownership support and assistance will occur in the Bear River and Uintah Basin Regions. |
| 5 | Project Name | CDBG Administration and Planning |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | Target Area | Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Five County Association of Governments (FCOAG) Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG) Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) |
| | Goals Supported | CDBG Administration and Planning |
| | Needs Addressed | CDBG Administration and Planning |
| | Funding | CDBG: \$584,751.00 |
| | Description | Activities include AOG administration and planning activities and project administration. |
| | Target Date | 6/30/2026 |
| | Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities | We propose to benefit some 35,800 people with the proposed planning activities throughout the state. |
| | Location Description | Activities will take place throughout the whole of the State of Utah, broken down by region including Bear River, Wasatch Front, Mountainland, Uintah Basin, Six County, Southeaster, and Five County regions. |
| 6 | Planned Activities | Bear River AOG- Admin & Planning, Bear River AOG - Home Buyer Assistance Program Delivery, Six County AOG - Admin & Planning, Six County AOG - Planning Only, SEUALG - Admin & Planning, SEUALG - Planning Only, Green River - Main Street Planning, Tooele County - Admin & Planning, Five County AOG - Admin & Planning, MAG - Admin & Planning, Wallsburg - Stormwater Removal - Planning, UBAOG - Admin & Planning, UBAOG - Home Ownership Assistance Program Delivery |
| | Project Name | CDBG - State Admin |
| | Target Area | |
| | Goals Supported | |
| | Needs Addressed | |
| | Funding | CDBG: \$265,000.00 |
| | Description | HUD CDBG grant funds used to pay state CDBG staff. |
| | Target Date | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities | |
| | Location Description | |
| | Planned Activities | These funds will be used to pay for statewide program administration and technical assistance. |
| 7 | Project Name | HOME and HTF New Affordable Housing |
| | Target Area | |
| | Goals Supported | HOME and HTF Affordable Housing |
| | Needs Addressed | New HOME and HTF Affordable Housing |
| | Funding | HOPWA: \$3,346,430.00 HOME: \$12,856,129.00 |
| | Description | Create affordable housing units |
| | Target Date | 12/31/2027 |
| | Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities | At least 60 low to moderate-income households will benefit from these funds |
| | Location Description | Throughout the state of Utah, primarily located along the Wasatch Front. |
| | Planned Activities | To be determined by application. For more information, please consult the CAPER for 2025 |
| 8 | Project Name | HESG FY25 - Utah State Homelessness Program |
| | Target Area | |
| | Goals Supported | Make Homelessness Rare Make Homelessness Brief Make Homelessness Non-Recurring |
| | Needs Addressed | Make Homelessness Rare Make Homelessness Non-Recurring Make Homelessness Brief |
| | Funding | ESG: \$1,383,733.00 |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | Description | Utah Homelessness Program awards HESG funds to statewide homeless service providers to assist homeless households in preventing them from being homeless and moving toward self-sufficiency. |
| | Target Date | 12/31/2027 |
| | Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities | We propose benefiting an estimated 5,000 distinct individuals over the course of the year (based on last year's performance.) |
| | Location Description | Throughout the state |
| | Planned Activities | To be determined by application throughout the year |
| | | |
| 9 | Project Name | HOPWA FY25 - Utah |
| | Target Area | |
| | Goals Supported | HOPWA- Assistance for Persons with HIV/AIDS |
| | Needs Addressed | HOPWA Support HIV/AIDS housing and case management |
| | Funding | HOPWA: \$361,344.00 |
| | Description | The State Office of Homeless Services awards HOPWA funds to statewide HOPWA eligible households to live independently in safe affordable & permanent housing & access healthcare and other supportive services to increase self-sufficiency and prevent homelessness. |
| | Target Date | 12/31/2027 |
| | Estimate the number and type of families that will benefit from the proposed activities | We propose benefiting around 40 households with HOPWA funds |
| | Location Description | Throughout the State |
| | Planned Activities | To be determined by application throughout the year |

AP-40 Section 108 Loan Guarantee – 91.320(k)(1)(ii)

Will the state help non-entitlement units of general local government to apply for Section 108 loan funds?

No

Available Grant Amounts

N/A

Acceptance process of applications

N/A

DRAFT

AP-45 Community Revitalization Strategies – 91.320(k)(1)(ii)

Will the state allow units of general local government to carry out community revitalization strategies?

No

State's Process and Criteria for approving local government revitalization strategies

N/A

DRAFT

DRAFT

AP-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.320(f)

Description of the geographic areas of the state (including areas of low-income and minority concentration) where assistance will be directed

The only instances in which HUD funds allocated to the DWS are distributed by geography are CDBG funds, which are distributed through seven regional bodies. These seven regional organizations independently determine what their project type priorities are and make project funding decisions, subject to state oversight. Within rural Utah, there are many communities that are low-income. None of these are designated RCAP or ECAPs. None of the seven regional organizations has geography-based set-asides for communities or neighborhoods within their respective regions.

HOME, HOPWA and ESG funds are not distributed geographically. CDBG funds are distributed to the seven regional associations of government, subject to state oversight and review. The percentage of funds that they receive in relation to the total funds the State programs receive is listed in table 10.

Geographic Distribution

| Target Area | Percentage of Funds |
|---|---------------------|
| Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) | 5 |
| Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) | 5 |
| Five County Association of Governments (FCOAG) | 5 |
| Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAG) | 5 |
| Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) | 5 |
| Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) | 5 |
| Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) | 5 |

Table 62 - Geographic Distribution

Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically

HOME, Housing Trust Fund (HTF), Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA) and Emergency Solutions (ESG) program funds are not distributed geographically. The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding is allocated geographically to the seven regional Associations of Governments (AOGs). This is done by design to ensure that local needs and priorities are addressed by local officials who have a greater understanding of their own communities. The AOGs award funding to projects that address those local, regional goals and priorities as outlined in the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action

Plans. See Section AP-30 for a complete explanation of this process. None of the AOGs have geography-based set-asides for communities or neighborhoods within their respective regions.

Discussion

DRAFT

Affordable Housing

AP-55 Affordable Housing – 24 CFR 91.320(g)

Introduction:

| One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported | |
|---|---|
| Homeless | 0 |
| Non-Homeless | 0 |
| Special-Needs | 0 |
| Total | 0 |

Table 64 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement

| One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through | |
|---|----|
| Rental Assistance | 0 |
| The Production of New Units | 0 |
| Rehab of Existing Units | 57 |
| Acquisition of Existing Units | 0 |
| Total | 57 |

Table 65 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type

Discussion:

The CDBG program plans to assist some 55 to 60 households by rehabbing existing units.

AP-60 Public Housing - 24 CFR 91.320(j)

Introduction:

Actions planned during the next year to address the needs to public housing

The State of Utah has not made any specific plans to help address public housing through public housing authorities. Most funding that goes into housing already goes through private developers who are engaged in creating housing, and the State essentially buys additional affordable housing units through programs like CDBG, HOME, and HTF, subject to program limitations.

Actions to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership

The State of Utah does not own or manage any public housing authorities in the non-entitlement areas of the state where the CDBG program operates. However, there are two housing authorities that are awarded CDBG funds frequently. Cedar City Housing Authority has 262 Section 8 Vouchers, 79 USDA rental assisted units, but no public housing units. It offers the following programs to their housing residents: Homebuyer Education classes, Budgeting & Financial Management classes, Homebuyer Assistance and a Rent to Own Program. Beaver Housing Authority is the other housing authority that frequently receives CDBG funding. It operates 18 public housing units for elderly and disabled persons and has 19 Section 8 Vouchers. It operates 12 units under EDA's Farm and Labor Housing program and operates another 75 units of housing that are available to those families that are at or below 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI). This housing authority offers online homebuyer education classes and Money Wise budgeting classes to all tenants.

If the PHA is designated as troubled, describe the manner in which financial assistance will be provided or other assistance

There are no known troubled Public Housing Authorities in Utah. CDBG does not assist troubled housing authorities directly.

Discussion:

AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities – 91.320(h)

Introduction

The effort to ensure that episodes of homelessness are rare, brief, and non-recurring is a coordinated and systematic statewide approach. Organizations throughout the state are approaching homelessness through a “human first” approach. The National Housing Trust Fund (HTF) application process promotes the creation of affordable housing for extremely low-income individuals, many of whom are at risk of homelessness. It is expected that the affordable units funded with HTF funds will assist extremely low income households and prevent many from experiencing bouts of homelessness.

The State of Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness aligns with the purpose of the NHTF and outlines several goals to make homelessness in Utah rare, brief, and non-recurring, all of which are evaluated annually and described below.

1. Increase accessible and affordable permanent housing opportunities for people experiencing homelessness across the state.
2. Increase access to and availability of supportive services and case management for people experiencing and at risk of homelessness.
3. Expand homelessness prevention efforts by increasing coordination, resources, and affordable housing opportunities.
4. Target housing resources and supportive services to people experiencing unsheltered homelessness.
5. Promote alignment and coordination across multiple systems of care to support people experiencing and at risk of homelessness.

Describe the jurisdictions one-year goals and actions for reducing and ending homelessness including

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

In alignment with the State Strategic Plan Implementation Guide, the Office of Homeless Services (OHS) will: Support localities to identify resources and infrastructure to increase availability of permanent housing and permanent supportive housing for people experiencing unsheltered homelessness with priority for people experiencing chronic unsheltered homelessness.

Assist localities in increasing supportive service and case management capacity to provide housing location, navigation, and stability services to provide the supports needed for unsheltered individuals to obtain and retain permanent housing.

Assist Continuum of Care (CoCs) and Local Homeless Councils (LHCs) to coordinate and target resources toward vulnerable unsheltered subpopulations by using by-name lists and other subpopulation targeting tools (e.g., chronically homeless, survivors of domestic violence, people with disabilities and/or substance use disorders, youth, etc.)

Support LHCs to identify specific needs, resources, and strategies to address unsheltered homelessness in their communities.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

The State of Utah's ESG funding will continue to be allocated to emergency shelters throughout the state for case management, operations and maintenance. With Utah's weather conditions being potentially life-threatening, it is imperative that these facilities and emergency motel vouchers exist to ensure that no lives are lost due to inadequate sheltering. Utilizing State funds, The Office of Homeless Services (OHS) also prioritizes funding for shelter diversion programs and training on diversion best practices. Diversion creates the opportunity to ensure that only the persons who have no other resources are being served within emergency shelter. If an individual or family cannot be diverted, rapid housing solutions are most effectively utilized for those who would remain homeless. This strategy enables us to maximize the use of shelter facilities and vouchers. The OHS encourages best practices be used in temporary shelter or when housing individuals and families. In addition, the OHS awarded emergency shelters with Rapid Re-housing dollars in order to facilitate a timely and appropriate exit from shelter in order to support outcomes and measures for funding. The OHS funds transitional housing in limited instances where studies have shown that it is effective among certain subpopulations.

Refer to the State Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness.

<https://jobs.utah.gov/homelessness/homelessnessstrategicplan.pdf>

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again

The OHS follows the ESG requirement that all recipients must participate in their CoCs adopted coordinated entry system. ESG recipients utilize coordinated entry and assessment to make housing

decisions. This systematic approach ensures resources are allocated to those in most need, provides the appropriate level of intervention, and decreases the amount of time a household will experience homelessness. Additionally, State ESG Rapid Re-housing funds are awarded to emergency shelters in an effort to facilitate moving chronically homeless individuals and families, veteran individuals and families and homeless youths into permanent housing. Additionally, we have implemented quarterly reporting for all of our State-funded programs. These reports are broken into project types and focus heavily on how well we are progressing persons experiencing homelessness into housing, as well as demonstrating how well supportive services are stabilizing an individual or families housing. For example, street outreach projects report on the number of participants enrolled from a place not meant for habitation, and the number of participants exiting to a temporary destination, institutional setting, or permanent destination. Rapid Re-housing projects report on the number of adults gaining or increasing employment and non-employment income, number of adults enrolled in mainstream benefits, and the average length of time between project start date and housing move-in date. There are established measures for emergency shelter, transitional housing, diversion, and permanent supportive housing. Tracking these measures enables the State to prioritize effective projects and engage in data-driven outcome conversations. Refer to the State Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness. <https://jobs.utah.gov/homelessness/homelessnessstrategicplan.pdf>

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); or, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

There are several systems throughout the state in place aimed towards homeless prevention in order to help low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless. Community Action Programs and other non-profits provide wrap-around services to address poverty and the OHS and HCD are committed to supporting these efforts. TANF, HOPWA and CDBG grants are distributed statewide to provide financial assistance to those who are extremely low-income and require short-term assistance in order to stabilize their housing. The Utah Department of Human Services' (DHS) Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) Practice Guidelines require a transition plan be developed at least 90 days prior to discharge with youth exiting foster care at age 18 and prohibits discharge to homelessness. Transition discharge plan to include: support services; housing; health care/insurance; vocational/educational needs; employment/workforce support. Persons exiting foster care are routinely discharged to family members, foster parents, independent living situations such as apartments, student housing, and other supervised living conditions. They may also be discharged to group homes or community residences that include support and supervision. The OHS also supports the Homeless Youth Resource Center (HYRC) run through Volunteers of America. The HYRC provides case management, street outreach, and a drop-in center for at-risk youth and homeless youth. The Utah Department of Corrections and Public Safety participate with the Utah Homeless Services Board and work with Local Homeless Councils to connect

inmates being released to housing, emergency shelter and other community resources. Additionally, services are provided to inmates to reduce recidivism and improve housing stability including: education, substance abuse treatment, vocational training/certification, employment (job readiness and resume courses) and transitional cognitive courses. Discharge options include residential treatment, boarding homes, halfway houses, market-rate apartments, and family/friends.

For a description of the programs that ensure that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing see MA-35. The OHS and HCD will continue to support the efforts made by partnering agencies and provide assistance when applicable. The DWS supportive services committee continues to refine protocol to support employment for those leaving incarceration, juvenile justice, and foster care. Set-aside housing units will be targeted for compliance monitoring. The HCD will ensure that housing units originally targeted to support discharged populations continue to target those populations. The HCD will ensure that service providers are tapped into the State of Utah's affordable housing database of property and unit listings.

Discussion

AP-70 HOPWA Goals – 91.320(k)(4)

| One year goals for the number of households to be provided housing through the use of HOPWA for: | |
|--|----|
| Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family | 24 |
| Tenant-based rental assistance | 20 |
| Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds | 0 |
| Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds | 0 |
| Total | 44 |

DRAFT

AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.320(i)

Introduction:

Housing Affordability is an issue that the HCD takes very seriously. A large majority of HCD's funds go towards promoting affordable housing in the form of new affordable units and preservation of existing affordable units. The HCD works with cities to eliminate barriers to fair housing. State law requires communities to develop affordable housing plans as part of their general plan requirement. Jurisdictions that are required to submit a plan, must select three from a menu of twenty-five strategies they can pursue to encourage affordable housing, such as waiving development fees, adopting zoning that encourages construction of high-density housing near transit lines, and etc. For more information, please see <https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/affordable/moderate/index.html>, for an overview of planning requirements required of municipalities in Utah and their reporting requirements.

Actions it planned to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment

In reviewing affordable housing plans that have been submitted by communities throughout the state, HCD staff has noticed improvements in the quality of the submitted plans. Jurisdictions that are required to have an affordable housing plan have adopted strategies to increase the opportunity for affordable housing to be built. HCD staff review these plans each year to ensure they have met the requirement and are progressing toward their goals.

The main method through which the Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) attempts to ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing, is through the promotion of good and effective local municipal Moderate Income Housing Plans.

Staff provide technical training and guidance to municipalities regarding the appropriate analyses and evaluations which they are meant to undertake. Furthermore, staff have created an advanced online template which allows communities to gather pertinent data, in both text, and graphic format. This template is very easy to use and is currently in use by communities throughout the state. Training on this new technology is being held to educate municipalities on how to improve their affordable housing plans. These trainings are being held statewide, including at the annual Utah American Planning Association.

The affordable housing plans are intended to evaluate land use controls, tax policies, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment.

Additionally, the HOME program awards points to applicants whose communities have written a

highly-rated affordable housing plan. Also, one of HCD's programs, the Community Driven Housing program, is only made available to communities that have written highly rated affordable housing plans. This encourages communities to evaluate their community needs as well as any policies, which may discourage affordable housing.

Discussion:

DRAFT

AP-85 Other Actions – 91.320(j)

Introduction:

Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs

The biggest challenge to meeting the underserved needs in the non-entitlement areas of the state CDBG program is the lack of adequate federal funding from HUD. As cities and counties have grown in population and left the State program, the annual State CDBG allocation has dropped from a high of \$8.2 million in 2003 to only \$5.5 million in 2020. There simply isn't enough funding to meet the community development needs of the rural communities. Critical infrastructure projects such as water, sewer, and public safety continue to be a high priority. With only \$600,000 - \$800,000 available in most AOG regions, only one or two of these projects can be funded in each region every year. The infrastructure is aging everywhere and the needs are never-ending. The regional rating and ranking systems award additional points for leveraged funds and this encourages applicants to seek matching funds for their projects. This system maximizes the CDBG impact throughout the state.

This is true for the other programs that the HCD operates. A lack of funding is the primary concern for the HOME and HTF programs. Each year these programs are unable to adequately fund affordable projects, which would benefit that portion of the population, which is underserved.

Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing

The HOME, ESG, and HOPWA programs are all focused on different segments of the housing market. These programs employ their own unique methods to fostering and maintaining affordable housing. The HOME program is dedicated to the creation of new affordable housing. Each year the HOME program is responsible for the creation of new affordable housing units. Over the last five years, OWHLF has averaged creating or preserving 933 affordable units per year. The HOME program works with all the properties it funds to ensure that the properties are operated successfully. HOME staff study all properties to determine that they are economically viable. HOME also inspects all properties it funds to ensure that affordable housing is maintained in good condition and that all residents have submitted appropriate paperwork and are correctly placed within their units. Units approved by HOME target (and are affordable to) individuals which on average earn 40 percent of the Area Median Income.

The ESG program is largely dependent on affordable housing for its Rapid Re-housing programs since it must meet all the rent reasonableness and fair market rent requirements. ESG subrecipients work to foster and maintain affordable housing in order to place their program participants in eligible, affordable units. The State provides training, support and resources in working with landlords and making affordable units a good investment.

The HOPWA program assists the placement of persons with HIV/AIDS into affordable housing units.

The CDBG program funds projects intended to support affordable housing. The Bear River and Uintah Basin regions operate homebuyer assistance programs for low- and moderate-income homebuyers. The state CDBG program continues to preserve affordable housing units by supporting single-family housing rehab programs in four of the seven AOG regions. Low- and moderate-income families depend on the CDBG program to make critical improvements to their homes such as water/sewer lines, roof replacement, ADA modifications, and heating systems. These programs make it possible for many elderly low- and moderate- income persons to stay in their homes.

In addition, the National Housing Trust Fund (NHTF) will be used to create new affordable housing for extremely low-income households. This is an important part of the HCD's plan to foster and maintain affordable housing.

Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards

The State of Utah has one of the lowest rates for lead poisoning for children under the age of six years, just one percent. Unlike the eastern United States, the housing stock in Utah is relatively new. Most of the housing stock is located in the Wasatch Front region where 76 % of the population resides. These urban, entitlement areas have received federal grants and are served by successful lead hazard reduction programs. The balance of the state that is served by the Utah small cities CDBG program has a small population and limited funding available for such targeted programs. Instead, most lead-based paint hazards are mitigated as a by-product of the single family housing rehab programs operated in four of the rural regions in the state. We encourage partnerships between the Weatherization, CDBG, HOME and NHTF programs so that, whenever possible, lead-based paint hazards can be mitigated in the homes that are being rehabilitated. NHTF funds are to be used primarily to create new housing so addressing lead-based paint hazards through the expenditure of NHTF funds will be rare. When such instances do occur they will be treated in the same manner as rehabilitation projects using other HUD funding such as HOME.

Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

By promoting affordable housing and the rapid re-housing of homeless households, the HCD promotes stability and a footing for families to build the stability to earn enough to no longer be impoverished. Case management and counseling is also provided to assist households in this transition.

The small annual CDBG allocation combined with Utah's Method of Distribution makes it difficult to fund programs designed to reduce the number of poverty level families. By statute, the state's allocation is divided by seven regional organizations and these organizations have the authority and control over which projects will be funded. Since public service type projects are limited to 15% of the annual allocation, job training programs are uncommon. Instead, the priorities for 2019 continue to be community infrastructure improvements and affordable housing. Single-family housing rehab programs throughout the state preserve the affordable housing stock in the rural areas and improve the housing

conditions for poverty-level families, but do not reduce their numbers.

The creation of affordable housing relieves the housing burden on low-income households. By creating affordable housing through the HOME program and NHTF program, the HCD is allowing poverty-level households a level of stability not otherwise possible.

Actions planned to develop institutional structure

Currently the HOME and HTF have very little institutional structure in that they do not funnel their funds through other entities.

Actions planned to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies

The State ESG Program is a partner of the Utah Homeless Services Board (UHSB). The UHSB is committed to coordinating the efforts of public, private and social service agencies in addressing homelessness. The USHB and the Utah Department of Workforce Services Office of Homeless Services (OHS) efforts have been a valuable contribution towards federal goals to end homelessness. UHSB has pioneered efforts to demonstrate the value and feasibility of coordination between public, private and social service agencies.

The CDBG program allocates funding to seven regional organizations. Application workshops are held throughout the state and the ten housing authorities located in the non-entitlement areas are invited to apply for funding through eligible applicants (cities and counties). Decent, safe, affordable housing is a priority in Utah and CDBG funding is used by the housing authorities to acquire and rehabilitate affordable housing throughout the state. Since CDBG funds cannot be used to construct housing, acquisition projects are often leveraged with HOME funds for new single and multifamily housing projects carried out by private developers.

The NHTF is a relatively new tool used in coordination with the HOME program to create affordable housing. The HCD expects applicants for these funds to come from private housing agencies, social service organizations, and local communities. Extensive coordination will take place as these programs operate to a greater degree than occurred previously.

Discussion:

Program Specific Requirements

AP-90 Program Specific Requirements – 91.320(k)(1,2,3)

Introduction:

Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) Reference 24 CFR 91.320(k)(1)

Projects planned with all CDBG funds expected to be available during the year are identified in the Projects Table. The following identifies program income that is available for use that is included in projects to be carried out.

| | |
|--|----------|
| 1. The total amount of program income that will have been received before the start of the next program year and that has not yet been reprogrammed | 0 |
| 2. The amount of proceeds from section 108 loan guarantees that will be used during the year to address the priority needs and specific objectives identified in the grantee's strategic plan. | 0 |
| 3. The amount of surplus funds from urban renewal settlements | 0 |
| 4. The amount of any grant funds returned to the line of credit for which the planned use has not been included in a prior statement or plan | 0 |
| 5. The amount of income from float-funded activities | 0 |
| Total Program Income: | 0 |

Other CDBG Requirements

| | |
|---|--------|
| 1. The amount of urgent need activities | 0 |
| 2. The estimated percentage of CDBG funds that will be used for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income. Overall Benefit - A consecutive period of one, two or three years may be used to determine that a minimum overall benefit of 70% of CDBG funds is used to benefit persons of low and moderate income. Specify the years covered that include this Annual Action Plan. | 90.00% |

HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME)
Reference 24 CFR 91.320(k)(2)

1. A description of other forms of investment being used beyond those identified in Section 92.205 is as follows:

OWHLF does not engage in other forms of investment beyond those identified in Section 92.205

2. A description of the guidelines that will be used for resale or recapture of HOME funds when used for homebuyer activities as required in 92.254, is as follows:

The Utah recapture resale provisions are attached as a separate unique grantee attachment in AD-25

3. A description of the guidelines for resale or recapture that ensures the affordability of units acquired with HOME funds? See 24 CFR 92.254(a)(4) are as follows:

The Utah recapture resale provisions are attached as a separate unique grantee attachment in AD-25

4. Plans for using HOME funds to refinance existing debt secured by multifamily housing that is rehabilitated with HOME funds along with a description of the refinancing guidelines required that will be used under 24 CFR 92.206(b), are as follows:

The state does not use federal funds to refinance multi-family housing projects.

5. If applicable to a planned HOME TBRA activity, a description of the preference for persons with special needs or disabilities. (See 24 CFR 92.209(c)(2)(i) and CFR 91.220(l)(2)(vii)).
6. If applicable to a planned HOME TBRA activity, a description of how the preference for a specific category of individuals with disabilities (e.g. persons with HIV/AIDS or chronic mental illness) will narrow the gap in benefits and the preference is needed to narrow the gap in benefits and services received by such persons. (See 24 CFR 92.209(c)(2)(ii) and 91.220(l)(2)(vii)).
7. If applicable, a description of any preference or limitation for rental housing projects. (See 24 CFR 92.253(d)(3) and CFR 91.220(l)(2)(vii)). Note: Preferences cannot be administered in a manner that limits the opportunities of persons on any basis prohibited by the laws listed under 24 CFR 5.105(a).

Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)
Reference 91.320(k)(3)

1. Include written standards for providing ESG assistance (may include as attachment)

This will be included as an attachment.

2. If the Continuum of Care has established a centralized or coordinated assessment system that meets HUD requirements, describe that centralized or coordinated assessment system.

DWS-OHS works to ensure that all of the CoCs and subrecipients of ESG are participating in a coordinated assessment system. When monitoring, staff reviews these processes to ensure that subrecipients are actively participating. Additionally, the State's three CoCs have contracted for a quick assessment system to be built within HMIS. This quick assessment was vetted through the Local Homeless Councils (LHCs) by way of the coordinated assessment workgroup. Below are explanations of how the three CoCs have implemented a coordinated assessment system: Balance of State: The Balance of State (BoS) consists of 25 out of 29 counties throughout Utah, and consists of 11 LHCS. The BoS CoC utilizes the VI-SPDAT as an initial assessment tool, which will be used in conjunction with the point in time count as a way of identifying vulnerable and chronically homeless persons that will be placed on a community-based housing wait list. The BoS Coordinated Entry Workgroup has been established to develop coordinated assessment policies and procedures, and to oversee all aspects of implementation. This committee is made up of a Coordinated Entry Lead from each LHC. They are also charged with the responsibility to outreach and to educate local communities about coordinated entry. The workgroup is also responsible for monitoring implementation and effectiveness of the Coordinated Entry System, outreach and education of LHCs, identifying best practices, maintaining the BoS Coordinated Entry Policies and Procedures, identifying and promoting access points in each community, developing measures of effectiveness and reporting regularly to the BoS Board of Directors. Mountainland: Mountainland CoC operates the coordinated intake and assessment system through 2-1-1 in partnership with the housing and homeless service providers. A client may present for services at any CoC service provider or contact the coordinated intake and assessment system through United Way 2-1-1. Following the initial standardized assessment (including a quick assessment for emergency services), the system is consulted to give clear direction for accessing appropriate services. Persons are then tracked as they progress toward housing and/or support services. Prioritization is given to certain populations, such as vulnerable chronic homeless persons, domestic violence (DV) survivors where housing is an element of their overall safety, and homeless families with children where family unity is essential. Salt Lake: Salt Lake CoC has developed a collaborative, Coordinated Entry and Exit plan. Consensus

exists for a CoC wide, multi-access entry point quick assessment method for any homeless individual or family in need of emergency shelter or service. The 2-1-1 system, service providers, government agencies, etc. publicize all existing access points. Anyone in need has clear direction for accessing appropriate services. After entry into an appropriate emergency service, individuals are tracked as they progress toward housing and/or support interventions. A community wide housing prioritization and placement process has been in place for six years. Individuals and families experiencing homelessness who are prioritized for permanent supportive housing and other housing placements are guided toward this centralized process and placed into one of several housing programs depending on assessment. Standardized assessments include a quick assessment for emergency services and eligibility and enrollment materials for housing placements.

3. Identify the process for making sub-awards and describe how the ESG allocation is available to private nonprofit organizations (including community and faith-based organizations).

State ESG funds are allocated through the DWS-OHS Homelessness Funding process, which includes allocation recommendations from the Utah Homeless Services Board (UHSB). The UHSB is representative of homeless stakeholders as appointed by the Governor or legislatively mandated. The Office of Homeless Services (OHS) issues a press release publicizing the request for grant applications and a state-wide training. Any interested parties are invited to attend this training and apply for funding, including nonprofit organizations, community and faith-based organizations and local government entities. The training covers specific guidance for and presentation of funding priorities and any changes in application process. The conclusion of the training also marks the day the online application will be open. After an appropriate amount of time, the application is closed and OHS staff and the allocation committee begins reviewing the applications and scores them based on past performance and strength of application. A list of recommendations is presented to the UHSB for final approval.

4. If the jurisdiction is unable to meet the homeless participation requirement in 24 CFR 576.405(a), the jurisdiction must specify its plan for reaching out to and consulting with homeless or formerly homeless individuals in considering policies and funding decisions regarding facilities and services funded under ESG.

As a state, Utah is not required to consult with homeless or formerly homeless individuals in considering policies and funding decisions regarding facilities and services funded. However, all state sub-recipients are required to have homeless or previously homeless individuals on their boards.

5. Describe performance standards for evaluating ESG.

The three key system measurements of progress in alignment with “All In”, the US Interagency

Council on Homelessness, and the HEARTH Act for DWS-OHS Homelessness Funding are to:

Reduce the rate of first time homelessness (prevention);

Reduce the time individuals and households remain homeless (homelessness response); and

Reduce returns to homelessness (housing and supports). State ESG recipient coordinates with each CoC to develop performance standards that will provide a measure to evaluate each ESG service provider's effectiveness including how well the provider succeeded at 1) targeting those who need the assistance most, 2) reducing the number of people living on the streets or emergency shelters, 3) shortening the time people spend homeless, and 4) reducing each program participant's housing barriers or housing stability risks. DWS and OHS recognizes that performance measures will continue to evolve as we become more proficient in administering the program and better able to identify and address the underlying causes of homelessness.

Housing Trust Fund (HTF)
Reference 24 CFR 91.320(k)(5)

1. How will the grantee distribute its HTF funds? Select all that apply:

☒ Applications submitted by eligible recipients

2. If distributing HTF funds through grants to subgrantees, describe the method for distributing HTF funds through grants to subgrantees and how those funds will be made available to state agencies and/or units of general local government. If not distributing funds through grants to subgrantees, enter "N/A".

N/A

3. If distributing HTF funds by selecting applications submitted by eligible recipients,

a. Describe the eligibility requirements for recipients of HTF funds (as defined in 24 CFR § 93.2). If not distributing funds by selecting applications submitted by eligible recipients, enter "N/A".

Any entity can apply for NHTF funds. Most applicants are partnerships between non-profit organizations such as housing authorities and private developers. The only accepted use of NHTF funds is in the development of extremely affordable multi-family housing. These are units which target extremely low

income persons/households who make 300% or less of the Area Median Income (AMI). OWHLF will not use NHTF to fund homeownership, or for administration or planning costs. All HTF-assisted rental housing will meet a 30-year affordability period. HCD administers HTF funds directly and does not employ a sub-grantee to distribute funds. HCD does award a small bonus to applicants targeting homeless individuals and the elderly. OWHLF has also chosen to award additional points for rural projects, however no funds are set aside to target rural areas or specific urban areas.

b. Describe the grantee's application requirements for eligible recipients to apply for HTF funds. If not distributing funds by selecting applications submitted by eligible recipients, enter "N/A".

Applications to apply for NHTF funds are available through the same method of applying for HOME funds, following the same application cycle available at housing.utah.gov.

c. Describe the selection criteria that the grantee will use to select applications submitted by eligible recipients. If not distributing funds by selecting applications submitted by eligible recipients, enter "N/A".

All HTF funding is for households at or below 30% AMI, as determined by HUD, for the county in which they reside

d. Describe the grantee's required priority for funding based on geographic diversity (as defined by the grantee in the consolidated plan). If not distributing funds by selecting applications submitted by eligible recipients, enter "N/A".

HCD has no set aside for specific geographic areas.

e. Describe the grantee's required priority for funding based on the applicant's ability to obligate HTF funds and undertake eligible activities in a timely manner. If not distributing funds by selecting applications submitted by eligible recipients, enter "N/A".

If staff determines that the applicant does not have the capacity to obligate funds or to develop the project in a timely manner the applicant will not receive funding despite meeting other criteria. The determination is determined during project underwriting as is influenced in part by the experience HCD has with an applicant.

f. Describe the grantee's required priority for funding based on the extent to which the rental project has Federal, State, or local project-based rental assistance so that rents are affordable to

extremely low-income families. If not distributing funds by selecting applications submitted by eligible recipients, enter "N/A".

Projects are presented to the Review Committee based on Policy and Procedures.

g. Describe the grantee's required priority for funding based on the financial feasibility of the project beyond the required 30-year period. If not distributing funds by selecting applications submitted by eligible recipients, enter "N/A".

HCD considers the financial feasibility of the project for the required 30-year affordability period. No consideration or priority is given on the basis of what may or may not happen in 30 years.

h. Describe the grantee's required priority for funding based on the merits of the application in meeting the priority housing needs of the grantee (such as housing that is accessible to transit or employment centers, housing that includes green building and sustainable development features, or housing that serves special needs populations). If not distributing funds by selecting applications submitted by eligible recipients, enter "N/A".

All HTF projects are required to meet Energy Star 3.0 or minimum HERS rating, unless a waiver is approved due to those enhancements not being cost effective.

i. Describe the grantee's required priority for funding based on the extent to which the application makes use of non-federal funding sources. If not distributing funds by selecting applications submitted by eligible recipients, enter "N/A".

Leveraging is a scoring criterion.

4. Does the grantee's application require the applicant to include a description of the eligible activities to be conducted with HTF funds? If not distributing funds by selecting applications submitted by eligible recipients, select "N/A".

Yes

5. Does the grantee's application require that each eligible recipient certify that housing units assisted with HTF funds will comply with HTF requirements? If not distributing funds by selecting applications submitted by eligible recipients, select "N/A".

Yes

6. Performance Goals and Benchmarks. The grantee has met the requirement to provide for performance goals and benchmarks against which the grantee will measure its progress, consistent with the grantee's goals established under 24 CFR 91.315(b)(2), by including HTF in its housing goals in the housing table on the SP-45 Goals and AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives screens.

Yes

7. Maximum Per-unit Development Subsidy Amount for Housing Assisted with HTF Funds.

Enter or attach the grantee's maximum per-unit development subsidy limits for housing assisted with HTF funds.

The limits must be adjusted for the number of bedrooms and the geographic location of the project. The limits must also be reasonable and based on actual costs of developing non-luxury housing in the area.

If the grantee will use existing limits developed for other federal programs such as the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) per-unit cost limits, HOME's maximum per-unit subsidy amounts, and/or Public Housing Development Cost Limits (TDCs), it must include a description of how the HTF maximum per-unit development subsidy limits were established or a description of how existing limits developed for another program and being adopted for HTF meet the HTF requirements specified above.

HCD utilizes the HUD HOME Program per Unit Subsidy Limits as a base limit from which to determine appropriate subsidy calculations for the HTF Program. HCDs HTF subsidy limits will be calculated on a per-unit basis and will vary depending on unit size.

8. Rehabilitation Standards. The grantee must establish rehabilitation standards for all HTF-assisted rehabilitation activities that set forth the requirements that must be met upon project completion. The grantee's description of its standards must be in sufficient detail to determine the required rehabilitation work including methods and materials. The standards may refer to applicable codes or they may establish requirements that exceed the minimum requirements of the codes. The grantee must attach its rehabilitation standards below.

In addition, the rehabilitation standards must address each of the following: health and safety; major systems; lead-based paint; accessibility; disaster mitigation (where relevant); state and local codes, ordinances, and zoning requirements; Uniform Physical Condition Standards; Capital Needs Assessments (if applicable); and broadband infrastructure (if applicable).

Rehabilitation Standards will be attached as a separate document.

9. Resale or Recapture Guidelines. Below, the grantee must provide a description of the guidelines that will be used for resale or recapture of HTF funds when used to assist first-time homebuyers. If the grantee will not use HTF funds to assist first-time homebuyers, enter "N/A".

N/A

10. HTF Affordable Homeownership Limits. If the grantee intends to use HTF funds for homebuyer assistance and does not use the HTF affordable homeownership limits for the area provided by HUD, it must determine 95 percent of the median area purchase price and set forth the information in accordance with §93.305. If the grantee will not use HTF funds to assist first-time homebuyers, enter "N/A".

N/A

11. Grantee Limited Beneficiaries or Preferences. Describe how the grantee will limit the beneficiaries or give preferences to a particular segment of the extremely low- or very low-income population to serve unmet needs identified in its consolidated plan or annual action plan. If the grantee will not limit the beneficiaries or give preferences to a particular segment of the extremely low- or very low-income population, enter "N/A."

Any limitation or preference must not violate nondiscrimination requirements in § 93.350, and the grantee must not limit or give preferences to students. The grantee may permit rental housing owners to limit tenants or give a preference in accordance with § 93.303(d)(3) only if such limitation or preference is described in the action plan.

N/A

12. Refinancing of Existing Debt. Enter or attach the grantee's refinancing guidelines below. The guidelines describe the conditions under which the grantee will refinance existing debt. The grantee's refinancing guidelines must, at minimum, demonstrate that rehabilitation is the primary eligible activity and ensure that this requirement is met by establishing a minimum level of rehabilitation per unit or a required ratio between rehabilitation and refinancing. If the grantee will not refinance existing debt, enter "N/A."

N/A

Discussion:

DRAFT

Appendix - Alternate/Local Data Sources

| | |
|---|--|
| 1 | <p>Data Source Name Utah HMIS Data</p> <p>List the name of the organization or individual who originated the data set. State of Utah Division of Housing and Community Development HMIS Data.</p> <p>Provide a brief summary of the data set. Data from HMIS</p> <p>What was the purpose for developing this data set? To complete this table in the Consolidated Plan</p> <p>How comprehensive is the coverage of this administrative data? Is data collection concentrated in one geographic area or among a certain population?</p> <p>What time period (provide the year, and optionally month, or month and day) is covered by this data set?</p> <p>What is the status of the data set (complete, in progress, or planned)?</p> |
| 2 | <p>Data Source Name Utah HCD Research</p> <p>List the name of the organization or individual who originated the data set. Zach Leavitt, Utah Housing and Community Development Division</p> <p>Provide a brief summary of the data set. Data compiled from Census Data and Market research by Zach Leavitt</p> <p>What was the purpose for developing this data set? Specifically to respond to MA-20 of the 2025 Consolidated Plan</p> <p>How comprehensive is the coverage of this administrative data? Is data collection concentrated in one geographic area or among a certain population? Statewide data provided by the Census Bureau and the commercial sources.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>What time period (provide the year, and optionally month, or month and day) is covered by this data set?</p> <p>ACS Five Year Estimates 2023</p> |
| | <p>What is the status of the data set (complete, in progress, or planned)?</p> <p>In progress</p> |

DRAFT