# 2020-2024 UTAH CONSOLIDATED PLAN

The goals policies and plans for the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan period encompassing the Utah HOME, HTF, CDBG, ESG, and HOPWA Programs

**WORKFORCE SERVICES**
**HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

# Contents

# Executive Summary

### 1.    Introduction

This Consolidated Plan has been prepared by the Utah Department of Workforce Services (DWS), Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) 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 2020 through 2024. 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 the seven regional associations of governments and submitted to the state for review.
- ESG and HOPWA funding requests are prioritized for recommendation to the State Homeless Coordinating Committee by 13 Local Homeless Coordinating Committees throughout the state.
- HOME and HTF funding has prioritized the funding of new affordable housing. Funding decisions are made by the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund (OWHLF) Board.

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 objectives are the creation of safe affordable housing and the promoting of sustainable communities throughout Utah. The priorities identified in this plan can be found in section SP-25. 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 has undertaken since its inception.

The Utah Small Cities Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program was intentionally designed to address the regional needs through local control of the funding process. Since the program's inception 37 years ago, regional rating and ranking committees have adopted scoring criteria that have reflected the local needs to ensure that the CDBG funding will be awarded to the projects that will address those needs. These criteria are revised annually to reflect changes in community development

needs.  Utah is consistently ranked as one of the top five states in the country for timely expenditure of their CDBG funds.

The Homelessness Programs Office (HPO) reviewed Annual Action Plans and the Consolidated Annual Performance Reports (CAPERs) submitted to HUD under the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan for evaluation of ESG and HOPWA past performance. The CAPERs provide an evaluation of past performance and indicate accomplishments in relation to established goals and priorities. Utah's Annual Action plans and CAPERs can be found at: https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/consolidated-plan/con-plans-aaps-capers/.

In SFY 2019, ESG was distributed to 13 agencies for 18 projects throughout Utah to provide services aligned with the HUD definition of allowable activities.
- Rapid Re-Housing (RRH) - 482 individuals
- Emergency Shelter - 1,629 individuals (half the projects started in the third quarter because funding year goes from July to June)
- Street Outreach - 1,546 individuals
- Homeless Prevention, including Diversion - 384 individuals
- Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) administration and staffing at HCD
These numbers have not been de-duplicated.

In FY20, 17 agencies were awarded ESG funding through the HCD Homelessness Funding allocation process. Data for the number of clients served will be available in the fall of 2020.

The HOME and HTF programs have been committed to funding new affordable housing. In the last five years HCD has seen an increased emphasis on Transit Oriented Development as many housing projects have been constructed along transit lines. HCD has also invested in a separate Transit Oriented Development Fund in an effort to further this effort. HCD plays a critical role often providing gap funding for projects receiving LIHTC funds and leveraging the HUD funding with other state, municipal, and private funding sources.

## 4.      Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

HCD has gone to great lengths to ensure broad citizen participation and extensive consultation with community partners.

In regards to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program sections of this plan, the state consulted directly with the seven regional associations of governments (AOG's).  CDBG funding was provided to each of the AOG's to consult with the towns, cities and counties to prepare a regional community development and housing needs assessment. Public hearings were held in each region to review the plans prior to submitting to the state for incorporation into the final state Consolidated Plan.

In 2019, DWS-HCD partnered with the University of Utah to conduct 14 focus groups across the State of Utah.  A total of 170 individuals representing nonprofit organizations, government, citizens and other

stakeholders' participated in focus groups. Specifically, focus groups were organized with 12 out of 13 Local Homeless Coordinating Committees (LHCC), and these groups consisted of individuals representing homeless service providers, government leaders and other key stakeholders within their jurisdiction. Additional focus groups were held with the leadership of the three Continua of Care (CoC) in Utah (Salt Lake County, Mountainland, and Balance of State) and with frontline employees of homeless services in Salt Lake County. This effort informed the Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness and was adopted by the State Homeless Coordinating Committee in September 2019 (https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/homelessness/shcc/documents/homelessnessstrategicplan.pdf)

As housing affordability becomes a greater public issue, the Utah Legislature has tasked the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund with studying housing affordability issues. The resulting 2019 Report on Affordable Housing has shown the great need for affordable housing for low income Utahns. In the process of creating this report involved extensive outreach to community partners and members of the public.

In regards to the citizen participation process for this 2020-2024 Utah Consolidated Plan, HCD posted a notice on the State Public Notice Website: https://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html. This notice gave the public and partners access to a copy of this plan and informed them of the time for the public hearing regarding the plan.

# The Process

## PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies

**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 | Housing and Community Development Division |
| HOPWA Administrator | UTAH | Housing and Community Development Division |
| HOME Administrator | UTAH | Housing and Community Development Division |
| ESG Administrator | UTAH | Housing and Community Development Division |
| HTF Administrator | UTAH | Housing and Community Development Division |

**Table 1 – Responsible Agencies**

**Narrative**

The Utah Department of Workforce Services-Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) is the agency responsible for the CDBG, ESG, HOME, HTF, and HOPWA Programs.

**Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information**

The HCD staff member responsible for receiving public comment regarding the 2020-2024 Utah Consolidated Plan is Elias Wise. He can be reached at 801-468-0140 or by email at ewise@utah.gov

# PR-10 Consultation

## 1.    Introduction

The State CDBG program staff met with the representatives of the seven regional associations of governments on November 18, 2019.  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 efforts in Utah are coordinated by the State Homeless Coordinating Committee (SHCC) to ensure housing and health service agencies are partners in addressing homelessness throughout the state. The Utah Department of Workforce Services, Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) is lead staffing agency supporting the SHCC.

**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**

The HOME and HTF programs are coordinated by the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund Board (OWHLF) to provide safe, decent, and affordable housing in the state of Utah. The Utah Department of Workforce Services, Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) is lead staffing agency supporting the OWHLF.

- OWHLF is chaired by the Director of the Housing and Community Development Division 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 OWHLF 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.

Homeless efforts in Utah are coordinated by the State Homeless Coordinating Committee (SHCC) to ensure housing and health service agencies are partners in addressing homelessness throughout the

state. The Utah Department of Workforce Services, Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) is lead staffing agency supporting the SHCC.

- SHCC is chaired by the Lt. Governor and is comprised of voting members representing the Department of Workforce Services, Housing and Community Development, Department of Human Services, Utah State Board of Education, Utah Housing Corporation, Department of Health, Department of Corrections, Governor's Office of Management and Budget, as well as Mayors from Midvale, Ogden, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, South Salt Lake and St. George. SHCC Advisory members include individuals from private for-profit business, non-profit organizations, homeless service providers, Veterans Administration, community advocates, and representatives from Utah's three Continuum of Care (CoC) areas.
- SHCC oversees the Homelessness Program Funding (HPF) allocation and processes for state ESG, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) for homelessness, state appropriated Pamela Atkinson Homeless Trust funds, Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA) and the Homeless to Housing Restricted account.
- HPF is coordinated through one competitive grant process, reviewed by the Allocation Committee, a sub-committee of SHCC.
- Recommendations for prioritization and funding are coordinated on a local level and are presented before the SHCC for approval.

**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 Continua of Care (CoC) through the State Homeless Coordinating Committee (SHCC).

The Utah CoCs are further divided geographically and consist of 13 Local Homeless Coordinating Committees (LHCCs). To enhance homeless services coordination, LHCC boards 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 Continua of Care (CoC) 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/housing/homelessness/shcc/documents/homelessnessstrategicplan.pdf The Strategic Plan is a five-year plan that was adopted by the SHCC in September 2019. 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 LHCC 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. HCD supports the CoC funding priorities and administers a single statewide instance of the statewide Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). Additionally, the State's partnership with the CoCs provides AdHoc, on-going and quarterly training opportunities to enhance the response of service providers addressing the needs of all those experiencing or at risk of experiencing homelessness.

HCD staff are assigned to support a specific LHCC within CoCs, by attending monthly LHCC meetings, allocation committees, data collection efforts, providing monitoring and technical assistance in order for funded projects to be successful.  With LHCC participation in the SHCC Allocation Committee prioritization process for HCD Homelessness Funding, the state coordinates the prioritization of funding for projects that meet the unique needs of: families with children, transitional-aged youth, single men or single women, veterans, victims 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 SHCC also specifically prioritizes the needs of homeless families with children through HCD Homelessness and CoC funding, emphasizing the use of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). Ending veteran homelessness continues to be an area of focus in Utah. The SHCC, HCD, CoCs, and The Veterans Administration are committed to implementing structural supports to more rapidly identify and connect veterans to services. The State continues to support youth specific homeless resource centers and projects throughout the state. In coordination with the CoCs the State is actively working to remove barriers that prevent these youth from accessing needed services.

**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**

Consultation and coordination for allocation of funding and development of performance standards takes place with the CoCs through the State Homeless Coordinating Committee (SHCC), the Local Homeless Coordinating Committees (LHCC), and Utah Homeless Network (UHN). UHN includes:

- Department of Workforce Services, Housing and Community Development Staff
- HUD Collaborative Applicant Staff
    - o Balance of State CoC
    - o Mountainland CoC
    - o Salt Lake CoC
- Bear River LHCC Chair

- Carbon/Emery LHCC Chair
- Davis LHCC Chair
- Grand LHCC Chair
- Iron LHCC Chair
- Mountainland LHCC Chair
- Salt Lake LHCC Chair
- San Juan LHCC Chair
- Six County LHCC Chair
- Tooele LHCC Chair
- Uintah LHCC Chair
- Washington LHCC Chair
- Weber LHCC Chair

Through the SHCC, Utah evaluates progress annually and works collaboratively with the LHCCs to develop performance improvement plans. The LHCCs are the designated local oversight bodies that are responsible to:

1) Develop a common agenda and vision for reducing homelessness in their respective regions;

2) Develop a spending plan that coordinates the funding supplied to local stakeholders;

3) Monitor the progress toward achieving state and local goals; and

4) Align local funding to projects that are improving outcomes and targeting specific needs in the community.

**Allocation Process for ESG and Homelessness Programs Funding:**
- State ESG funds are administered by the Utah Department of Workforce Services, Housing and Community Development Division (HCD). Funds are allocated through the HCD Homelessness Programs Funding (HPF) process.
- The HPF is one competitive grant process that includes ESG, HOPWA, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) for homelessness, state general fund in the Pamela Atkinson Homeless Trust Funds (PAHTF), and state appropriated funding through the Homeless to Housing Restricted account. These funds are, with few exceptions, dedicated to those who are literally homeless as defined by HUD.
- Funding priorities and allocation recommendations are determined through local prioritization processes which take into consideration project performance standards and outcomes.
- LHCC funding recommendations are presented to the Allocation Committee, a sub-committee of SHCC. The Allocation Committee includes representatives from the SHCC voting members or their designees as well as representatives from the CoC.

**Performance Standards and Evaluation of Outcomes:**
Funding allocations are prioritized for project services and interventions that focus on making episodes of homelessness rare, brief, and nonrecurring. Performance standards and evaluation of outcomes take place in the funding allocation process. These standards were developed in consultation with the CoCs through a strategic planning process in 2019. All funded projects

have contract performance measures specific to the project type and expected outcomes related to the key system measurements of progress in alignment with The State of Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness are to:

- Reduce the number of first-time individuals who experience homelessness
- Reduce days spent in emergency beds or shelters
- Reduce the number of individuals who return to homelessness, and
- Increase the number of individuals who are placed in, or retain permanent housing

Reports may also be crafted to isolate funding sources, such as ESG, and all ESG and CoC leads are given access to HMIS where this data is stored. CoCs have also teamed up with the ESG State agency to participate in monitoring efforts of all ESG recipients within their respective geographic area.

**Administration and Funding of HMIS:**
Utah HCD is the designated HMIS lead agency for all three Utah CoCs, creating a statewide HMIS system. This statewide HMIS is funded through a joint effort between the CoC's and the State of Utah, utilizing CoC funds secured through the CoC Program Competition and state funding. State staff working as the HMIS lead agency coordinate and collaborate regularly with CoC collaborative applicants, executive committees, and representatives on the HMIS steering committee to ensure the system is meeting the needs of the continua.

**HMIS Policies and Procedures:**

The CoCs are responsible for HMIS project oversight and implementation, which encompasses planning, administration, software selection, managing of HMIS data compliance with HMIS standards, and reviewing and approving all policies, procedures and data management plans governing Contributing HMIS Organizations (CHOs). The CoCs oversight and governance responsibilities are carried out by its Steering Committee, which includes representation from all three CoCs in the state as well as representation from ESG administrators, Runaway Homeless Youth (RHY) provider, HOPWA funders, PATH funders, Utah Domestic Violence Coalition, Veterans Administration, local providers and leaders, individuals with lived experience and the HCD Lead Agency HMIS staff. The steering committee develops, reviews and updates all HMIS policies and procedures.

**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 (BRAG) |
|---|---|---|
| | **Agency/Group/Organization Type** | Regional organization<br>Planning organization |
| | **What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?** | Housing Need Assessment<br>Market Analysis<br>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 Governments |
| | **Agency/Group/Organization Type** | Regional organization<br>Planning organization |
| | **What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?** | Housing Need Assessment<br>Market Analysis<br>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 Six 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 Governments (SEUALG) |
| | **Agency/Group/Organization Type** | Regional organization<br>Planning organization |
| | **What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?** | Housing Need Assessment<br>Market Analysis<br>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 (UBAOG) |
|---|---|---|
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Regional organization<br>Planning organization |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment<br>Market Analysis<br>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<br>Planning organization |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment<br>Market Analysis<br>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 Five-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 (MAG) |
| | Agency/Group/Organization Type | Regional organization<br>Planning organization |
| | What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? | Housing Need Assessment<br>Market Analysis<br>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 (WFRC) |
|---|---|---|
| | **Agency/Group/Organization Type** | Regional organization<br>Planning organization |
| | **What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?** | Housing Need Assessment<br>Market Analysis<br>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. |

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

HCD has consulted with all important partners. The State CDBG program has elected to limit public service activities to transportation and meals-on-wheels type vehicles that serve the elderly and disabled populations in the non-entitlement areas of the state. Therefore, the state did not consult directly with any social services agencies that serve persons with disabilities, or HIV/AIDS and homeless persons

**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 | State Homelessness Coordinating Committee | State Homelessness Coordinating Committee is the body in charge of leading the planning and administering of Utah Homeless efforts. This 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. |
| 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. |

| Name of Plan | Lead Organization | How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan? |
|---|---|---|
| 6-County 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. |
| 5-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 | State Homelessness Coordinating Committee | State Homelessness Coordinating Committee 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. |

**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**

The State of Utah made an effort to advertise the 2020 Consolidated Plan during the public comment period to all relevant parties including units of local government. The State CDBG program has elected to limit public service activities to transportation and meals-on-wheels type vehicles that serve the elderly and disabled populations in the non-entitlement areas of the state.

In 2019, DWS-HCD partnered with the University of Utah to conduct 14 focus groups across the State of Utah.  A total of 170 individuals representing nonprofit organizations, government, citizens and other stakeholders' participated in focus groups. Specifically, focus groups were organized with 12 out of 13 Local Homeless Coordinating Committees (LHCC), and these groups consisted of individuals representing homeless service providers, government leaders and other key stakeholders within their jurisdiction. Additional focus groups were held with the leadership of the three Continua of Care (CoC) in Utah (Salt Lake County, Mountainland, and Balance of State) and with frontline employees of homeless services in Salt Lake County. This effort informed the Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness and was adopted by the State Homeless Coordinating Committee in September 2019 (https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/homelessness/shcc/documents/homelessnessstrategicplan.pdf)

## PR-15 Citizen Participation

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

HCD has engaged the public in many forms as part of the process of creating this plan. The CDBG program requires each AOG they work through to create their own Consolidated Plan. Each AOG is required to involve the public. This is done through community outreach as the AOG staff and HCD staff do how-to-apply workshops throughout the state. Also each AOG is required to have a public comment period and public hearing. The ESG and HOPWA programs are constantly coordinating with the COCs, nonprofit organizations and other partners in working together within the framework established by the State Homelessness Coordinating Committee. In this process they are very connected to the front line service agencies working with homeless populations. The homeless effort is a very public issue in Utah and citizens have been participating in making their views known every step of the way.

The vast majority of the communities served by the CDBG Small Cities CDBG program live in very rural areas that are predominately white.  There are few communities that have concentrations of minorities. Most of the non-English speaking persons are Hispanic. Activities to address the CDBG Slum & Blight national objective are not a priority in the CDBG program, and so citizens residing in those areas were not specifically invited to participate in the development of this plan.

In 2019, DWS-HCD partnered with the University of Utah to conduct 14 focus groups across the State of Utah.  A total of 170 individuals representing nonprofit organizations, government, citizens and other stakeholders' participated in focus groups. Specifically, focus groups were organized with 12 out of 13 Local Homeless Coordinating Committees (LHCC), and these groups consisted of individuals representing homeless service providers, government leaders and other key stakeholders within their jurisdiction. Additional focus groups were held with the leadership of the three Continua of Care (CoC) in Utah (Salt Lake County, Mountainland, and Balance of State) and with frontline employees of homeless services in Salt Lake County. This effort informed the Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness and was adopted by the State Homeless Coordinating Committee in September 2019 (https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/homelessness/shcc/documents/homelessnessstrategicplan.pdf)

# Needs Assessment

## NA-05 Overview

**Needs Assessment Overview**

The legislatively mandated Affordable Housing
Report: https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/reports/documents/affordablehousingreport.pdf is a well-researched broad investigation of affordability issues in Utah and highlights the great need for affordable housing units at low, very low, and extremely low income levels. The county by county level data can be found in:
https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/reports/documents/affordablehousinggapcounty20.pdf

The State of Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness provides an in depth analysis of the extent of needs for homeless resources and provides a plan for addressing those needs
(https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/homelessness/shcc/documents/homelessnessstrategicplan.pdf).

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

# NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment

## Summary of Housing Needs

| Demographics | Base Year:  2009 | Most Recent Year:  2015 | % Change |
|---|---|---|---|
| Population | 2,763,885 | 2,903,379 | 5% |
| Households | 831,563 | 906,292 | 9% |
| Median Income | $55,642.00 | $60,727.00 | 9% |

**Table 4 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics**

**Data Source:** 2005-2009 ACS (Base Year), 2011-2015 ACS (Most Recent Year)

## Number of Households Table

| | 0-30% HAMFI | >30-50% HAMFI | >50-80% HAMFI | >80-100% HAMFI | >100% HAMFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Households | 98,575 | 103,385 | 171,695 | 109,700 | 422,940 |
| Small Family Households | 34,330 | 36,960 | 67,095 | 47,080 | 212,605 |
| Large Family Households | 11,315 | 16,175 | 34,405 | 24,295 | 82,370 |
| Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age | 15,050 | 16,500 | 27,795 | 17,865 | 78,855 |
| Household contains at least one person age 75 or older | 11,360 | 16,755 | 19,510 | 8,990 | 25,840 |
| Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger | 23,275 | 26,630 | 49,990 | 31,205 | 70,505 |

**Table 5 - Total Households Table**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 CHAS

**Housing Needs Summary Tables**

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

| | 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities | 1,585 | 1,185 | 875 | 255 | 3,900 | 470 | 240 | 315 | 200 | 1,225 |
| Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing) | 1,280 | 910 | 660 | 195 | 3,045 | 190 | 460 | 570 | 155 | 1,375 |
| Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems) | 4,535 | 3,565 | 3,970 | 1,585 | 13,655 | 945 | 1,970 | 3,040 | 1,700 | 7,655 |
| Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems) | 36,760 | 11,190 | 1,840 | 215 | 50,005 | 18,840 | 13,190 | 9,230 | 2,195 | 43,455 |

| | 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) | 6,900 | 24,985 | 19,980 | 2,880 | 54,745 | 5,435 | 12,635 | 33,760 | 16,015 | 67,845 |
| Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems) | 5,025 | -0 | 0 | 0 | 5,025 | 3,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,300 |

**Table 6 – Housing Problems Table**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 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 | 44,160 | 16,855 | 7,350 | 2,245 | 70,610 | 20,445 | 15,860 | 13,155 | 4,250 | 53,710 |
| Having none of four housing problems | 14,905 | 36,645 | 58,280 | 27,995 | 137,825 | 10,740 | 34,025 | 92,905 | 75,205 | 212,875 |

|  | 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 |
| Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems | 5,025 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,025 | 3,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,300 |

**Table 7 – Housing Problems 2**

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 | 21,135 | 18,970 | 8,885 | 48,990 | 7,225 | 8,780 | 18,790 | 34,795 |
| Large Related | 6,655 | 5,475 | 4,020 | 16,150 | 3,330 | 6,100 | 10,835 | 20,265 |
| Elderly | 6,615 | 4,815 | 2,980 | 14,410 | 9,795 | 8,885 | 8,225 | 26,905 |
| Other | 15,650 | 10,540 | 7,525 | 33,715 | 5,020 | 3,405 | 6,440 | 14,865 |
| Total need by income | 50,055 | 39,800 | 23,410 | 113,265 | 25,370 | 27,170 | 44,290 | 96,830 |

**Table 8 – Cost Burden > 30%**

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 | 18,370 | 5,105 | 435 | 23,910 | 5,980 | 4,745 | 3,575 | 14,300 |

| | Renter | | | | Owner | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | Total |
| Large Related | 5,110 | 1,315 | 150 | 6,575 | 2,985 | 2,665 | 1,555 | 7,205 |
| Elderly | 4,980 | 2,055 | 835 | 7,870 | 6,660 | 4,245 | 2,575 | 13,480 |
| Other | 13,075 | 3,535 | 725 | 17,335 | 4,090 | 1,990 | 1,605 | 7,685 |
| Total need by income | 41,535 | 12,010 | 2,145 | 55,690 | 19,715 | 13,645 | 9,310 | 42,670 |

**Table 9 – Cost Burden > 50%**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 CHAS

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 | 5,180 | 3,800 | 3,785 | 1,505 | 14,270 | 1,020 | 1,910 | 2,780 | 1,500 | 7,210 |
| Multiple, unrelated family households | 385 | 250 | 635 | 220 | 1,490 | 145 | 525 | 845 | 360 | 1,875 |
| Other, non-family households | 270 | 465 | 265 | 55 | 1,055 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 30 | 49 |
| Total need by income | 5,835 | 4,515 | 4,685 | 1,780 | 16,815 | 1,165 | 2,439 | 3,640 | 1,890 | 9,134 |

**Table 10 – Crowding Information – 1/2**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 CHAS

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

Utah does not have an accurate count of single person households. Many of these households are students or young adults with unique housing situations who may or may not be in the workforce. This population also includes recently incarcerated, separated, youth aging out of foster care and other populations which are at a higher risk of poverty and more likely to be experiencing housing insecurity. According to information on the table regarding crowding, there is a large population of single person households that are experiencing overcrowding. Recent upheavals in the service industry and other

industries impacted by the economic restriction enacted in response to Covid-19 have likely had a disproportionate impact on young single adult single person households. HCD has seen many market studies undertaken by multifamily developers which demonstrate a strong need for SRO units targeting this single individual household population.

**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:  On the night of the 2019 Point in Time Count, 622 individuals in Utah, 266 of which were minors, reported being homeless because they were currently fleeing some form of domestic violence. 56 of those individuals were staying in a place not meant for human habitation. In 2018, Utah's Domestic Violence (DV) Coalition Hotline received over 50,000 calls from victims needing assistance, and that number could easily double with the current health crisis this nation is facing.  In 2018 the state had 15 domestic violence service providers, whose combined bed count was 578 which was typically always at capacity.

There is a delay in housing victims 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. Moving DV clients from shelter to housing is also exacerbated by average length of stay in shelter being well above the average benchmark of 20 days or less in  emergency shelter stay benchmark set in the Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness due to the need for intense, focused case management services needed to stabilize clients. DWS-HCD Homelessness Funding is utilized for Transitional Housing projects serving victims of domestic violence.

Disabilities: Estimates from the 2014-2018 American Community Survey indicate that 6.8% of the population is living with a diagnosed disability, however According to the Public Health Indicator Based Information system, 17.9% of all Utahns have a form of limited activity. Persons whose activities are limited due to physical, mental, or emotional problems may need more specialized health care than persons without such limitation. Their medical costs are generally higher and they are more likely to miss days from school or work. The elderly population is most affected by disability with 16.5% of residents over the age of 65 experiencing at least one disability.

**What are the most common housing problems?**

An important factor in maintaining housing stability is access to affordable housing. When affordable housing is not available, family stability is affected. Housing is affordable when families pay less than 30 percent of their income to housing. When families pay more than that, they are considered cost burdened and likely experiencing difficulties meeting other basic needs such as food, clothing, transportation or medical care. Additionally, families that are cost burdened face instability, which may be reflected in frequent moves and in some cases, homelessness. The challenges confronting families who are cost burdened by housing has generated concern in Utah, which is experiencing a shortage of

40,000 affordable housing units throughout the state. Any efforts to address this shortage will not only benefit those living in poverty but those families on the brink of poverty.

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 crept upward at a rate of 1.03% per year in 2017 constant dollars.

Agencies providing housing assistance are limited in their scope due to the HUD assistance limits set by the Fair Market Rent identification for areas in Utah are so low that it makes it exponentially difficult to find applicable units to place clients in.

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

Housing problems, including cost burden, are more likely to affect households earning 0 to 50% of the area median income (AMI). Households within this income 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 groups, 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, obtain additional education, access good childcare and even impact such basic needs 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. 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**

Three in ten persons that are low-income Utahans pay over half their income for rent or are homeless. Most don't receive federal rental assistance due to limited funding (State of Utah Affordable Housing Report, https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/reports/documents/affordablehousingreport.pdf). Across Utah, there is a shortage of rental homes affordable and available to extremely low income households (ELI), 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 other necessities like healthy food and healthcare to pay the rent, and to experience unstable housing situations like evictions.

Needs for those experiencing imminent risk or termination of assistance:

- Homeless prevention funding

- Rental assistance

- Affordable housing

- Case management

- Access to mainstream benefits

Characteristics that influence housing insecurity

- Food insecurity, prioritize food over housing

- Criminal activity

- Substance use disorders

- Physical and mental health disorders

- Low education level

Homeless prevention funding, rental assistance and long-term subsidies are critical supports for low-income individuals and families who are at imminent risk of becoming homeless.

Formerly homeless families and individuals who are receiving Rapid Re-Housing assistance that are nearing the termination of that assistance need appropriate and flexible supportive services including connections to case managers. Through focus groups conducted statewide for the Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness, the shortage of case managers was identified as a critical gap. Many agencies providing housing assistance have partnered with DWS and mental health providers who can continue case management activities after housing assistance ends

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 and 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:**

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 crept upward at a rate of 1.03% per year in 2017 constant dollars. Now, more than 183,000 low-income Utah households pay more than half their income for rent, becoming more likely to be evicted and moving closer to homelessness (State of Utah Affordable Housing Report).

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 2017, the Utah Legislature amended the Intergenerational Poverty Mitigation Act ("Act") to include evaluation of the intersection between child homelessness and intergenerational poverty. This modification recognizes the research indicating the impact homelessness has on child development and academic outcomes. This issue has gained particular importance in Utah where there are increasing concerns regarding the growing homeless population, including homeless children. As is the case with intergenerational poverty, homelessness is often intergenerational and ending it requires more than a place to sleep just as ending intergenerational poverty requires more than financial resources. In Utah, there is an increasing need to understand the full impact of homelessness. Among states, Utah is ranked 11th nationally in identifying homeless students.

In 2018, the federal poverty guideline amount for a family of three, the average size intergenerational poverty family, was $20,780. This amount is insufficient to meet the basic needs of a family this size, which is $61,360.  The gap between these amounts, approximately $41,000, is partially closed through receipt of public assistance, but even those resources decrease the gap by only $19,500 per year. The ability to obtain employment that offers a wage to make up the remaining $21,500 is a challenge for families within the intergenerational poverty population.

Additional research shows that there are foundational challenges remaining for children experiencing intergenerational poverty. These challenges include increased exposure to toxic stress and trauma beginning in early childhood. This increased 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 intergenerational poverty have higher levels of engagement in the juvenile justice system and higher rates of health challenges. In addition to the role that trauma and toxic stress play in keeping individuals in poverty, the other significant foundational challenges identified in the research are ongoing struggles with educational outcomes and low levels of educational attainment. Given the role of education in providing a springboard to financial stability, these challenges need to be addressed for Utah to reduce its rate of families experiencing intergenerational poverty.

The federal plan recognizes that "the people who experience homelessness are diverse—in their experiences, in their challenges, in their household compositions, in their ages, and in many other ways—and we must tailor and target our strategies and actions to reflect that diversity" (Home, Together, p. 6). The plan also outlines a process where "federal partners will continue to work with communities, and provide tools and information that will enable them to set their own ambitious goals, tailored to their local conditions, and grounded in their local data" (Home, Together, p. 6). A strong emphasis in the Utah State plan is to let LHCCs that have the best grasp of local variations in homeless populations and their needs, be given the authority, resources and responsibility for prioritizing needs and tailoring effective responses to meeting the local priorities. This push for local resourcing and local control is a direct response to the current diversity of homeless populations in Utah as well as variations in local resources and needs.

**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. Rents and house prices have increased because many national, state, and local governments have retrenched from social policies or pursued austerity, reducing funding for affordable housing.

# NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems

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

**Introduction**

**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 | 76,962 | 13,393 | 8,333 |
| White | 53,935 | 11,052 | 5,937 |
| Black / African American | 1,633 | 39 | 199 |
| Asian | 2,115 | 255 | 636 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 1,714 | 342 | 137 |
| Pacific Islander | 912 | 50 | 69 |
| Hispanic | 15,425 | 1,387 | 1,158 |

**Table 11 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 70,388 | 33,012 |
| White | 49,879 | 27,343 |
| Black / African American | 1,488 | 312 |
| Asian | 1,506 | 748 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 899 | 412 |
| Pacific Islander | 687 | 129 |
| Hispanic | 14,725 | 3,820 |

**Table 12 - Disproportionately Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

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

## 50%-80% of Area Median Income

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems |
|---|---|---|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 74,230 | 97,456 |
| White | 59,580 | 81,043 |
| Black / African American | 671 | 772 |
| Asian | 1,300 | 1,427 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 671 | 937 |
| Pacific Islander | 654 | 505 |
| Hispanic | 10,408 | 11,853 |

**Table 13 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 CHAS

## 80%-100% of Area Median Income

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems |
|---|---|---|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 25,457 | 84,284 |
| White | 21,261 | 71,608 |
| Black / African American | 179 | 579 |
| Asian | 548 | 1,320 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 251 | 499 |
| Pacific Islander | 296 | 417 |
| Hispanic | 2,690 | 8,873 |

**Table 14 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 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%

# NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems

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

## 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 | 64,663 | 25,693 | 8,333 |
| White | 44,665 | 20,294 | 5,937 |
| Black / African American | 1,460 | 221 | 199 |
| Asian | 1,907 | 467 | 636 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 1,393 | 644 | 137 |
| Pacific Islander | 897 | 64 | 69 |
| Hispanic | 13,282 | 3,519 | 1,158 |

**Table 15 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 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 | 32,781 | 70,591 | 0 |
| White | 22,578 | 54,635 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 774 | 1,021 | 0 |
| Asian | 616 | 1,624 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 477 | 833 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 338 | 471 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 7,367 | 11,167 | 0 |

**Table 16 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 CHAS

 *The four severe housing problems are:

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

## 50%-80% of Area Median Income

| 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 | 20,484 | 151,186 | 0 |
| White | 15,050 | 125,470 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 98 | 1,337 | 0 |
| Asian | 499 | 2,216 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 198 | 1,403 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 269 | 890 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 4,121 | 18,148 | 0 |

**Table 17 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:
1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4.Cost Burden over 50%

## 80%-100% of Area Median Income

| 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 | 6,473 | 103,188 | 0 |
| White | 4,815 | 88,025 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 55 | 704 | 0 |
| Asian | 166 | 1,722 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 181 | 569 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 142 | 567 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 1,089 | 10,476 | 0 |

**Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 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%

## NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens

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

**Housing Cost Burden**

| Housing Cost Burden | <=30% | 30-50% | >50% | No / negative income (not computed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 642,014 | 152,188 | 103,263 | 8,919 |
| White | 558,149 | 121,110 | 77,329 | 6,257 |
| Black / African American | 4,476 | 1,792 | 2,034 | 219 |
| Asian | 12,215 | 2,696 | 2,616 | 711 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 4,466 | 1,492 | 1,487 | 186 |
| Pacific Islander | 3,166 | 1,308 | 1,007 | 69 |
| Hispanic | 53,325 | 21,669 | 17,062 | 1,287 |

**Table 19 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 CHAS

## NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion

**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, there is a great need for affordable housing regardless of racial or ethnic makeup. However there are populations that have a greater need than the population as a whole. These are primarily populations that do not have a strong community, institutional knowledge, or an understanding of community resources or the means to access them. One population that has disproportionate need in the population of native Americans which exist in a number of regions but which are concentrated in the Navajo nation based in the southeast corner of Utah and the Uintah and Ouray population located in the Uintah Basin in eastern Utah. However Utah is restricted from operating in within in Navajo reservation due to their receiving direct CPD funds and operating their own programs and operating within the Ouray or Uintah Reservations is difficult due to complicated tribal policies and restrictions on private ownership of property. The other large minority population in Utah is the population of Hispanic persons. The challenges experiences by this population's relative poverty are exacerbated by limited knowledge of English and of American institutions. This is also true of refugee populations whose issues are further complicated by having smaller communities and an even greater limitation in connections within the workforce.

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

N/A

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

The Hispanic population of Utah is widely dispersed and is found within most communities and neighborhoods. However, it is found in large concentrations on the north and west side of Salt Lake Valley. The refugee population in Utah is diverse and has settled in a variety of locations primarily in and around Salt Lake City

## NA-35 Public Housing

### Introduction

There are only three public housing authorities in the non-entitlement areas that operate public housing units: Beaver City (18 units), Carbon County (121 units), and Tooele County (22 units). The CDBG program has funded rehabilitation activities for two of these housing authorities. The Tooele County Housing Authority has received CDBG assistance for their homeless prevention and home-buyer assistance programs.

Some housing agencies make an effort to submit for HCD to certify that their efforts are consistent with the State Consolidated Plan. One agency that has been diligent to maintaining this certification is the Roosevelt Housing Agency located in Roosevelt Utah. Upon creation of this plan HCD was required to link a housing agency to this plan. Despite this limited interaction between the Roosevelt Housing Agency and HCD the Roosevelt Housing Agency was identified as being linking to this plan.

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

HCD has limited interactions with housing agencies. HCD has not compiled a list of housing needs at the many housing agencies located throughout the state. Therefore, we cannot accurately comment on the need for Section 504 accessible units. HCD through its OWHLF board has encouraged the construction of ADA units through its rating and ranking process. Market assessments submitted by multi-family housing project applicants indicate a large and ongoing need for additional section 504 ADA units.

### 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?

Housing Agencies within the major population centers of Utah have large wait lists for public housing units and section 8 or housing choice vouchers. These wait lists are more severe for large families in need of units with many bedrooms.

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

The needs of the public housing agencies reflect the needs of the low income population at large.

## NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment

**Introduction:**

The State Homeless Coordinating Committee (SHCC) acts as the lead convener and facilitator of all homeless services in Utah, the SHCC outlines overarching policies and planning for the state including implementing the State of Utah Strategic Plan on Making Homelessness Rare, Brief, and Non-Recurring. The SHCC then directs leadership of all three Utah Continuums of Care (CoC) and Utah's thirteen Local Homeless Coordinating Committees (LHCC) to enact effective policies and procedures statewide.

The State of Utah Department of Workforce Services Homlessness Programs Office contracts with each CoC and acts as a centralized administrator of HMIS. All service agencies in the State are under a uniform data standard for HUD reporting and local ESG funders. All ESG funded organizations participate in HMIS.

Homelessness data is utilized to assess local needs through coordination with the CoCs and LHCCs.

As of January 2018, Utah had an estimated 2,876 experiencing homelessness on any given day, as reported by Continuums of Care to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Of that total, 287 were family households, 239 were Veterans, 191 were unaccompanied young adults (aged 18-24), and 306 were individuals experiencing chronic homelessness. Public school data reported to the U.S. Department of Education during the 2017-2018 school year shows that an estimated 13,838 public school students experienced homelessness over the course of the year. Of that total, 84.6% were doubled up, 3.4% were staying in hotels or motels, 7% were in emergency shelter, 5.1% were in unsheltered situations.

According to the 2019 Point-In-Time Count:
- .09% of Utah's total population is homeless
- 31% of Utah's homeless population live in family groups of parents and children
- 8% of Utah's homeless population are unaccompanied youth under the age 24
- 22% of Utah's homeless population are fleeing domestic violence.
- 18% of Utah's homeless population is experiencing "chronic" homelessness
- 78% 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) | 3 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Persons in Households with Only Children | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Persons in Households with Only Adults | 90 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chronically Homeless Individuals | 21 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chronically Homeless Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veterans | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unaccompanied Child | 9 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Persons with HIV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Table 20 - Homeless Needs Assessment**

Data Source State
HMIS Data
Comments:

**Homeless Needs Assessment:**
While some data is available for the Homeless Needs Assessment and Rural Homeless Needs Assessment tables, data regarding columns 'Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year', 'Estimate the # becoming homeless each year', 'Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year', and '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 each category, and is presented below:

Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year: 12,856
> This number was found by summarizing the Federal Fiscal Year 2019 (FFY19) SPM submission for Measure 5.1, Universe: Person with entries into ES, SH or TH during the reporting period for Utah's three CoCs.

Estimate the # becoming homeless each year: 7,459
> This number was found by summarizing the FFY19 SPM submission for Measure 5.1, Of persons above, count those who did not have entries in ES, SH, TH or PH in the previous 24 months. (i.e. Number of persons experiencing homelessness for the first time) for Utah's three CoCs

Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year: 3,591
> This number was found by manipulating the FFY19 SPM submission for Measure 2, The Extent to which Persons who Exit Homelessness to Permanent Housing Destinations Return to Homelessness for Utah's three CoCs. The total persons who exited to permanent destinations was found for the State. The total returns to homelessness over two years was also found for the State. The two numbers were then subtracted from each other to find the reported number. The calculation used the same methodology used for the State of Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness.

Estimate the # of days person's experience homelessness: 77.46
> This number was found by manipulating the FFY19 SPM submission for Measure 1.1 a, Change in the average and median length of time persons are homeless in ES and SH projects, This measure is of the client's entry, exit, and bed night dates strictly as entered in the HMIS system. The calculation used the same methodology used for the State of Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness.

**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) | 3 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Persons in Households with Only Adults | 90 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chronically Homeless Individuals | 21 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chronically Homeless Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veterans | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unaccompanied Youth | 9 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Persons with HIV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Table 21 - Homeless Needs Assessment**

**Data Source Comments:** Information regarding homelessness numbers in rural areas is not available

The same methodology was used to estimate the Rural Homeless Needs Assessment as was used to estimate the Homeless Needs Assessment, but with Urban Counties (Weber, Davis, Salt Lake, and Utah Counties) removed from the overall estimation.

Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year: 4,279

Estimate the # becoming homeless each year: 2,793

Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year: 2,186

Estimate the # of days person's experience homelessness: 95.63

**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:**

On the night of the 2019 Point in Time Count (PIT), 360 individuals or 13% of the individuals experiencing homelessness in Utah were in rural counties. Rural counties accounted for 18% of Utah's individuals in households of adults and children, 20% of individuals in households of only children, and 11% of individuals in households of only adults. The 2019 PIT count does reveal that chronic homelessness, veteran homelessness, and homelessness among individuals with HIV/AIDS 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.

**Nature and Extent of Homelessness: (Optional)**

| Race: | Sheltered: | Unsheltered (optional) |
|---|---|---|
| White | 1,817 | 342 |
| Black or African American | 255 | 21 |
| Asian | 39 | 2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 105 | 26 |
| Pacific Islander | 74 | 3 |
| **Ethnicity:** | **Sheltered:** | **Unsheltered (optional)** |
| Hispanic | 546 | 62 |
| Not Hispanic | 1,844 | 346 |

**Data Source Comments:** 2019 PIT

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

Utah had 260 households of adults and children containing 877 individuals experiencing homelessness on the night of its 2019 Point in Time Count. Three of these households included veterans.

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

The 2019 PIT count found that 78% of individuals experiencing homelessness in Utah were Non-Hispanic or Latino and 22% were Hispanic or Latino. This shows that homelessness disproportionately impacts Utah's Hispanic and Latino community, as the U.S. Census Bureau estimates that in July 2019 14% of Utah's population was Hispanic or Latino.

The 2019 PIT count reported that 78% of those experiencing homelessness were White, 10% were Black or African-American, 1% were Asian, 5% were American Indian or Alaska Native, 3% were Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and 4% were multiple races. When compared to the July 2019 U.S. Census Bureau estimates for the population of Utah, we find that Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and multi-racial individuals are over represented in the homeless population, while White and Asian individuals are underrepresented.

While the nature and proportion of these disparities vary by region, we do find that there are racial and ethnic disparities in each of Utah's Continua of Care. Each Continuum has begun analyzing these disparities and discussing how to begin addressing them.

**Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.**

There were 2,798 individuals experiencing homelessness in Utah on the night of the 2019 Point in Time Count. 2,390 or 85% were sheltered in either emergency shelter or transitional housing projects and 408 or 15% 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, homeless 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.

## NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment

**HOPWA**

| Current HOPWA formula use: | |
|---|---:|
| Cumulative cases of AIDS reported | 121 |
| Area incidence of AIDS | 3 |
| Rate per population | 5 |
| 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 22 – HOPWA Data**

**Alternate Data Source Name:**
Utah HMIS Data

**Data Source Comments:**

### HIV Housing Need (HOPWA Grantees Only)

| Type of HOPWA Assistance | Estimates of Unmet Need |
|---|---:|
| Tenant based rental assistance | 63 |
| Short-term Rent, Mortgage, and Utility | 16 |
| Facility Based Housing (Permanent, short-term or transitional) | 13 |

**Table 23 – HIV Housing Need**

**Alternate Data Source Name:**
Utah HMIS Data

**Data Source Comments:**

### Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

Special need populations include elderly (defined as 62 and older), frail elderly (defined as an elderly person who requires assistance with three or more activities of daily living, such as bathing, walking and performing light housework), Persons with mental, physical, and/or developmental disabilities, Persons with alcohol or other drug addiction, Persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, Victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. These populations all exist within Utah. Each of these is an at risk population and have greater need for assistance than the overall population. Many of these populations are the target of set aside units within affordable housing projects. The HIV/AIDS population is targeted specifically by the HOPWA program.

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

The housing and supportive service needs for 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, medical and supportive case management services to establish or maintain a stable, safe, and affordable, with sanitary living environment free from discrimination while waiting for permanent housing placement or 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 current statewide HIV/AIDS HOPWA Steering Committee plays an important role in unifying all HOPWA stakeholders. This independent group continues to meet to bi-monthly to collaborate and insure the needs of people living with HIV/AIDS are met. The committee addresses common issues and:

- Coordinates activities between the City and State HOPWA Programs
- Identifies gaps in services
- Works with HOPWA Project Sponsors to resolve any housing delivery problems
- Identifies existing rental units and makes that information available to HOPWA clients

The Homelessness Programs Office (HPO) encourages project sponsors to work closely with the University of Utah Clinic 1A and the Utah Aids Foundation to receive referrals to provide eligible HOPWA clients with housing assistance and case management. These two entities are a main source of client referral. The coordination between referral 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 Homelessness Programs Office 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.

## NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs

**Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Facilities:**

For the CDBG program, Public Facilities Improvements continue to be a big priority in the Utah 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 Homelessness Programs Office (HPO) encourages project sponsors to work closely with the University of Utah Clinic 1A and the Utah Aids Foundation 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 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 (AOG's). 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. Local communities prepare Capital Improvement Plans (CIP) with 1-year, 3-year and 5-year priorities. The regional CDBG application rating and ranking systems are updated annually to reflect these local plans. The Utah CDBG program receives a very limited amount of funding, approximately $5,000,000 per year. The CDBG Policy Committee has decided to limit the type of eligible activities in order to focus on the most critical needs. Accordingly, economic development activities are rarely funded and are limited to those carried by an AOG.

**Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Improvements:**

The number one priority in the CDBG program is Public Improvements. Improvements to aging infrastructure such as water and sewer systems are the most critical needs in rural Utah. In small towns of less than 1,000 people, there is not a big enough tax base to pay for these types of projects. In many cases, the jurisdiction is replacing and upsizing lines that are 50+ years old just to bring them up to code.

**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. Local communities prepare Capital Improvement Plans (CIP) with 1-year, 3-year and 5-year priorities. The regional CDBG application rating and ranking systems are updated annually to reflect these local plans. The Utah CDBG program receives a very limited amount of funding, approximately $5,000,000 per year. The CDBG Policy

Committee has decided to limit the type of eligible activities in order to focus on the most critical 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 are Meals-on-Wheels vehicles and senior transportation vehicles.

**How were these needs determined?**

In 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 HCD using Community Development and Planning (CPD) funds on a statewide basis is extremely challenging. HCD has gone to great length to address the need for affordable housing in the Report on affordable housing: https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/reports/documents/affordablehousingreport.pdf. This report details the market conditions within each county in 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

## Introduction

The housing markets found in Utah are complex and varied. The major population centers in the Wasatch Front have experienced strong population increases. So far, housing supply has kept up, however increases in the cost of housing have far outstripped 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 rental 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 extends to all housing types and household types and is most felt at the lowest income levels. More county by county information can be found in 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 | 695,319 | 69% |
| 1-unit, attached structure | 60,609 | 6% |
| 2-4 units | 77,002 | 8% |
| 5-19 units | 79,995 | 8% |
| 20 or more units | 59,835 | 6% |
| Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc. | 38,339 | 4% |
| *Total* | *1,011,099* | *100%* |

**Table 24 – Residential Properties by Unit Number**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 ACS

## Unit Size by Tenure

| | Owners | | Renters | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | % | Number | % |
| No bedroom | 1,185 | 0% | 7,671 | 3% |
| 1 bedroom | 8,478 | 1% | 50,913 | 18% |
| 2 bedrooms | 70,903 | 11% | 103,880 | 38% |
| 3 or more bedrooms | 549,018 | 87% | 114,244 | 41% |
| *Total* | *629,584* | *99%* | *276,708* | *100%* |

**Table 25 – Unit Size by Tenure**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 ACS

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

The OWHLF fund often acts as a "gap financer" in multifamily housing projects. These OWHLF funds are highly leveraged and help provide a piece of the funding puzzle to ensure the creation of hundreds of affordable housing units. Over the last few years OWHLF has helped fund about 900 units per year with HOME Funds. These projects typically target 60% 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 to HCD 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 vouchers 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. The current difficulties with Covid-19 could potential lead to a large number of foreclosures and a general depression in the economy which might return some units to affordability, but would also likely greatly increase the number of low income households thus continuing the strain on the low income population's housing needs. This situation is very volatile and it will be some time before we have a good idea of how things will shake out.

**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 regional along the Wasatch Front. So far overall housing supply has met the need for the increase in households however with population increases has come increases in the cost of housing as housing cost increases has far outstripped wage growth.

**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 percent 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 percent or lower AMI households as these populations are the most impacted by unaffordability.

**Discussion**

Utah's total supply of housing has been increasing by 13,430 housing units per year on average according to estimates provided by the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey. The number of housing units being occupied is increasing by 10,997 units on average per year. This indicates an excess supply of housing. As such, supply constraints do not seem to be the significant variable, but rather demand side factors like wages and cost burdens (which are not mutually exclusive) and economic security & employment stability, diminishing what is in fact affordably available to Utah's working families.

Those with the greatest resources are able to buy or rent the best housing in the best locations, with each income stratum down the ladder buying successively lower-quality housing in worse locations (notwithstanding the distorting effects of discrimination). Hypothetically, the market should produce enough housing to satisfy the demands of those throughout the socioeconomic spectrum. As stated above, the housing problem does not arise because of a lack of supply. Instead, because of a complex set of housing and labor market policies and practices, there is a lack of supply at a price that low-income households can afford.

Housing construction is outweighing demand, suggesting aggravated real estate appreciation, which is a stress factor that needs attention. This cannot be assumed to be normal business operations, unless by normal we mean a high degree of unnecessary cost burdens. An expectation that the excess housing supply will perhaps lead to lower housing costs, and therefore alleviate housing affordability challenges, is unrealistic. The supply of expensive housing does not create a trickledown effect, whereby supply creates its own demand; this is not a tide that lifts all boats.

## MA-15 Cost of Housing

### Cost of Housing

| | **Base Year: 2009** | **Most Recent Year: 2015** | **% Change** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Median Home Value | 208,100 | 215,900 | 4% |
| Median Contract Rent | 656 | 768 | 17% |

**Table 26 – Cost of Housing**

**Data Source:** 2005-2009 ACS (Base Year), 2011-2015 ACS (Most Recent Year)

| **Rent Paid** | **Number** | **%** |
|---|---|---|
| Less than $500 | 51,583 | 18.6% |
| $500-999 | 158,315 | 57.2% |
| $1,000-1,499 | 52,958 | 19.1% |
| $1,500-1,999 | 9,415 | 3.4% |
| $2,000 or more | 4,437 | 1.6% |
| *Total* | *276,708* | *100.0%* |

**Table 27 - Rent Paid**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 ACS

### Housing Affordability

| **% Units affordable to Households earning** | **Renter** | **Owner** |
|---|---|---|
| 30% HAMFI | 17,620 | No Data |
| 50% HAMFI | 74,405 | 30,865 |
| 80% HAMFI | 184,680 | 137,160 |
| 100% HAMFI | No Data | 227,415 |
| *Total* | *276,705* | *395,440* |

**Table 28 – Housing Affordability**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 CHAS

### Monthly Rent

| **Monthly Rent ($)** | **Efficiency (no bedroom)** | **1 Bedroom** | **2 Bedroom** | **3 Bedroom** | **4 Bedroom** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fair Market Rent | 500 | 556 | 714 | 1,005 | 1,254 |
| High HOME Rent | 500 | 549 | 699 | 1,101 | 1,211 |
| Low HOME Rent | 500 | 549 | 699 | 945 | 1,031 |

**Table 29 – Monthly Rent**

**Data Source Comments:** Rents are determined by county and so we have entered the information for Carbon County which is a rural county with rent level typical of many of our rural counties.

**Is there sufficient housing for households at all income levels?**

The current housing situation is very much in flux. The stock market is swinging wildly and as it stands has erased all gains during the Trump Presidency. Unemployment requests are at all-time highs and many industries are completely shuttered. How this is going to impact persons person income levels and how the housing market is going to  be impacted is a very important question with no 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.

**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 5 year plan. However, the changes in home values and rents which have occurred over the course of the last 5 year period has caused many to be rent/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/depression increase the number of very low or extremely low income households.

**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 diverse 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 in urban areas where they are most needed.

## MA-20 Condition of Housing

### Definitions

The definition for "Standard Condition" is that the condition must be in compliance with HUD Quality Standards (HQS) and also State and local codes. The definition in use for "Substandard Condition but Suitable for Rehabilitation" is the unit is in poor condition but that it is financial and structurally feasible to rehabilitate.

### Condition of Units

| Condition of Units | Owner-Occupied | | Renter-Occupied | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Number** | **%** | **Number** | **%** |
| With one selected Condition | 143,434 | 23% | 117,188 | 42% |
| With two selected Conditions | 4,727 | 1% | 11,905 | 4% |
| With three selected Conditions | 156 | 0% | 605 | 0% |
| With four selected Conditions | 0 | 0% | 21 | 0% |
| No selected Conditions | 481,267 | 76% | 146,989 | 53% |
| *Total* | *629,584* | *100%* | *276,708* | *99%* |

**Table 30 - Condition of Units**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 ACS

### Year Unit Built

| Year Unit Built | Owner-Occupied | | Renter-Occupied | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Number** | **%** | **Number** | **%** |
| 2000 or later | 169,787 | 27% | 58,677 | 21% |
| 1980-1999 | 194,404 | 31% | 85,339 | 31% |
| 1950-1979 | 199,816 | 32% | 96,041 | 35% |
| Before 1950 | 65,577 | 10% | 36,651 | 13% |
| *Total* | *629,584* | *100%* | *276,708* | *100%* |

**Table 31 – Year Unit Built**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 CHAS

### 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 | 265,393 | 42% | 132,692 | 48% |
| Housing Units build before 1980 with children present | 138,775 | 22% | 97,675 | 35% |

**Table 32 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 ACS (Total Units) 2011-2015 CHAS (Units with Children present)

## Vacant Units

|  | Suitable for Rehabilitation | Not Suitable for Rehabilitation | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Vacant Units | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Abandoned Vacant Units | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| REO Properties | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Abandoned REO Properties | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Table 33 - Vacant Units**

**Data Source:**　2005-2009 CHAS

## Need for Owner and Rental Rehabilitation

Utah has a wide variety of housing markets with some areas composed of much newer housing stock and other areas have older poorer housing stock. According to ACS data there is a large number of housing units, especially rental units which have at least one of the four conditions which indicate a property is in substandard condition. This would indicate that there is a great need for rental units, and to a lesser degree owner occupied housing units, to be rehabilitated in order to be suitable for occupation.

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

HCD does not have a good estimate for the number of households statewide that might have lead based paint hazards. Although 42% of the housing in Utah was constructed prior to 1980, there is no way to know the hazards that may exist in such housing.  Lead based paint in good condition is not, itself, a hazard.  By the time lead based paint was outlawed in 1980, many paint manufacturers had phased it out.  The Utah Department of Health has concluded that the hazards are found most often in the pre-1950 housing.  Only 11 percent of housing in Utah was constructed prior to 1950.  According to information presented in this section there is a large proportion of housing units which were constructed pre 1980 and have the potential for lead based paint poisoning. However, Utah has a Lead poisoning rate of less than one percent.  A full accounting of our efforts can be found in section SP-65.

## MA-25 Public and Assisted Housing

**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:**

HCD does not fund housing agencies. 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 room and playgrounds.

## MA-30 Homeless Facilities

### 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) | 934 | 39 | 298 | 1,391 | 0 |
| Households with Only Adults | 1,293 | 163 | 238 | 1,947 | 142 |
| Chronically Homeless Households | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,667 | 0 |
| Veterans | 0 | 0 | 94 | 697 | 0 |
| Unaccompanied Youth | 78 | 20 | 37 | 9 | 0 |

**Table 34 - Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons**

**Data Source Comments: State HMIS data**

**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

Medicare

Medicaid (for families)

Mental Health Court for adults and juveniles

Refugee financial assistance

Social Security

Social Security Disability (SSDI)

Supplemental Security Income (SSI)

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)

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

**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.**

| Agency/Program | Location | Service Description |
|---|---|---|
| Asian Association of Utah | Salt Lake County | Provides employment, legal, and housing services for refugees and immigrants which includes homeless refugee individuals and families with children. |
| Bear River Association of Governments | Cache County | Provides hotel vouchers, housing and case management services to individuals and families with children experiencing homelessness in Box Elder, Rich and Cache Counties. |
| Canyon Creek Services | Iron County | Provides shelter and case management services for female and male victims of domestic violence and their children in Iron, Beaver and Garfield counties. |
| CAPSA | Cache County | Provides shelter, housing and case management services for female and male victims of domestic violence and their children in Cache and Riche counties. |
| Catholic Community Services | Salt Lake County | Provides day shelter services and meals for all people experiencing homelessness. |
| Center for Women & Children in Crisis | Utah County | Provides shelter and housing services for female and male victims of domestic violence and their children in Utah and Juab counties. |
| Christian Center of Park City | Summit County | Provides hotel vouchers, housing and food bank services for all people experiencing homelessness. |
| Colleen Quigley Women's Shelter | Carbon County | Provides shelter and case management services for female victims of domestic violence and their children in Carbon and Emery counties. |
| Community Action Services & Food Bank | Utah County | Provides housing and case management services for homeless individuals and families with children. Provides food bank services. |

| Department of Workforce Services | State Wide | Provides employment services, training assistance, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), childcare and financial assistance to individuals and families experiencing homelessness. The System Administration team for the Utah Homeless Management Information System (UHMIS) is located within DWS in the Homeless Programs Office. |
|---|---|---|
| Dove Center | Washington County | Provides shelter, housing and case management services for female and male victims of domestic violence and their children in Washington and Kane counties. |
| Family Promise - Ogden | Weber County | Provides shelter services for families with children. |
| Family Promise - Salt Lake | Salt Lake County | Provides shelter and housing services for families with children. |
| Family Support Center | Salt Lake County | Provides housing and case management services for families with children. |
| First Step House | Salt Lake County | Provides housing and case management services for veterans, chronically homeless, single men and women. Provides treatment services. |
| Five County Association of Governments | Washington County | Provides housing and case management services for individuals and families with children experiencing homelessness in Beaver, Iron, Garfield, Kane and Washington Counties. |
| Food & Care Coalition | Utah County | Provides transitional housing and meal services for male and female individuals experiencing homelessness. Provides food pantry services for all people experiencing homelessness. |
| Fourth Street Clinic | Salt Lake County | Provides medical services to all people experiencing homelessness. |
| Friends Against Family Violence | Uintah County | Provides shelter and case management services for female and male victims of domestic violence and their children in Uintah, Duchesne and Daggett counties. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Homeless Veterans Fellowship | Utah and Weber Counties | Provides housing and case management services for single veterans and veterans with families experiencing homelessness. |
| Housing Authority of Salt Lake City | Salt Lake County | Provides housing and case management services for all people experiencing homelessness including chronically homeless, veterans, people with HIV/AIDS, families with children, and individuals. |
| Housing Connect | Salt Lake County | Provides housing and case management services for all people experiencing homelessness including chronically homeless, veterans, people with HIV/AIDS, families with children, and individuals. |
| Housing Authority of Utah County | Utah County | Provides housing services for individuals and families with children experiencing homelessness. |
| Iron County Care & Share | Iron County | Provides shelter and housing services for individuals and families with children experiencing homelessness. Provides food pantry services for all people experiencing homelessness. |
| Lantern House | Weber County | Provides shelter, housing and case management services for individuals and families with children. |
| Mountainlands Community Housing Trust | Summit County | Provides transitional housing for individuals and families with children experiencing homelessness. |
| New Hope Crisis Center | Box Elder County | Provides shelter and case management services for female and male victims of domestic violence and their children. |
| New Horizons Crisis Center | Sevier County | Provides shelter, housing and case management services for female and male victims of domestic violence and their children in Sevier, Millard, Piute, Sanpete and Wayne counties. |
| Ogden City Housing Authority | Weber County | Provides housing and case management services for all people experiencing homelessness including chronically homeless, veterans, people with HIV/AIDS, families with children, and individuals. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Open Doors | Davis County | Provides housing and case management services for individuals and families with children experiencing homelessness. Provides food pantry services for all people experiencing homelessness. |
| Peace House | Summit County | Provides shelter and housing services for female and male victims of domestic violence and their children in Summit and Wasatch counties. |
| Problems Anonymous Action Group | Weber County | Provides housing and case management services for individuals experiencing homelessness. |
| Provo City Housing Authority | Utah County | Provides housing services for individuals and families with children experiencing homelessness |
| Rescue Mission | Salt Lake and Weber Counties | Provides shelter, day services and treatment services to single men and women |
| Safe Harbor Crisis Center | Davis County | Provides shelter, housing and case management services for female and male victims of domestic violence and their children |
| Salt Lake County Youth Services | Salt Lake County | Provides shelter and transitional housing services for youth |
| Seek Haven | Grand County | Provides shelter and case management services for female and male victims of domestic violence and their children. |
| South Valley Services | Salt Lake County | Provides shelter and housing services for female and male victims of domestic violence and their children. |
| Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments | Carbon County | Provides hotel vouchers, housing and case management services to individuals and families with children experiencing homelessness in Carbon, Emery, Grand and San Juan counties. |
| St. George Housing Authority | Washington County | Provides housing and case management services for all people experiencing homelessness including chronically homeless, veterans, families with children, and individuals. |

| Switchpoint | Washington County | Provides shelter, housing and case management services for individuals and families with children experiencing homelessness. Provides food pantry services for all people experiencing homelessness. |
|---|---|---|
| The Road Home | Salt Lake County | Provides housing and case management services for veterans, chronically homeless, families with children and individuals. Provides shelter and case management for single men and families. Operates permanent supportive housing for formerly homeless families and individuals. |
| Tooele County Housing Authority | Tooele County | Provides housing services for individuals and families with children experiencing homelessness. |
| Turning Point | Uintah County | Provides shelter and case management services for individuals and families with children experiencing homelessness. |
| Uintah Basin Association of Governments | Duchesne County | Provides hotel vouchers, housing and case management services to individuals and families with children experiencing homelessness in Uintah, Duchesne and Daggett Counties. |
| Utah Community Action | Salt Lake and Tooele Counties | Provides employment, welfare, financial assistance, housing services to all people experiencing homelessness. |
| Valley Behavioral Health | Salt Lake and Tooele Counties | Provides housing and case management services for single men and women with mental health barriers. Provides mental health treatment services for all people experiencing homelessness. Provides shelter and case management services for female victims of domestic violence and their children. |
| Veterans Administration Homeless Program | State Wide | Provides housing services for veterans, including chronically homeless veterans. |
| Volunteers of America, Utah | Salt Lake County | Provides shelter for single women. Provides housing and case management services for single men, women and unaccompanied youth who are experiencing homelessness. Provides shelter and day services for unaccompanied youth who are homeless. Provides detox services for homeless |

| | | individuals, and women with children. Provides mental health, addiction and domestic violence counseling to all people experiencing homelessness. |
|---|---|---|
| Wasatch Mental Health | Utah County | Provides therapy, substance abuse treatment and case management services to homeless individuals with mental health issues. Provides housing case management to formally homeless individuals who have been housed. Provides shelter and day services for unaccompanied youth. |
| Weber County Housing Authority | Weber County | Provides housing and case management services for all people experiencing homelessness including chronically homeless, families with children, and individuals experiencing homelessness. |
| Youth Community Connection | Weber County | Provides shelter, housing and case management services for female and male victims of domestic violence and their children in Weber and Morgan counties. |
| Youth Futures | Weber and Washington Counties | Provides shelter, day services and case management to unaccompanied youth. |
| YWCA | Salt Lake County | Provides shelter and housing services for female victims of domestic violence and their children. |

## MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services

**HOPWA Assistance Baseline Table**

| Type of HOWA Assistance | Number of Units Designated or Available for People with HIV/AIDS and their families |
|---|---|
| TBRA | 24 |
| PH in facilities | 8 |
| STRMU | 15 |
| ST or TH facilities | 0 |
| PH placement | 0 |

**Table 35 – HOPWA Assistance Baseline**

**Alternate Data Source Name:**
Utah HMIS Data

**Data Source Comments:**


**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 in 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 commited 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 Continua 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.

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

Programs serving those with returning from mental and physical health institutions exist around the state of Utah and are coordinated on a local level. Programs that provide supportive housing and supportive services are listed in MA-30. Utah funds recovery projects and Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) for the development of projects throughout the state utilizing various funding sources. PSH enables this population to live as independently as possible in a permanent setting upon exit from an institution. Supportive services may be provided by the organization managing the housing or coordinated with other public or private service agencies. PSH provides access to affordable housing and supportive services customized and designed to help tenants achieve and sustain housing stability and move toward recovery.

**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 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 Coordinating Committees. 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. Local Homeless Coordinating Committees (LHCCs) 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.

## MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing

### 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 2009 to 2016 real income only grew at 0.31% per year while rent crept upward at a rate of 1.03% per year in 2017 constant dollars.

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 Recession3 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 the following: a governmental failure to adhere to full employment objectives; 4 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. See Table 1. 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 Utah's 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 is 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.

# MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets

## 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 | 10,667 | 11,049 | 4 | 6 | 2 |
| Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations | 38,414 | 34,671 | 15 | 19 | 4 |
| Construction | 22,428 | 18,215 | 9 | 10 | 1 |
| Education and Health Care Services | 39,847 | 24,203 | 15 | 13 | -2 |
| Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate | 15,041 | 10,027 | 6 | 5 | -1 |
| Information | 6,095 | 2,649 | 2 | 1 | -1 |
| Manufacturing | 35,982 | 23,655 | 14 | 13 | -1 |
| Other Services | 8,203 | 5,962 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Professional, Scientific, Management Services | 20,564 | 9,958 | 8 | 5 | -3 |
| Public Administration | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail Trade | 40,721 | 29,998 | 16 | 16 | 0 |
| Transportation and Warehousing | 12,934 | 9,367 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Wholesale Trade | 11,373 | 6,736 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Total | 262,269 | 186,490 | -- | -- | -- |

**Table 36- Business Activity**

Data Source:    2011-2015 ACS (Workers), 2015 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (Jobs)

**Labor Force**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force | 367,820 |
| Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over | 345,921 |
| Unemployment Rate | 5.97 |
| Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24 | 15.38 |
| Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65 | 3.59 |

**Table 37 - Labor Force**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 ACS

| Occupations by Sector | Number of People |
|---|---|
| Management, business and financial | 81,349 |
| Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations | 13,168 |
| Service | 33,119 |
| Sales and office | 83,913 |
| Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair | 38,219 |
| Production, transportation and material moving | 23,292 |

**Table 38 – Occupations by Sector**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 ACS

**Travel Time**

| Travel Time | Number | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| < 30 Minutes | 232,898 | 72% |
| 30-59 Minutes | 67,981 | 21% |
| 60 or More Minutes | 21,908 | 7% |
| *Total* | *322,787* | *100%* |

**Table 39 - Travel Time**

**Data Source:** 2011-2015 ACS

**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 | 15,220 | 2,055 | 9,507 |

| Educational Attainment | In Labor Force | | Not in Labor Force |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Civilian Employed | Unemployed | |
| High school graduate (includes equivalency) | 69,166 | 4,610 | 26,043 |
| Some college or Associate's degree | 106,474 | 4,945 | 36,726 |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 82,367 | 1,850 | 18,099 |

**Table 40 - Educational Attainment by Employment Status**

**Data Source:**  2011-2015 ACS


## Educational Attainment by Age

| | Age | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 18–24 yrs | 25–34 yrs | 35–44 yrs | 45–65 yrs | 65+ yrs |
| Less than 9th grade | 1,003 | 1,728 | 2,296 | 3,428 | 3,045 |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 10,231 | 6,487 | 4,685 | 8,078 | 6,494 |
| High school graduate, GED, or alternative | 26,770 | 27,510 | 26,247 | 46,074 | 27,165 |
| Some college, no degree | 28,567 | 31,100 | 27,755 | 50,387 | 25,751 |
| Associate's degree | 5,701 | 11,847 | 10,910 | 16,539 | 5,497 |
| Bachelor's degree | 3,030 | 20,368 | 19,896 | 31,299 | 13,974 |
| Graduate or professional degree | 161 | 4,979 | 9,021 | 17,205 | 9,607 |

**Table 41 - Educational Attainment by Age**

**Data Source:**  2011-2015 ACS


## Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

| Educational Attainment | Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months |
|---|---|
| Less than high school graduate | 4,255,802 |
| High school graduate (includes equivalency) | 9,043,109 |
| Some college or Associate's degree | 9,799,953 |
| Bachelor's degree | 11,869,644 |
| Graduate or professional degree | 13,219,488 |

**Table 42 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months**

**Data Source:**  2011-2015 ACS


**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. In addition, many of those employed are in sales, management or other business or finance type professions.

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

Utah is fortunate to have a well-developed workforce. Before the recent Covid-19 crisis, Utah had one of the lowest unemployment rates and one of the highest job growth that led the nation. Success comes with a workforce that is talented, multi-skilled and adaptable. Utah is well known for having business friendly policies which has helped Utah attract a number of well-paying tech industries. With this economic boom has come infrastructure challenges especially along the I-15 corridor. However, these challenges have been confronted and are being met. In rural areas Utah has struggled. As with many rural areas of the United States, many rural communities are struggling from a loss of natural resource extraction type employment and are seeing a drain of young talented persons. However, Utah is fortunate in that it has many attractive outdoor amenities. Communities such as Moab are seeing a boom and they become destination spots for tourists. Recent troubled in the economy threaten the workforce as many have needed unemployment benefits as a result of the Covid-19 crisis. It is too early to tell what the long term impact of this situation will be.

**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.**

It is probably that the current crisis with Covid-19 will be the most impactful economic disturbance Utah will experience during the 5 year period covered by this Consolidated Plan. While the full effects of the crisis are difficult to project, it is likely that the disruption in employment that many are currently experiencing will have an ongoing impact for many years. Utah has made an effort to promote economic prosperity by promoting a business friendly environment. This public approach to business has been very fruitful and has brought in many jobs from international corporations. In order to extend this prosperity to Rural Areas, Utah has promoted job growth in rural counties with a job creating initiative.

**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 indicates that there is still a large portion of the population without advanced degrees. This would seem to indicate that there is still a need for more educational training. Fortunately, there is no indication that the current level of educational attainment is leading to high unemployment. Nevertheless, higher employment attainment would 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 Publically funded universities have made a concerted effort to building university extensions or campuses in rural communities. These campuses are now found in many regional centers found in rural areas and are hugely beneficial to promoting workforce training to populations that previously did not have access to workforce training. 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. HCD promotes this effort by funding infrastructure and community services within these communities that compliment this effort. As these training opportunities allow citizens to increase their wages, they are housing 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 participate 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.

The primary method supporting economic growth and promoting job creation is through favorable tax policies and a general elimination or suppression of discouraging bureaucratic red tape

## MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

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

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 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 wealth 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 extends into minority heavy areas and neighborhoods.

**Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?**

While 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. Recent redevelopment efforts which include HOME and HTF funds has placed grocery stores in a food desert in South Salt Lake along the S-Line light rail line.

**Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?**

HCD has prioritized the building of new affordable housing. Much of this affordable housing is being constructed along light rail lines used for commuting. Many low income areas and neighborhoods are located within reach of these light rail lines and new affordable housing is addressing a major concern which is housing affordability.

## MA-60 Broadband Needs

**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 as a framework.

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

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

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

Most recently a major effort was completed to provide fiber connectivity to Daggett County in the Northeast corner of the state which is isolated by the Uintah Mountain Range and a lack of major transportation options such as rail or interstate highways. (HUD funding was not used in this effort.)

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 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 microwaves, 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 equity is a top priority and has been for many years.  Broadband access is readily available statewide with the key barrier being affordability. An unfortunate reality for many Americans is the very real choice between food, shelter and other necessities.  In those cases, food takes precedence over broadband regardless of affordability. This is a manifestation of what is often described as the "digital divide".

## MA-65 Hazard Mitigation

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

Addressing hazard mitigation and resiliency during this time of the COVID19 pandemic and on the heels of a significant earthquake centered in Magna Utah, an suburb of Salt Lake City, provides an interesting backdrop to this plan.

As with many of the consolidated plan topics, it is challenging for the state to address hazard mitigation authoritatively since housing and resiliency are often local jurisdictional issues. 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.  Utah is a very geologically diverse state.

As was recently demonstrated, earthquakes are the state's greatest natural hazard risk.  Fortunately, recent events also demonstrated just how prepared the state is to deal with natural hazards. Even with this earthquake and it's hundreds of sizable aftershocks occurring during the height of the COVID19 pandemic frenzy, the local governments responded amazingly well to local needs.  One thing the COVID19 pandemic has taught people and communities is how to cope with the unexpected and how to pivot services to meet community needs in unusual and stressful times.

The risk of earthquakes in Utah is followed by the threat of fire and flooding which generally go hand in hand. Demonstrating Utah's preparedness and resilience is the fact that Utah is one of the few state's, at the time of this writing, to not have received any Disaster Recovery funding through HUD.

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, bare more of the brunt of the unfolding disaster. Of course 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, are unfortunately compromised by the extent of income inequality, which is often beyond the scope of our Division.

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

Climate change has often complex consequences many of which are not obvious. In Utah we are not threatened by Hurricanes and have historically only very rarely dealt with severe flooding. One issue that could be exacerbated by climate change could be an increase of fires as has been seen in California. While Utah did experience a bad fire season in 2018, we have not seen an overall increase in the threat of fires and have had above average rainfall and adequate snow for the last couple of years. Any disaster is going to disproportionately impact low income households. However, we do not have any data and

findings that lead us to believe that we are at risk of climate change caused disasters and certainly we do not have any information regarding how such a hypothetical scenario could potential risk low to moderate income households.

# 2020-2024 Strategic Plan

## SP-05 Overview

**Strategic Plan Overview**

The Utah 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 Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness was adopted by the State Homeless Coordinating Committee (SHCC) in September 2019. This Plan has as its main priorities making homelessness brief, rare and non-recurring. The Homelessness Programs Office will support the work of the SHCC and Local Homeless Coordinating Committees as outlined in the Strategic Plan (https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/homelessness/shcc/documents/homelessnessstrategicplan.pdf)

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

## SP-10 Geographic Priorities

### Geographic Area

**Table 43 - 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. | Utah County is ineligible for state CDBG funds. The CDBG funds in this area are primarily expended in Wasatch county, which is an expensive county with 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. | Public facilities and infrastructure. |
| | What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area? | The CDBG program hopes to make communities for sustainable. |
| | Are there barriers to improvement in this target area? | No |
| 2 | 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 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.** | Public facilities and infrastructure. |
| | **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 and one midsized cities in St. George and 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.** | Public facilities and infrastructure. |
| | **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. | Public facilities and infrastructure. |
| | 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.** | Public facilities and infrastructure. |
| | **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 no large towns or cities. |
| | **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.** | Public facilities and infrastructure. |
| | **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.** | Public facilities and infrastructure. |
| | **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 |
| **8** | **Area Name:** | State of Utah |
| | **Area Type:** | Strategy area |
| | **Other Target Area Description:** | |
| | **HUD Approval Date:** | 3/1/2014 |
| | **% of Low/ Mod:** | |
| | **Revital Type:** | |
| | **Other Revital Description:** | |
| | **Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.** | The State of Utah |

| Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area. | |
|---|---|
| How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area? | This area is identified so the HCD could indicate that funding was spent within this broad region. Many HCD programs do not allocate funds within specific geographic regions. |
| Identify the needs in this target area. | |
| What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area? | |
| Are there barriers to improvement in this target area? | |

## 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 ESG and HOPWA programs distribute funds according to the needs of the 13 regional Local Homeless Coordinating Councils (LHCCs). LHCC priorities for allocating ESG and HOPWA funds are assessed by community members and stakeholders within those areas. The State Homeless Coordinating Committee (appointed by the state legislature) evaluate LHCC priorities and how they relate to state priorities and based on their assessment make funding decisions for agency awards within all LHCCs. Distribution between LHCCs are not equal due to disparate needs and subpopulations served within the LHCCs. HCD anticipates that the majority of ESG and HOPWA funds will be allocated to agencies within LHCCs located within the major population center in Salt Lake City with Provo City Ogden City, and Washington County also being prominent recipients of ESG and HOPWA funds.

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 Admin.

The CDBG program's Method of Distribution (MOD), or allocation formula, is determined by the State CDBG Policy Committee.  This committee is represented by one elected official from each of the seven regional associations of governments.  The current MOD is effective for program years 2019-2021.  Each region receives a base amount of $400,000.  The balance of the funding, after state administration costs are deducted, are allocated based on the percentage of the state's LMI population, average poverty rate, pre-1980 housing and the number of pre-approved LMI communities.  The CDBG program does not operate in Davis, Salt Lake and Utah counties as these are entitlement counties.

The HOME and HTF programs accept applications statewide and the location of these application 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.

## SP-25 Priority Needs

### Priority Needs

**Table 44 – Priority Needs Summary**

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="7">1</td><td>**Priority Need Name**</td><td>New HOME and HTF Affordable Housing</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Priority Level**</td><td>High</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Population**</td><td>Extremely Low<br>Low</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Geographic Areas Affected**</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>**Associated Goals**</td><td>HOME and HTF  New Affordable Housing</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Description**</td><td>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.</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Basis for Relative Priority**</td><td>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.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">2</td><td>**Priority Need Name**</td><td>CDBG Affordable Housing</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Priority Level**</td><td>High</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Population**</td><td>Extremely Low<br>Low<br>Moderate<br>Large Families<br>Families with Children<br>Elderly<br>Public Housing Residents</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Geographic Areas Affected**</td><td>All areas of the state with the exception of the Salt Lake, Davis and Utah Counties, and St. George, Loan and Ogden with are entitlement areas.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>**Associated Goals**</td><td>CDBG Single Family Housing Rehab<br>CDBG Other Affordable Housing</td></tr>
</table>

Consolidated Plan                    UTAH                                      83

OMB Control No: 2506-0117 (exp. 06/30/2018)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **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, four 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. |
| **3** | **Priority Need Name** | CDBG Public Services |
| | **Priority Level** | High |
| | **Population** | Extremely Low<br>Low<br>Moderate<br>Elderly<br>Elderly<br>Frail Elderly<br>Persons with Physical Disabilities<br>Persons with Developmental Disabilities<br>Victims of Domestic Violence |
| | **Geographic Areas Affected** | All areas of the state with the exception of the Salt Lake, Davis and Utah Counties, and St. George, Loan and Ogden with are entitlement areas. |
| | **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. |
| **4** | **Priority Need Name** | CDBG Community Capital Improvements |
| | **Priority Level** | High |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Population** | Extremely Low<br>Low<br>Moderate<br>Middle |
| | **Geographic Areas Affected** | All areas of the state with the exception of the Salt Lake, Davis and Utah Counties, and St. George, Loan and Ogden with are entitlement areas. |
| | **Associated Goals** | CDBG Public Facilities<br>CDBG Public Infrastructure |
| | **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 |
| **5** | **Priority Need Name** | Make Homelessness Rare |
| | **Priority Level** | High |
| | **Population** | Extremely Low<br>Chronic Homelessness<br>Individuals<br>Mentally Ill<br>Chronic Substance Abuse<br>veterans<br>Persons with HIV/AIDS |
| | **Geographic Areas Affected** | All areas of the state with the exception of the Salt Lake, Davis and Utah Counties, and St. George, Loan and Ogden with are entitlement areas. |
| | **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. |
| **6** | **Priority Need Name** | Make Homelessness Non-Recurring |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Priority Level** | High |
| | **Population** | Extremely Low<br>Rural<br>Chronic Homelessness<br>Individuals<br>Families with Children<br>Mentally Ill<br>Chronic Substance Abuse<br>veterans<br>Persons with HIV/AIDS<br>Victims of Domestic Violence<br>Unaccompanied Youth |
| | **Geographic Areas Affected** | All areas of the state with the exception of the Salt Lake, Davis and Utah Counties, and St. George, Loan and Ogden with are entitlement areas. |
| | **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. |
| 7 | **Priority Need Name** | Make Homelessness Brief |
| | **Priority Level** | High |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Population** | Extremely Low<br>Rural<br>Chronic Homelessness<br>Individuals<br>Families with Children<br>Mentally Ill<br>Chronic Substance Abuse<br>veterans<br>Persons with HIV/AIDS<br>Victims of Domestic Violence<br>Unaccompanied Youth |
| | **Geographic Areas Affected** | All areas of the state with the exception of the Salt Lake, Davis and Utah Counties, and St. George, Loan and Ogden with are entitlement areas. |
| | **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. |
| 8 | **Priority Need Name** | CDBG Economic Development |
| | **Priority Level** | Low |
| | **Population** | Moderate |
| | **Geographic Areas Affected** | All areas of the state with the exception of the Salt Lake, Davis and Utah Counties, and St. George, Loan and Ogden with are entitlement areas. |
| | **Associated Goals** | Make Homelessness Rare |
| | **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 less than $800,000 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. |
| 9 | **Priority Need Name** | CDBG Administration and Planning |

| | Priority Level | Low |
|---|---|---|
| | **Population** | Extremely Low<br>Low<br>Moderate<br>Middle |
| | **Geographic Areas Affected** | 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. |
| | **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 at least 85% of the CDBG allocation is directed to activities that serve the public. |
| 10 | **Priority Need Name** | HOPWA Support HIV/AIDS housing and case management |
| | **Priority Level** | Low |
| | **Population** | Extremely Low<br>Low<br>Moderate<br>Persons with HIV/AIDS<br>Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families |
| | **Geographic Areas Affected** | All areas of the state with the exception of the Salt Lake, Davis and Utah Counties, and St. George, Loan and Ogden with are entitlement areas. |
| | **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 |

# SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions

## 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. Many of these areas also do not have issues with affordability but have a large low income population. So for this reason single family rehabilitation has become a major focus for CDBG funds in some of the regions of the state. |
| 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 of dedicating efforts or resources towards this category of funding. |

Table 45 – Influence of Market Conditions

## SP-35 Anticipated Resources

### Introduction

The State CDBG program funding has been relatively stable the past three years.  The program does not generate program income, so we can predict the available resources with relative confidence.  We expect to have at least $27,500,000 available to allocate to CDBG activities over the next five years - 2020 through 2024.

### 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 | 5,559,087 | 0 | 0 | 5,559,087 | 22,236,348 | 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 | 3,502,823 | 7,601,095 | 2,335,619 | 13,439,537 | 27,514,115 | 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 | 251,411 | 0 | 0 | 251,411 | 1,257,055 | HCD 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 | 1,343,756 | 0 | 0 | 1,343,756 | 6,718,780 | HCD 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 | 3,000,000 | 12,553 | 2,700,000 | 5,712,553 | 1,750,000 | 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 46 - 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 uses HUD allocations to fund multifamily housing developments. HCD also uses state funds to funds 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. I past years leveraging ratios have averaged approximately 18:1 leveraging ratio with 18 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.  Overall, in the past 5 years, each CDBG dollar was matched with 80 cents of other funding.  CDBG continues to serve a critical role as gap financing for critical projects throughout the non-entitlement areas of the state

**If appropriate, describe publically 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 publically owned land or property that can be used to address the needs identified in the plan.

## SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure

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 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 Governments | Regional organization | Economic Development Ownership Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services | Region |
| Five County Association of Governments | Regional organization | Economic Development Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services | Region |

| Responsible Entity | Responsible Entity Type | Role | Geographic Area Served |
|---|---|---|---|
| Uintah Basin Association of Local Governments | Regional organization | Economic Development Ownership Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services | Region |
| Mountainland Association of Governments | Regional organization | Economic Development Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services | Region |
| Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments | Regional organization | Economic Development Ownership Planning neighborhood improvements public facilities public services | Region |

**Table 47 - 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 (AOG) 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. These AOG reps provide the much needed technical assistance needed 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 reps 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 State Homeless Coordinating Committee (SHCC) includes representation from private industry, non-profit organizations, state agencies and other public institutions. The consolidated plan will be carried out in relation to homelessness funding through coordination with the SHCC, LHCCs and in alignment with the Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness.

**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 48 - 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 LHCC.

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, medical and supportive case management services to establish or maintain a stable, safe, and affordable, with sanitary living environment. All HOPWA housing referrals for the program come from a waitlist held by the Utah AIDS Foundation, who collaborates with the University of Utah's Clinic 1A. 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 Homelessness Programs Office, HOPWA providers, Clinic 1A, Utah Aids Foundation, and the Department of Health meet monthly to discuss client needs and available resources.

Additionally, most LHCCs 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 service or resources aren't duplicating efforts; 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**

DWS Housing and Community Development 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 CoCs.

In order to address gaps in the service delivery system, the Local Homeless Coordinating Committees (LHCCs) 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.. LHCCs 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 diversity of homeless populations throughout Utah. LHCCs 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 LHCCs began the gap analysis process in February 2020 and presented initial information to the SHCC. 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 DV services or HOPWA programs are often the highly functioning foundation in many LHCCs.

**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, DWS-HCD will work collaboratively with local communities to develop performance improvement plans and hold them accountable for making progress. Local Homeless Coordinating Committees (LHCCs) 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.

SHCC will prioritize funding in alignment with the priorities identified by the LHCCs, using flexible funding mechanisms allowing for local allocation control, and to direct state-controlled funding toward LHCCs 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

**Goals Summary Information**

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | HOME and HTF New Affordable Housing | 2020 | 2024 | Affordable Housing | State of Utah | New HOME and HTF Affordable Housing | HOME: $27,514,115 HTF: $1,750,000 | Rental units constructed: 200 Household Housing Unit Rental units rehabilitated: 100 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Added: 50 Household Housing Unit |
| 2 | CDBG Single Family Housing Rehab | 2020 | 2024 | Affordable Housing | State of Utah | CDBG Affordable Housing | CDBG: $3,557,816 | Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated: 570 Household Housing Unit |
| 4 | CDBG Public Facilities | 2020 | 2024 | Non-Housing Community Development | State of Utah | CDBG Community Capital Improvements | CDBG: $3,780,179 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | CDBG Other Affordable Housing | 2020 | 2024 | Affordable Housing | State of Utah | CDBG Affordable Housing | CDBG: $1,556,544 | Rental units constructed: 85 Household Housing Unit  Rental units rehabilitated: 120 Household Housing Unit  Homeowner Housing Added: 85 Household Housing Unit  Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 163 Households Assisted |
| 6 | Make Homelessness Rare | 2020 | 2024 | Homeless | State of Utah | Make Homelessness Brief | ESG: $2,015,634 | Homelessness Prevention: 1530 Persons Assisted |
| 7 | Make Homelessness Brief | 2020 | 2024 | Homeless | State of Utah | Make Homelessness Non-Recurring | ESG: $2,821,888 | |
| 8 | Make Homelessness Non-Recurring | 2020 | 2024 | Homeless | State of Utah | Make Homelessness Rate | ESG: $1,881,258 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | CDBG Public Services | 2020 | 2024 | Non-Housing Community Development | State of Utah | CDBG Public Services | CDBG: $2,890,725 | Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 17500 Persons Assisted<br><br>Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 325 Households Assisted |
| 10 | CDBG Administration and Planning | 2020 | 2024 | Admin/Planning | State of Utah | CDBG Community Capital Improvements CDBG Administration and Planning | CDBG: $444,727 | Other: 0 Other |
| 11 | CDBG Economic Development | 2020 | 2024 | Non-Housing Community Development | State of Utah | | CDBG: $500,000 | Jobs created/retained: 1 Jobs<br><br>Businesses assisted: 1 Businesses Assisted |
| 12 | HOPWA-Assistance for Persons with HIV/AIDS | 2020 | 2024 | Non-Homeless Special Needs | State of Utah | HOPWA Support HIV/AIDS housing and case management | HOPWA: $1,257,055 | Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 100 Households Assisted<br><br>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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | CDBG Public Infrastructure | 2020 | 2024 | Non-Housing Community Development | State of Utah | CDBG Public Infrastructure | CDBG: $9,561,630 | Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 57500 Persons Assisted |

**Table 49 – Goals Summary**

## Goal Descriptions

| 1 | **Goal Name** | HOME and HTF  New Affordable Housing |
|---|---|---|
| | **Goal Description** | Creation of new affordable housing targeting low income individuals with HOME funds. |
| 2 | **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. |
| 4 | **Goal Name** | CDBG Public Facilities |
| | **Goal Description** | Grants for construction or rehabilitation of public facilities such as fire stations, community centers, senior centers, domestic violence facilities, parks, etc. |
| 5 | **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. |

| 6 | **Goal Name** | Make Homelessness Rare |
|---|---|---|
| | **Goal Description** | Support positive tenants and landlords relations.  A primary homelessness prevention strategy is mediation, which helps tenants and landlords manage their relationships and resolve disputes before an eviction occurs. (measure - 70 clients annually) 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. (measure - 140 clients annually) 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 sleeping on a friend's couch.  Utah is tracking this population of other homeless individuals and families through the Board of Education of potential individuals stepping into unsheltered homelessness. (measure - 60 households/100 clients annually) |
| 7 | **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. |
| 8 | **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) |

| 9 | Goal Name | CDBG Public Services |
|---|---|---|
| | **Goal Description** | Public services activities funded with CDBG include transportation for elderly/handicapped and meals on wheels vehicles |
| 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** | AOG grants or loans to businesses. This is an acceptable use of CDBG funds however 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. |
| 12 | **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. |
| 13 | **Goal Name** | CDBG Public Infrastructure |
| | **Goal Description** | Funding water/sewer or other infrastructure projects. |

**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)**

HCD 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 but according to HUD rules HOME and HTF can only take credit for a small number of these units. The overall projects may not be financially feasible without HOME and HTF funds. Also, the CDBG and ESG and HOPWA programs all assist in providing affordable housing through single family rehab, TBRA, or other programs. Overall the number of extremely low income, low income, and moderate income families  HCD provides housing towards is estimated at approximately 5000 per year.

## SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement

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

N/A

**Activities to Increase Resident Involvements**

With very minor exceptions within the CDBG program, HCD does not fund PHAs, and is not involved in efforts to increase resident involvement.

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

No

**Plan to remove the 'troubled' designation**

No PHAs are designated as troubled per HUD designations.

## SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing

**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.

## SP-60 Homelessness Strategy

**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 LHCCs 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.

Utah will increase efforts to connect service systems through data integration. There is strong support from LHCCs to strengthen local ties, networks, case management and assessment through data sharing. While there are clear obstacles such as legal and ethical considerations, service providers are interested in finding innovative data sharing solutions to better serve clients, improve coordination, increase understanding of the causes of homelessness and reduce duplication of services and overall costs. Data integration would make it easier to avoid institutional homelessness, created when individuals exit the criminal justice system, the health care system or state foster care system.

**Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons**

The Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness outlines steps for LHCCs 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 LHCCs is, therefore, necessary.

This data collection shall inform and facilitate short- and long-term affordable housing development across Utah.

• Utah LHCCs 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 State Homeless Coordinating Committee (SHCC) will summarize and make the housing inventory data reported by LHCCs publically available.

• The LHCCs will collaborate with local housing partners, towns 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.

LHCCs 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 for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless 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. A third distinct but related need to 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.

## SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards

**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 6 years – only 1%.  In Utah, 42% of the 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 is Davis, Salt Lake and Utah counties.  These are entitlement areas that the Utah Small Cities CDBG program does not serve

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

The CDBG program does not fund lead-based paint remediation activities.  Housing rehabilitation programs are carried out by four 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 is available in each of the seven 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) to serve

# SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy

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

HCD is a division of the Utah Department of Workforce Services whose primary responsibility is to provide programs aimed at reducing the number of poverty-level families by increasing employment viability and self-sufficiency of our clients. HCD's goals and priorities increase LMI families' access to decent, affordable housing.  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 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?**

HCD's plan to provide new affordable housing through the use of CDP 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.

## SP-80 Monitoring

**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**

HCD fully complies with the audit requirements of 2 CFR Part 200.  Pre-award risk assessments 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 pe-award risk assessment 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: 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).  For 2018, the most recent completed year, HCD staff completed 213 compliance monitoring visits to individual multifamily properties.

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 award is made, Sub recipients 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 Pre-Award Risk Assessment (PARA) to gauge fiscal risk and ability to provide program services in a productive manner.  From this process, a regulatory, structured monitoring of the sub recipients grant is determined to be low, medium or high risk for program or fiscal management failure, and informs the depth and breadth of monitoring the agency will endure throughout the contract period. Agencies receive an ESG Monitoring Tool used by the grant specialist during yearly on-site and/or desktop monitoring. Sub recipients are required to submit online requests for reimbursement with back-up documentation at least quarterly.

HOPWA contracts received both desktop and on site reviews during this fiscal year.

# 2020 Annual Action Plan

## AP-15 Introduction

The State CDBG program funding has been relatively stable the past three years.  The program does not generate program income, so we can predict the available resources with relative confidence.  We expect to have at least $27,500,000 available to allocate to CDBG activities over the next five years - 2020 through 2024.

**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 | 5,559,087 | 0 | 0 | 5,559,087 | 22,236,348 | 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 | 3,502,823 | 7,601,095 | 2,335,619 | 13,439,537 | 27,514,115 | 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 | 251,411 | 0 | 0 | 251,411 | 1,257,055 | HCD 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 | 1,343,756 | 0 | 0 | 1,343,756 | 6,718,780 | HCD 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 | 3,000,000 | 12,553 | 2,700,000 | 5,712,553 | 1,750,000 | 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 50 - 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 uses HUD allocations to fund multifamily housing developments. HCD also uses state funds to funds 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 18:1 leveraging ratio with 18 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.  Overall, in the past 5 years, each CDBG dollar was matched with 80 cents of other funding.  CDBG continues to serve a critical role as

gap financing for critical projects throughout the non-entitlement areas of the state.

**If appropriate, describe publically 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 publically owned land or property that can be used to address the needs identified in the plan.

## AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives

**Goals Summary Information**

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | HOME and HTF New Affordable Housing | 2020 | 2024 | Affordable Housing | State of Utah | | HOME: $13,439,537 HTF: $5,712,553 | Rental units constructed: 20 Household Housing Unit Rental units rehabilitated: 10 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Added: 10 Household Housing Unit |

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | CDBG Single Family Housing Rehab | 2020 | 2024 | 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: $889,454 | Rental units rehabilitated: 114 Household Housing Unit |

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | CDBG Public Facilities | 2020 | 2024 | 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: $945,045 | Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 223 Households Assisted |

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4** | CDBG Other Affordable Housing | 2020 | 2024 | 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: $389,136 | Rental units constructed: 17 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Added: 17 Household Housing Unit Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 163 Households Assisted |

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Make Homelessness Rare | 2020 | 2024 | Homeless | | Make Homelessness Rate | ESG: $403,127 | Homelessness Prevention: 310 Persons Assisted |
| 6 | Make Homelessness Brief | 2020 | 2024 | Homeless | State of Utah | Make Homelessness Brief | ESG: $564,378 | Homeless Person Overnight Shelter: 2500 Persons Assisted Overnight/Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing Beds added: 25 Beds |
| 7 | Make Homelessness Non-Recurring | 2020 | 2024 | Homeless | State of Utah | Make Homelessness Non-Recurring | ESG: $376,252 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | CDBG Public Services | 2020 | 2024 | 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: $111,182 | Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 3500 Persons Assisted Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 70 Households Assisted |

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | CDBG Administration and Planning | 2020 | 2024 | 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: $722,681 | Other: 0 Other |

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **10** | CDBG Economic Development | 2020 | 2024 | 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: $111,182 | |

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **11** | HOPWA- Assistance for Persons with HIV/AIDS | 2020 | 2024 | Non-Homeless Special Needs | State of Utah | HOPWA Support HIV/AIDS housing and case management | HOPWA: $251,411 | Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 20 Households Assisted HIV/AIDS Housing Operations: 24 Household Housing Unit |

| Sort Order | Goal Name | Start Year | End Year | Category | Geographic Area | Needs Addressed | Funding | Goal Outcome Indicator |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | CDBG Public Infrastructure | 2020 | 2024 | 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 Infrastructure | CDBG: $2,390,407 | Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 12831 Persons Assisted |

**Table 51 – Goals Summary**

## Goal Descriptions

| 1 | Goal Name | HOME and HTF  New Affordable Housing |
|---|---|---|
| | **Goal Description** | Creation of new affordable housing targeting low-income individuals with HOME and HTF funds. |
| **2** | **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. |
| **3** | **Goal Name** | CDBG Public Facilities |
| | **Goal Description** | Grants for construction or rehabilitation of public facilities such as fire stations, community centers, senior centers, domestic violence facilities, parks, etc. |
| **4** | **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. |

| 5 | Goal Name | Make Homelessness Rare |
|---|---|---|
| | **Goal Description** | Support positive tenants and landlords relations.  A primary homelessness prevention strategy is mediation, which helps tenants and landlords manage their relationships and resolve disputes before an eviction occurs. (measure - 70 clients annually) 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. (measure - 140 clients annually) 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 sleeping on a friend's couch.  Utah is tracking this population of other homeless individuals and families through the Board of Education of potential individuals stepping into unsheltered homelessness. (measure - 60 households/100 clients annually) |
| 6 | 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. |
| 7 | 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) |

| 8 | Goal Name | CDBG Public Services |
|---|---|---|
| | Goal Description | Public services activities funded with CDBG include transportation for elderly/handicapped and meals on wheels vehicles |
| 9 | 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. |
| 10 | Goal Name | CDBG Economic Development |
| | Goal Description | AOG grants or loans to businesses. This is an acceptable use of CDBG funds however, 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. |
| 11 | 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. |
| 12 | Goal Name | CDBG Public Infrastructure |
| | Goal Description | Funding of water/sewer or other infrastructure projects. |

# AP-25 Allocation Priorities

**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 New Afford able Hous ing (%) | CDBG Sin gle Fa mil y Ho usi ng Reh ab (%) | CDB G Pub lic Faci litie s (%) | CDB G Othe r Afford abl e Hous ing (%) | Make Homel essnes s Rare (%) | Make Homel essnes s Brief (%) | Make Homel essnes s Non- Recurr ing (%) | CD BG Pub lic Ser vice s (%) | CDBG Admini stratio n and Planni ng (%) | CDBG Econo mic Devel opme nt (%) | HOP WA- Assis tanc e for Pers ons with HIV/ AIDS (%) | CDBG Public Infrast ructur e (%) | To ta l (% ) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CD BG | 0 | 16 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 43 | 10 0 |
| HO ME | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 0 |
| HO PW A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 10 0 |
| ESG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 42 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 0 |
| HTF | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 0 |

**Table 52 – 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.

## How will the proposed distribution of funds will 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 objective described in the Consolidated Plan

# AP-30 Methods of Distribution

## Distribution Methods

**Table 53 - 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 to 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. |
| | **Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories.** | All resources will be used to address the need for additional funding for new affordable housing. |
| | **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 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 Board 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 purchase 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. |
| | **Describe all of the criteria that will be used to select applications and the relative importance of these criteria.** | 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. A perfect application would have a score of 100 points. The most important criteria are new capacity and loan leveraging, both of which have a possible value of twenty-five points. More new affordable units, and a higher leveraging ratio will earn an applicant more points. AMI targeting, worth a maximum of 10 points, is the next most valuable criteria. Projects which target a lower income population receive higher scores. Rehabilitation, community support and county population are all worth a possible ten 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 worth 5 points. This criteria awards 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 receive up to 5 points for incorporating green energy efficiency elements into their projects. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories.** | HCD uses federal HOME funds specifically to support our multi-family housing program and also our single family Self Help Program |
| | **Describe threshold factors and grant size limits.** | OWHLF does not award more than one million to any one applicant. Applicants which are building multi-stage projects are allowed to submit for more funds upon initiation of a new phase of their construction. The OWHLF board has discretion to award more than one million 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), Housing and Community Development Division, 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. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Describe all of the criteria that will be used to select applications and the relative importance of these criteria.** | 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.  HPO released a request for proposal 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 equitable among the providers and client needs throughout the state. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Identify the method of selecting project sponsors (including providing full access to grassroots faith-based and other community-based organizations). (HOPWA only)** | 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. | |
| | The funding allocation is a competitive process that begins with a Request for Proposal (RFP). This competitive process includes the review of proposals and funding recommendations offered by a diverse 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. | |
| | The State HOPWA program posts public notice for RFP in the on the Department of Workforce Services Grant page (https://jobs.utah.gov/department/rfg/index.html) and the HCD Homelessness Programs grant page (https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/homelessness/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. | |
| **Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories.** | HCD 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 HCD 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. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Describe threshold factors and grant size limits.** | There are no limits or threshold factors in the awarding of HOPWA funds. |
| | **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 essential services to homeless individuals and families. ESG provides housing relocation 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 Proposal (RFP) process. The HCD Homelessness Funding application process includes ESG, TANF, HOPWA and state appropriations in order to coordinate priorities and to meet the match requirement for ESG funding. The State Homeless Coordinating Committee (SHCC) sets state priorities for the competitive grant process based on HUD Hearth Act, HUD priorities in regard the chronic, veterans, families and youth as well as the specific needs identified in collaboration with partners and CoCs. HCD coordinates the review process with SHCC Allocation Committee which includes CoC leadership and the Collaborative Applicant Lead Agency in order to align goals and resources. HCD utilizes ESG for applications that support HUD goals and objectives. The Allocation Committee is given scoring criteria for each section of the application including: General Information, Project Information, Agency Overview, Funding Purpose, Project Inventory, Project Allowable Activities, Project Description, Funding Gap Analysis, Homelessness Budget, and required Application Attachments. HCD follows HUD direction to allocate no more that 60% of ESG funds for shelter and outreach. The primary focus is Rapid Rehousing dollars for those staying in shelters who are literally homeless and street outreach to identify unsheltered households and offer services and housing. | |
| **Describe the process for awarding funds to state recipients and how the state will make its allocation available**<br><br>**to units of general local government, and non-profit organizations, including community and faith-based**<br><br>**organizations. (ESG only)** | The State of Utah, Housing and Community Development (HCD), has consolidated both state and federal sources of homelessness program grants into a single application process, HCD Homelessness Funding. This competitive RFP 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.<br><br>A statewide allocation plan was developed by an allocation committee and approved by the interagency council on homelessness (the State Homeless Coordinating Committee (SHCC)). The HCD Homelessness Programs Office oversees the funding process for proposals from programs statewide that serve homeless persons according to HUD's definition of homelessness. All agencies 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 SHCC, Allocation Committee scores and prioritizes funding proposals, then, creates recommendations regarding the distribution of ESG. The recommendations are presented to the SHCC for final approval. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **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, Street Outreach and Rapid Rehousing projects throughout the state that target only literally homeless and those who are most vulnerable, HCD expects the following outcomes: 1) Reduction in the number of people living on the streets or in emergency shelter, 2) Reduction in the length of time individuals and households remain homeless, and 3) Increase in exits to a permanent housing destinations. |
| **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. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Describe all of the criteria that will be used to select applications and the relative importance of these criteria.** | Annually, Utah provides an allocation to each of the regional associations of governments AOGs who then score applications based on approved rating and ranking systems. The 2019 State allocation will be divided 7 ways. Cities over 50,000 and counties over 200,000 in population receive their own allocations of federal CDBG funds directly from HUD and are not factored into this calculation. Each AOG has developed its own rating and ranking system to determine how to award CDBG funds to applicants. The 8 mandated criteria are as follows: | |
| | 1) "Capacity to carry out the grant". In other words the grantee must have a history of successful grant administration in order to receive full points in this category. | |
| | 2) "Job creation". Points are given to projects that create or retain jobs. | |
| | 3) "Housing stock". Housing is a state priority. Housing projects that improve or expand affordable housing stock are given additional points. | |
| | 4) ."Affordable housing plan". Utah House Bill 295 requires all cities and counties to address the problems associated with the availability of affordable housing in their community's plan. | |
| | 5) "Extent of Poverty". Points are given for the percentage of low-income, and very low-income persons benefiting either from the project or carried out in a low-income community. | |
| | 6) "Financial commitment to community development". Points are given to communities who show commitment based on criteria selected by the regional AOGs. | |
| | 7) "Project Maturity". Each application must contain a specific and detailed scope of work that contains a narrative description and a detailed. cost estimate. The AOG should determine the immediate viability of the project. Leveraging is also considered as part of this criteria. | |
| | 8) "Planning". The AOGs review the 5-year Consolidated Plans, as well as more recent annual updates to the consolidated plan, when available, and then establish regional priorities and award points accordingly. | |
| | Additional criteria chosen by each AOG can be added to the criteria listed above. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **If only summary criteria were described, how can potential applicants access application manuals or other state publications describing the application criteria? (CDBG only)** | The Utah Small Cities CDBG program in Utah goes to great lengths to ensure that all eligible applicants are notified and prepared to apply for CDBG funds. On an annual basis the State holds 12 How-to-Apply workshops throughout the state. Counties, cities, towns, and private and public service providers are invited to attend. In this workshop State staff and AOG representatives present and review the annually updated CDBG Application Policies and Procedures manual. This manual clearly outlines the procedures for applying for CDBG funds. It explains the CDBG rating and ranking systems, important deadlines, and all other information needed to successfully apply for funds. These workshops are well attended. State and AOG Staff are all made available to applicants. The application policies and procedures manual is also on CDBGs website at https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/community/cdbg/publications.html | |
| **Describe how resources will be allocated among funding categories.** | CDBG funding categories include admin, planning, technical assistance, housing, public facilities, public services, and "other". Each AOG has developed their own rating and ranking system according to the needs of their regions. The rating and ranking systems promote certain project types over others. However, regional funding priorities reflect the needs of the region.  The state has final approval authority over these systems, and they must include the state's mandatory elements (Capacity to Carry Out the Grant, Job Creation, Housing Stock, Affordable Housing Plan, Extent of Poverty, Financial Commitment to Community Development, Project Maturity, Planning). The rating and ranking systems are evaluated each year and modifications are made. Special efforts continue to eliminate subjectivity and create clearer scoring criteria. | |
| **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 2019 Method of Distribution uses a formula that takes into account the following criteria that are applied to each region.<br><br>% of State LMI Population<br><br>Average Poverty Rate<br><br>Pre 1980 Housing<br><br>Pre-Approved LMI Communities<br><br>This formula will focus resources in the rural communities that have the greatest need. | |

## AP-35 Projects

**Introduction:**

HCD awards funds throughout the duration of the program year and will enter those projects in an amended plan once HCD is aware of all of them.

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

Allocation priorities are based on estimates of how funding will be spent between the various priorities identified in this plan. All funds allocated by HUD to HCD are employed in addressing underserved needs such as affordable housing, homeless needs, and community development. The primary obstacle in addressing underserved needs is a lack of funding from government and private sources, which could address needs.

## AP-40 Section 108 Loan Guarantee

**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

## AP-45 Community Revitalization Strategies

**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

## AP-50 Geographic Distribution

**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 HCD, are distributed by geography are CDBG funds which are distributed to seven regional bodies. These seven regional organizations independently determine their priorities and make funding decisions. Within rural Utah there are a great many communities which are low income. None of these are designated racial or ethnic areas of poverty (RCAP or ECAPs). None of the seven regional organizations have 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. The percentage of funds which they receive in relation to the total funds the four 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 54 - Geographic Distribution**

**Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically**

HOME, HOPWA and ESG funds are not distributed geographically. CDBG funds are distributed to the seven regional associations of government. The percentage of funds which they receive in relation to the total funds the five CPD programs receive is listed above in table 10. As stated earlier in the "Method of Distribution" section of this document, CDBG funds are divided equally between the regions. NHTF funds prioritize rural areas in their project scoring methodology. However, the NHTF allocation plan does not have a set aside for specific rural areas.

## AP-55 Affordable Housing

| One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported | |
|---|---|
| Homeless | 150 |
| Non-Homeless | 471 |
| Special-Needs | 20 |
| Total | 641 |

**Table 55 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement**

| One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through | |
|---|---|
| Rental Assistance | 178 |
| The Production of New Units | 45 |
| Rehab of Existing Units | 405 |
| Acquisition of Existing Units | 13 |
| Total | 641 |

**Table 56 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type**

### Discussion:

The CDBG program assists 8 persons with rental assistance, 20 persons with production of new units, 395 persons with rehab of existing units, and 8 persons with acquisition of existing units. The HOME and HTF programs plan on assisting 25 persons with construction of new units, 10 persons with rehab of existing units, and 5 persons with acquisition of existing units. The ESG Program plans on assisting 150 persons with rental assistance. The HOPWA program plans on assisting 20 persons with rental assistance.

## AP-60 Public Housing

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

The State of Utah CDBG program has historically provided funding to cities and counties that pass through grants to the following rural housing authorities that operate public housing units:  Beaver City (18), Carbon County (121), Emery County (24) and Tooele (22). Most of the funding is used for multi-family housing rehabilitation.

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

All public housing residents are given notice of the HA board meetings and are invited to attend.  Most of the PHA's have resident meetings that are held as needed to discuss any issues. Aside from a homeownership assistance program at Weber Housing Authority, we are unaware of any homeownership assistance programs being offered by the other housing authorities.

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

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

# AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities

## Introduction

The effort to ensure that episodes of homelessness are rare, brief and non-recurring is a coordinated and systematic statewide approach. Agencies throughout the state are approaching homelessness through a "Housing First" model. The National Housing Trust Fund 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 NHTF funds will assist extremely low income households and prevent many from experiencing bouts of homelessness.

The State of Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness outlines several goals to make homelessness in Utah rare, brief, and non-recurring. The goals are evaluated annually. Refer to page 4, 10, 14, 16, and 17 of the State Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness.
https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/homelessness/shcc/documents/homelessnessstrategicplan.pdf.

1. Fewer days spent in emergency beds or shelters

2. Fewer persons returning to homelessness

3. Fewer first-time individuals who experience homelessness

4. More persons successfully retaining housing

## 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

Benchmarks

Benchmark 1: Fewer first-time individuals who experience homelessness

SPM Baseline: Number of persons who become homeless for the first time (SPM 5) in Utah for FFY17, averaged for the three CoC's is 3,378. Benchmark will be reestablished using FFY19 SPM by spring of 2020.

Benchmark 2: Fewer days spent in emergency beds or shelters.

SPM Baseline: Length of time persons remain homeless (SPM 1) indicates that the average length of stay in an emergency shelter statewide in FFY18 was 52 days in FFY18. Benchmark will be reestablished using FFY19 SPM by spring of 2020.

Benchmark 3: Fewer persons returning to homelessness, and more persons successfully retaining housing.

SPM Baseline: The Extent to which Persons Who Exit Homelessness to Permanent Housing Destinations Return to Homelessness (SPM 2). In FFY17 an average of 34 percent of persons who exit homelessness

to permanent housing destinations return to homelessness. Benchmark will be reestablished using FFY19 SPM by spring of 2020.

Benchmark 4: Fewer persons returning to homelessness, and more persons successfully retaining housing.

SPM Baseline: Successful Placement in, or Retention of, Permanent Housing (SPM 7). In FFY17, on average Utah CoC's had 89 percent of persons who were housed in permanent housing projects other than rapid rehousing exited to or retained permanent housing.

**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/or emergency motel vouchers exist to ensure that no lives are lost due to inadequate sheltering. Utilizing state funds, HCD 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. Housing and Community Development (HCD) encourages best practices be used in temporary shelter or when housing individuals and families. In addition, HCD awarded emergency shelters with rapid rehousing dollars in order to facilitate a timely and appropriate exit from shelter in order to support outcomes and measures for funding. HCD funds transitional housing in limited instances where studies have shown that it is effective among certain sub-populations.

Refer to pages 25-35 of the State Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness.
https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/homelessness/shcc/documents/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**

HCD 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 decrease the amount of time a household will experience homelessness. Additionally, State ESG rapid rehousing 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 Rehousing projects report on 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 pages 25-35 of the State Utah Strategic Plan on Homelessness.
https://jobs.utah.gov/housing/homelessness/shcc/documents/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 HCD is committed to supporting these efforts. TANF, HOPWA and CSBG grants are distributed state-wide 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 supports and supervision. HCD 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 on the State Homeless Coordinating

Committee and work with Local Homeless Coordinating Committees to connect inmates being released to housing, emergency shelter and other community resources. Additionally, services are provided to inmates to reduce recidivism and 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.

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. HCD will ensure that housing units originally targeted to support discharged populations continue to target those populations. HCD will ensure that service providers are tapped into the State of Utah's affordable housing database of property and unit listings.

## AP-65 HOPWA Goals

| 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 | 21 |
| Tenant-based rental assistance | 20 |
| Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds | 3 |
| Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds | 0 |
| Total | 44 |

# AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing

**Introduction:**

Housing Affordability is an issue that 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. HCD works with cities to eliminate barriers to fair housing. State law requires communities to compete 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.

In addition, the new NHTF monies are being used to create new affordable housing for extremely low income households. While this is an important part of creating new affordable housing, NHTF funds will not be used in efforts to remove barriers to affordable housing at the local level.

**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 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. Trainings on this new technology are 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.

## AP-85 Other Actions

**Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs**

The biggest obstacle to underserved needs in the small cities 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 allocation has dropped from a high of $8.2 million in 2003 to only $4.86 million in 2017. There simply isn't enough funding to meet the community development needs of the communities. Critical infrastructure projects; water, sewer, and public safety continue to be a high priority. With only $500,000 - $600,000 available in most regions, only one or two of these projects can be funded in each region, and their size and scope is limited. 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 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 in 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 rehousing programs since it must meet all the rent reasonableness and fair market rent requirements. ESG sub-recipients 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 (LMI) 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 LMI persons to stay in their homes.

In addition, the National Housing Trust Fund will be used to create new affordable housing for extremely low income households. This is an important part of HCDs 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 6 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 funding.

## Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

By promoting affordable housing and the rapid rehousing of homeless households, HCD promotes stability and a footing for families to build the stability to earn enough to no longer be impoverished. Also case management and counseling is 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 HCD is allowing poverty level

households a level of stability not otherwise possible.

**Actions planned to develop institutional structure**

There are no plans to change the method in which the federal block grant programs allocate their funds. 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 on the Utah State Homelessness Coordinating Committee (SHCC). The SHCC is committed to coordinating the efforts of public private and social service agencies in addressing homelessness. The SHCC and HCD efforts have been a valuable contribution towards federal goals to end homelessness. SHCC has pioneered efforts to demonstrate the value and feasibility of coordination between public private and social service agencies. The Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund also reaches out to both public private and social service agencies in its efforts. HCD works with cities, non-profits, and private developers and contractors in the course of completing its work.

The CDBG program allocates funding to seven regional organizations. Application workshops are held throughout the state and the 10 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 multi-family 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. 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.

# AP-90 Program Specific Requirements

## Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)

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)

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:

   Contracts issued by the Division of Housing and Community Development for projects funded by Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund Board (using HOME funds and state match including program income) include language that requires adherence to recapture provisions per CFR 92.254 (a)

(5).  The promissory note for loans also restates the recapture requirement and the affordability period. Under the recapture option selected by HCD, the division will recover all of the HOME assistance or share in net proceeds at the time of the sale by the borrower/grantee. HCD homeownership loans are non-repercussion loans and HCD will not seek additional recompense beyond the outstanding value of the loan. Depending upon each particular project, HCD will apply one of the basic options for recapture:

1. HCD can recapture the balance remaining on the entire amount of the HOME assistance from the borrower/grantee if the property is sold during the HUD affordability period; if no payments have been made HCD will recapture the entire balance of the loan,

2. HCD can elect to reduce the amount of HOME assistance to be repaid on a pro-rata basis according to the amount of the affordability period the borrower/grantee has owned and occupied the property,

3. HCD and the borrower/grantee can share the net proceeds of the sale of the property based upon the ratio of the HOME assistance provided to the sum of the borrower/grantee's investment plus the HOME assistance, or

4. HCD may allow the borrower/grantee to recover his/her entire investment before any of the HOME assistance is repaid to the HCD from the remaining net proceeds of the sale of the property.

In most cases, HCD will apply option #1 above.  There are no restrictions on the price of the property or an income requirement of the buyer.  Upon recapture, the affordability period is terminated. HCD will identify the returned funds as program income and use the returned funds for other HOME-eligible activities.

In cases of foreclosure, HCD will recapture the amount from net proceeds available from the sale rather than the entire amount of the HOME investment.  If there are no net proceeds from the foreclosure, repayment to the HOME account is not required and HOME affordability requirements are considered satisfied.

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:

Only rarely does HCD apply resale provisions. Resale option is typically used in areas where it is difficult to obtain affordable housing such as areas with high home prices, rapidly appreciating housing costs, shortage of affordable homes and no land available. In this case, the property must remain affordable for the length of the HUD designated affordability period. If the original borrower/grantee sells the property, it must be sold to a buyer with an AMI between 65%-80%. Depending upon each particular project, HCD will ensure that the resale price must provide the original borrower with a "fair return on investment" which includes any initial investment by the

borrower as well as any capital investment. The fair return will be based off of the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index over the period of ownership. In a declining market, a loss of investment may constitute a "fair return on investment". Capital investments must increase the value of the home, prolong the life of the home, adapt it to new uses and last longer than one year. Capital improvements may include, but are not limited to the following: new roof, additions to the home, kitchen or bathroom modernization, landscaping, fence.

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.

## Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)

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 centralized or coordinated assessment system that meets HUD requirements, describe that centralized or coordinated assessment system.

HCD 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 Coordinating Committees (LHCCs) by way of the coordinated assessment workgroup. Below are explanations of how the three CoCs have implemented a coordinated assessment system

The Balance of State (BoS) consists of 25 out of 29 counties throughout Utah. The BoS consists of 11 LHCCS. The majority of the LHCCs utilize the coordinated entry system within HMIS. The BoS CoC is also currently uses the Vulnerability Index - Service Prioritization Decision Assistance Tool (VI-SPDAT) as an initial assessment tool as a way of identifying vulnerable and chronically homeless persons that will be placed on a community-based housing wait list. Coordinated Entry policies allow participation from agencies that provide services to survivors of domestic violence. Each LHCC has developed a specific policy on how its particular system will address the needs of individuals and families who are fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking, but who are seeking shelter or services from non-victim service providers, as well as Emergency Transfer Plans to assist in keeping all clients safe.

The 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 Entry system through United Way 2-1-1. Following the initial assessment, 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, DV survivors where housing is an element of their overall safety, and homeless families with children where family unity is essential.

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. Our 211 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 two years. All homeless families and those individuals prioritized for PSH 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 available to private nonprofit organizations (including community and faith-based organizations).

State ESG funds are allocated through the State's Request for Proposal (RFP) process:

The Homelessness Programs Office (HPO) develops the RFP that outlines the resources and regulations that are used to define and disseminate funding requirements, performance standards, contractual overview and application scoring guidance. HPO issues a press release publicizing the RFP release, and provides state-wide training on submission requirements. 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 and the application is closed, the HPO staff and the State Homeless Coordinating Committee (SHCC) sub-committee for Allocation, whose membership is comprised of SHCC, LHCC and CoC representation begins reviewing the applications and score them based on projected LHCC support, services being provided, past performance and strength of application. A list of allocation recommendations is made to the SHCC, which is chaired by the Lt. Governor and is representative of homeless stakeholders statewide including the CoC chair (or designee) from each of the three CoCs.

Consultation and coordination for allocation of funding and development of performance standards takes place with the CoCs through the State Homeless Coordinating Committee (SHCC), the Local Homeless Coordinating Committees (LHCC), and Utah Homeless Network (UHN). UHN includes:

- Department of Workforce Services, Housing and Community Development Staff
- HUD Collaborative Applicant Staff
  - Balance of State CoC
  - Mountainland CoC
  - Salt Lake CoC
- Bear River LHCC Chair
- Carbon/Emery LHCC Chair
- Davis LHCC Chair
- Grand LHCC Chair
- Iron LHCC Chair
- Mountainland LHCC Chair
- Salt Lake LHCC Chair
- San Juan LHCC Chair
- Six County LHCC Chair
- Tooele LHCC Chair
- Uintah LHCC Chair
- Washington LHCC Chair
- Weber LHCC Chair

Through the SHCC, Utah evaluates progress annually and works collaboratively with the Local Homeless Coordinating Committees (LHCC) to develop performance improvement plans. The LHCCs are the designated local oversight bodies that are responsible to:

1) Develop a common agenda and vision for reducing homelessness in their respective regions;

2) Develop a spending plan that coordinates the funding supplied to local stakeholders;

3) Monitor the progress toward achieving state and local goals; and

4) Align local funding to projects that are improving outcomes and targeting specific needs in the community.

**Allocation Process for ESG and Homelessness Programs Funding:**

- State ESG funds are administered by the Utah Department of Workforce Services, Housing and Community Development Division (HCD). Funds are allocated through the HCD Homelessness Programs Funding (HPF) process.
- The HPF is one competitive grant process that includes ESG, HOPWA, Temporary Assistance for

Needy Families (TANF) for homelessness, state general fund in the Pamela Atkinson Homeless Trust Funds (PAHTF), and state appropriated funding through the Homeless to Housing Restricted account. These funds are, with few exceptions, dedicated to those who are literally homeless as defined by HUD.

- Funding priorities and allocation recommendations are determined through local prioritization processes which take into consideration project performance standards and outcomes.
- LHCC funding recommendations are presented to the Allocation Committee, a sub-committee of SHCC. The Allocation Committee includes representatives from the SHCC voting members or their designees as well as representatives from the CoC.

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.*

Working closely with the three CoCs in the state as well as other funders and service providers, HPO representatives provided direction and support for how funding priorities are considered in Emergency Solutions Grant allocations. Utilizing data sources like the annual 'Point in Time Count' and UHMIS outputs, HPO HMIS team workes to assess progress on shared metrics such as an individual's average length of homelessness, likelihood to return to homelessness, and the percent of exits from emergency shelter, transitional housing, and rapid rehousing projects to permanent housing.

HPO representatives actively participate in meetings regarding the funding, policies and procedures for the administration of the Utah Homeless Management Information System (UHMIS). UHMIS helps homeless providers coordinate care, manage operations, and better serve clients by tracking client service needs over time. All ESG-funded entities participate in UHMIS. HPO works with CoC representatives to develop and share consistent UHMIS Standard Operating Procedures, UHMIS Data Quality Plan, and UHMIS training. All of which provides guidance on HMIS data elements for CoCs. UHMIS leadership also monitors all HMIS participating projects, including all State ESG funded projects.

**Housing Trust Fund (HTF)**

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 30% 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 on the OWHLF housing.utah.gov webpage. These application are submitted to Daniel Herbert-Voss at dhvoss@utah.gov. Application must be submitted 6 weeks prior to quarterly board meetings. The dates of these board meeting are available at housing.utah.gov. The next two OWHLF board meetings are on July 18, 2020 and October 24, 2020. Applicants are usually in communication with Daniel throughout the application process. Applicants are then brought before the OWHLF board and the board approves or denies the request for funds. As part of the board review, OWHLF staff make a recommendation to fund or not fund an applicant.

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".

So far all applicants who have units below 30% AMI have been awarded funds. The state has a method to score applicants should funding decisions be made between eligible applicants, but so far that has not

been the case.

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. A small 2-point bonus is given to projects in rural 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. This decision is determined during project underwriting and 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 with project based rental assistance are given a 2 point boost in the project scoring process.

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. No additional points are awarded for projects guaranteeing affordability beyond the 30 year affordability period.

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".

We require 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 encouraged but is not a criteria in the scoring of projects.

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 has chosen to use 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. The following table indicated the per unit subsidy:

SRO/Studio:  $152,367
1BR: $174,669
2BR: $212,394
3BR: $274,770
4BR: $301,612

8. **Rehabilitation Standards.**  The grantee must establish rehabilitation standards for all HTF-assisted housing rehabilitation activities that set forth the requirements that the housing must meet 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; and Capital Needs Assessments (if applicable).

Rehabilitation Standards will be attached as a separate document.

9. **Resale or Recapture Guidelines.**  Below, the grantee must enter (or attach) 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".

☑ The grantee has determined its own affordable homeownership limits using the methodology described in § 93.305(a)(2) and the limits are attached.

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