

2021 UTAH COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT (CAPER)

Performance of the HOME, CDBG, ESG, HTF, and HOPWA Programs for federal program year
2021

For comments or
questions contact:
Elias Wise
State of Utah-
Department of
Workforce Services
Housing and Community
Development Division
(HCD) 140 E 300 S SLC
Utah 84111
ewise@utah.gov (385)
535-7952

Contents

CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes	3
CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted	9
CR-15 - Resources and Investments	11
CR-20 - Affordable Housing	17
CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs	20
CR-30 - Public Housing	24
CR-35 - Other Actions	25
CR-40 - Monitoring	28
CR-50 - HOME	30
CR-55 - HOPWA	33
CR-56 - HTF	34
CR-60 - ESG	35
CR-65 - Persons Assisted	42
CR-70 - Assistance Provided and Outcomes	46
CR-75 - Expenditures	47

CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes

In the 2021 program year, HCD continued its efforts to address its priorities of creating new affordable housing, promoting a sustainable Utah, and making homelessness rare, brief, and non-recurring.

In FY21 HCD funded eight projects with HOME funds and another 3 with HTF funds. The HOME projects were funded with a combination of FY 20 funds, FY 21 funds and program income. For HTF projects, the projects funded were funded with mostly FY 20 funds. The one project funded with 2021 funds included both HOME and HTF funds. This activity has not been completed and will not show up as resulting in accomplishments within this CAPER. Other projects have been approved for funding with FY 21 funds but those funds have not yet been allocated to them. HOME and HTF projects take years to complete and while many projects are completed each year very few have been completed during that same program year in which they are funded.

The CDBG priorities of the state policy committee in Program Year 2021 again were Public Facilities, Infrastructure and Single Family Housing Rehab, in coordination with the CDBG supported administration and planning groups within the seven rural regional areas. The 2021 CDBG allocation supported 9 Public Facilities projects, 11 Infrastructure projects, 13 Housing Projects for Single Family Housing Rehabilitation and Homeownership activities, and 3 Public Service projects in support of operations and planning activities. Additionally, in alignment with the Amended 2019 Annual Action Plan, the PY21 CDBG-CV activities included 1. Supplementing five current CDBG funded projects to mitigate delays and cost overruns for COVID-19 appropriate project/activities that mainly included water infrastructure. 2. Alterations to seven public facilities providing services to those most at risk of having serious complications if contracting COVID-19, such as senior centers and community centers. 3. Public Services include Transport resources and Personal Protective Equipment distributed to thirteen public service providers including community services providers, public safety and school offices. 4. Economic Development and Job Retention Activities through the seven regional areas across the state that assisted small Business and micro-enterprise agencies in Utah's rural communities and small cities. 5. Supporting Housing activities through five projects that provided mortgage/rent relief to keep clients from becoming homeless and will increase housing stock.

The State of Utah was able to achieve the targets as outlined for the ESG and HOPWA programs. The specific measures and goals identified were focused around the outputs of the different funding sources and volume of services provided. In future plans, goals will be considered that more closely reflect the progress of the different interventions as they relate to ending homelessness. One specific measure from this period, the number of beds added to the emergency shelter response, is especially high due to the influx of ESG Covid 19 funding that was braided with

	CAPER	3
--	-------	---

traditional ESG funding. This resulted in a large increase in shelter beds reflected in these measures.

Comparison of the proposed versus actual outcomes for each outcome measure submitted with the 2020 consolidated plan and explain, if applicable, why progress was not made toward meeting goals and objectives.

Goal Name	Category	Needs Addressed	Funding	Actual Funding	Goal	Actual Outcome
HOME and HTF New Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing	Housing affordability	HOME: \$13,439,537 HTF: \$5,712,553	HOME: \$3,875,238 HTF: \$1,620,249	Rental units constructed: 20 Household Housing Unit Rental units rehabilitated: 10 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Added: 10 Household Housing Unit	Rental units constructed: 0 Household Housing Unit Rental units rehabilitated: 0 Household Housing Unit Homeowner Housing Added: 0 Household Housing Unit
CDBG Single Family Housing Rehab	Affordable Housing	CDBG Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$560,616	CDBG: \$431,808.44	Homeowner units rehabilitated: 52 Household Housing Unit	Homeowner units rehabilitated: 61 Household Housing Unit
CDBG Public Facilities	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG Community Capital Improvements	CDBG: \$1,833,347	CDBG: \$1,338,519	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 18,139 Households Assisted	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing

						Benefit: 15,343 Households Assisted
Make Homelessness Rare	Homeless	Make Homelessness Rare	ESG: \$403,127	ESG:	Homelessness Prevention: 310 Persons Assisted	Homelessness Prevention: 686 Persons Assisted
Make Homelessness Brief	Homeless	Make Homelessness Brief	ESG: \$564,378	ESG:	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter: 2500 Persons Assisted Overnight/Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing Beds added: 25 Beds	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter: 3408 Persons Assisted Overnight/Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing Beds added: 177* Beds
Make Homelessness Non-Recurring	Homeless	Make Homelessness Non-Recurring	ESG: \$376,252	ESG:	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 150 Households Assisted	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 204 Households Assisted
CDBG Public Services	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG Public Services	CDBG: 30,000	CDBG: \$50,029	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 0 Households Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: _____ Households Assisted	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 0 Households Assisted Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: Households Assisted: 335

CDBG Administration and Planning	Admin/Planning	CDBG Administration and Planning	CDBG: \$459,000	CDBG: \$300,920	Other: 0 Other N/A	Other: 0 Other N/A
CDBG Economic Development	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG Economic Development	CDBG: \$0.00	CDBG: \$0	Jobs created/retained: 0 Businesses assisted: 0	Jobs created/retained: 0 Businesses assisted: 0
HOPWA-Assistance for Persons with HIV/AIDS	Non-Homeless Special Needs	HOPWA Support HIV/AIDS housing and case management	HOPWA: \$251,411	HOPWA:	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 20 Households Assisted HIV/AIDS Housing Operations: 24 Household Housing Unit	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 20 Households Assisted HIV/AIDS Housing Operations: 30 Household Housing Unit
CDBG Public Infrastructure	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG Public Infrastructure	CDBG: \$2,964,636	CDBG: \$609,204	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 500 Households Assisted	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 2978 Households Assisted

Table 1 - Accomplishments – Program Year & Strategic Plan to Date

1. CDBG-CV Public Infrastructure	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG Public Infrastructure	3.2020 to 6/30/2022	CDBG: \$289,656	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: reported on mainstream projects	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Households
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------	-----------------	---	---

2. CDBG-CV Public Services	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG Public Services	3.2020 to 6/30/2022	CDBG: \$2,618,522.5	Urgent need (no income data collected), Low/Mod Community (presumed 51%) and Low/Mod Income (100%) activities to prepare, prevent and respond to COVID-19.	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Benefit: 37,882 Assisted Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Benefit: Households Assisted: 315
3. CDBG-CV Public Services Housing - Rent/Mortga ge Assistance	Affordable Housing	CDBG Affordable Housing	3.2020 to 6/30/2022	CDBG: 40996.5	Rent/Mortgage assistance provided to keep clients at risk of homelessness in their homes	Assisted Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Benefit: Households Assisted: 23
4. CDBG-CV Administration and Planning	Admin/Planning	CDBG Administration and Planning	3.2020 to 6/30/2022	CDBG: \$447,252.36	AOG administration that identifies most urgent needs in unique regional areas of rural Utah	Other: Other N/A
5. CDBG-CV Economic Development	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG Economic Development	3.2020 to 6/30/2022	CDBG: For Profit Small Businesses assistance: 1,472,798 Micro- Enterprise	For Profit Small Business and Micro-Enterprise Business Assistance to retain jobs and support economic recovery after COVID-19	Jobs created/retained: 0 For Profit Businesses assisted: 21 Micro-Enterprise assisted: 319 TA to 40 Assisted Businesses

				assisted: \$2,718,519 TA assistance \$50,000		
6. CDBG-CV Public Facilities	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG Community Capital Improvements	3.2020 to 6/30/2022	CDBG: \$568,151.77	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit, primarily improvements to Senior Centers and Homeless services facilities	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: Households Assisted 20,846
7. CDBG-CV Single Family Housing	Housing - Community Development - Affordable Housing	CDBG Affordable Housing acquisition of Real Property	3.2020 to 6/30/2022	CDBG: \$250,000 ⁴	Homeowner units rehabilitated for rental to Low Income clients	Homeowner units rehabilitated: 5 Household Housing Unit

Assess how the jurisdiction's use of funds, particularly CDBG, addresses the priorities and specific objectives identified in the plan, giving special attention to the highest priority activities identified.

In FY21 HCD funded 1 project with HOME and HTF funds. This project included both HOME and HTF funding. No activities begun during FY21 has been completed or closed out in IDIS. HCD is aware that almost all HOME and HTF projects are not completed in the same year as they are funded. This is due to many factors, primarily that most funded activities are large new construction multi-family projects that take a long time to build. HCD makes goals based on the anticipated accomplishments that will eventually occur in subsequent program years. These eventual accomplishments may be reflected in following years and show up as being accomplished in the "strategic plan period". However, since we are reporting on the first year of the five year consolidated plan period and we cannot report on accomplishments realized on projects funded

during the previous consolidated plan period, we have nothing to report at this time.

The Utah State Small Cities CDBG Program's Method of Distribution (MOD) is designed so that each of the seven region's Association of Governments (AOG) determines their own priorities that meet the state program's goal of "Increase Sustainability of Rural Utah". In 2021, each AOG received an annual allocation amount to be awarded to grantees based through the regional scoring criteria. Highest priority activities receive a higher score during the rating and ranking process. As in years past, most of the funding was targeted to infrastructure improvements, critical public facilities and single family housing rehabilitation. Four of the seven AOG's prioritize funding to address the substandard housing in their regions. Economic development activities have been eliminated as a viable priority in the Utah CDBG program due to the small allocation that Utah receives except for those eligible activities carried out by the AOG's. Utah's Small Cities CDBG program completed 35 projects with CDBG annual mainstream PY20 and 21 funds of \$5,309,402, with 7% supporting local administrative activities.

CDBG CV funding was distributed to AOGs using the same method, and the AOGs worked with area representatives to determine the most urgent need in their communities that follow HUD's guidelines of Prevent, Prepare and Respond to the COVID-19 pandemic. Evident from the table reflecting the CV activities, several hundred Utah small, for-profit organizations were assisted with rent, utilities and payroll costs, with a projected 90% success rate. Many infrastructure projects that were in the process of working on potable water supply was deeply affected by the pandemic's effects on supply chain issues and long lead times were assisted with needed funding streams that increased the ability to complete the projects and maintain the safety and sanitary services, meeting the high demands of those community members required to stay indoors in an effort to mitigate the risk of spreading the disease. In addition, the increased need for client services of providing meals to homebound community members, emergency rent/mortgage payments, as well as those in need of emergency food assistance, were met with programmatic transportation vehicles. Administrative services of project identification, awarding and management was 5% of total expenditures.

CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted

Describe the families assisted (including the racial and ethnic status of families assisted).

	CDBG-CV	CDBG	HOME	HOPWA	ESG	HTF
White	72,875	32,607	0	19	4537	0
Black or African American	296	298	0	22	555	0
Asian	823	443	0	3	74	0
American Indian or American Native	184	180	0	2	456	0
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	207	99	0	0	143	0
2 or more races, Other	165	1384				
Total	112642	36,620	0			0

Hispanic	7761	3996	0	5	1169	0
Not Hispanic	104881	32,624	0	41	4583	0

Table 2 – Table of assistance to racial and ethnic populations by source of funds

Narrative

The numbers reported in this section do not exactly match other reports submitted to HUD, or maintained internally. The reason for this is that the categories listed here do not include many racial categories used in our reporting such as "multiple races" or instances in which the client declines or refuses to report this information. For example, with the ESG program, there were 281 persons who indicated that they were multiple races, and an additional 263 in which the client didn't know or refused to answer regarding their race. Nearly all racial and ethnic minorities are overrepresented in the population served by ESG when compared to the population of Utah as a whole. Black or African American and American Indian or American Native individuals are most disproportionately represented among those receiving ESG-fund assistance, at approximately 6 and 4 times, respectively, their percentage of the total population. The State Office of Homeless Services is working with the local Continuum of Care to plan ways to address these ethnic and racial disparities. HOME reported no families assisted because funding is pledged to multi-family housing developments which take multiple years to complete and we are unable to report accomplishments on those at this time.

Four out of the seven regional Association of Governments (AOG) operate single family housing rehab and homebuyer assistance programs. Senior centers, fire stations, community sidewalks; community parks, ect. benefit entire communities. It is difficult to determine the exact racial and ethnic makeup of those being served, or who will benefit upon project completion. CDBG staff continues to provide technical assistance to all organizations that carry out these activities to ensure that, to the greatest extent possible, minority and non-English speaking populations have equal access to programs funded with these dollars. The CDBG Grantee Handbook includes a Language Access Plan template. All grantees are encouraged to adopt this plan to provide access to programs and activities by persons with limited English Proficiency. The handbook also includes non-entitlement communities and the percent of populations who speak Spanish, I Speak Cards for language reference and a list of interpretation/translation providers. CDBG has expanded the methodology used to determine the count of beneficiaries for all projects, not just Single Family Housing Rehab and the Homebuyers Assistance program.

The number of total persons assisted as divided between racial categories and the total number of persons assisted as divided between Hispanic and non-Hispanic do not equal the same number. This is due to table 2 having limited options of racial categories. Some categories that exist on our close out forms are not present on table 2. Also, recipients of HCD assistance at times decline to indicate their racial or ethnic identities. Examples of this are Hispanics who do not identify as any of the races provided as options, or persons who identify as multiple races who are not given the option to indicate multiple races.

CR-15 - Resources and Investments

Identify the resources made available

Source of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG	public - federal	\$5,825,398	\$2,392,902
CDBG-CV	public - federal	\$11,062,136	\$8,205,943
HOME	public - federal	\$11,984,836	\$6,252,483
HOPWA	public - federal	\$354,955	\$291,602
ESG	public - federal	\$1,219,397	\$1,075,110
HTF	public - federal	\$3,082,582	\$1,758,700

Table 3 - Resources Made Available

Narrative

The resources made available are based on HUD allocations and estimates on program income and estimates on prior year's resources. These estimates are not exact due to the plan being put into place before the 2020 program year was completed. ESG spent a small amount more than the amount listed as available. These were funds that were held over from FY19.

Even with increased costs, low availability and long lead times for both supplies and labor, the Utah CDBG program has been ranked by HUD in the top five states for expending annual allocations quickly. The state's application process ensures that projects are ready to start as soon as CDBG funding is available.

Overall Utah has done a very good job of getting HUD grant funds spent on eligible activities and does not typically have much funding unexpended at the end of the program year. This year with the CARES Act funding, there will be very large amounts of funds left over which are in the process of being spent during FY21.

Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Allocation	Actual Percentage of Allocation	Narrative Description
Bear River Association of Governments	6	6	See below

Five County Association of Governments	7	7	See below
Mountainland Association of Governments	4	4	See below
Six County Association of Governments	6	6	See below
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments	6	6	See below
State of Utah	59	59	See below
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	5	5	See below
Wasatch Front Regional Council	7	7	See below

Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Narrative

The HOME, HTF, ESG, and HOPWA programs operate statewide and have no geographically based set asides. At the beginning of the year HCD has no knowledge of where these funds are going to be spent. Therefore, when establishing goals these funds are allocated toward the “State of Utah” region. The HOME, HTF, ESG, and HOPWA programs comprise 59% of all HUD grant funding in 2021.

The CDBG program receives 41 percent of all HUD grant funding. These CDBG funds are limited for use to rural areas. The funds are divided and sub granted to several regional bodies. These regional bodies receive a base amount, that is equal between regions, and then receive additional funds based on the percent of LMI population, average poverty rate, age of housing and pre-approved applicants. The distribution of the funds as a percent of total HCD HUD funding can be seen in Table 4.

Leveraging

HOME funds are matched by a state appropriation from the State of Utah at 25 cents for each dollar of HOME funds spent on affordable housing. In 2021 the HOME program used state match funds on one project, 85 North Phase II. This project is a multi-family rental complex targeting low income individuals.

Leveraging/Match is not a requirement in the CDBG program. However, each of the 7 Associations of Governments (AOG’s), through their rating and ranking process, award additional points to projects that contribute local and other funding sources. In 2021, the CDBG total expenditures of mainstream PY20 and PY21 funding of \$5,309,401 was matched with \$4,242,863 in other funds. The seven AOG’s, through their rating and ranking process, continue to encourage applicants to secure additional resources to

support their projects. The state office strives to clearly communicate to all applicants that CDBG should be used as gap funding.

The State supports the match requirement for ESG with State funds that support the same project and activities as ESG, and awards grants through the same competitive application process as ESG. In FY20, ESG was about 15% of the total amount awarded by the State to homeless service agencies. Regional Local Homeless Councils (LHC) conduct a funding gap analysis which includes analysis of private and local funding sources utilized in projects during the competitive grant process. All funded agencies report on leveraging of resources from other sources, as required by HUD.

HCD does not own any public housing and has no property available to use to address the needs identified in this plan.

Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	4,634,564
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	171,554
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	4,806,118
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	0
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	4,806,118

Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report

Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year								
Project No. or Other ID	Date of Contribution	Cash (non-Federal sources)	Foregone Taxes, Fees, Charges	Appraised Land/Real Property	Required Infrastructure	Site Preparation, Construction Materials, Donated labor	Bond Financing	Total Match
22-DWS-0072	10/22/2020	171,554	0	0	0	0	0	171,554

Table 6 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

HOME MBE/WBE report

Program Income – Enter the program amounts for the reporting period				
Balance on hand at beginning of reporting period \$	Amount received during reporting period \$	Total amount expended during reporting period \$	Amount expended for TBRA \$	Balance on hand at end of reporting period \$
9,309,962	5,342,058	5,490,243	0	9,161,777

Table 7 – Program Income

Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises – Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period

	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	

Contracts						
Dollar Amount	3,820,346	0	175,000	0	0	3,645,346
Number	8	0	1	0	0	7

Sub-Contracts						
Number	81	0	2	0	4	75
Dollar Amount	26,546,023	0	146,351	0	631,780	25,767,892

	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male
--	-------	----------------------------	------

Contracts			
Dollar Amount	44,554,143	176,800	44,377,343
Number	24	2	22

Sub-Contracts			
Number	81	1	80
Dollar Amount	26,546,023	133,979	26,412,044

Table 8 - Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises

Minority Owners of Rental Property – Indicate the number of HOME assisted rental property owners and the total amount of HOME funds in these rental properties assisted

	Total	Minority Property Owners				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	25	0	0	0	0	25
Dollar Amount	9,460,740	0	0	0	0	9,460,740

Table 9 – Minority Owners of Rental Property

Relocation and Real Property Acquisition – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition

Parcels Acquired	25	9,640,740
Businesses Displaced	0	0
Nonprofit Organizations Displaced	0	0
Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced	152	94,732

Households Displaced	Total	Minority Property Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition

CR-20 - Affordable Housing

Evaluation of the jurisdiction's progress in providing affordable housing, including the number and types of families served, the number of extremely low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income persons served.

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	150	430
Number of Non-Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	471	69
Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units	20	44
Total	641	543

Table 11 – Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through Rental Assistance	178	474
Number of households supported through The Production of New Units	45	8
Number of households supported through Rehab of Existing Units	405	61
Number of households supported through Acquisition of Existing Units	13	0
Total	641	543

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

Discuss the difference between goals and outcomes and problems encountered in meeting these goals.

The initial goals made for affordable housing included the following description:

The CDBG program assists 23 households with rental assistance, 2 households with production of new units, projected 54 and assisted 45 households with rehab of existing units, and proposed 74 and assisted 72 persons with down payment assistance for 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.

The total number of persons assisted did not meet our goal in all categories. The CDBG program for single family housing has faced many challenges with the shortage of supplies and materials as a result of COVID, the housing construction that draws contractors to more lucrative projects, and the lead time that makes completing projects difficult in the year eligibility was determined. The HOME and HTF programs also performed well in 2020, however they are unable to report accomplishments due to the projects they funded still being underway. ESG and HOPWA both over performed their stated accomplishments.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

HCD will continue to make goals based on anticipated accomplishments. The HCD and HOME programs in particular will struggle to meet our goals due to accomplishments being delayed by long construction schedules. HCD does not anticipate changing our future action plans based on the accomplishments reported in this plan.

Include the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons served by each activity where information on income by family size is required to determine the eligibility of the activity.

Number of Households Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual	HTF Actual
Extremely Low-income	3179	0	0
Low-income	12675	0	0
Moderate-income	12681	0	0
Total	28535	0	0

Table 13 – Number of Households Served

Narrative Information

The number of units supported with HOME funds varies year to year in accordance with the applications put forth by Utah low income housing developers. In the 2021 program year HOME and HTF funded multiple multifamily rental properties with HOME and HTF funds. Other projects were funded with program income. More details are available in CR-50. These projects are underway and are not yet completed so we are unable at this time to report on the number of individuals assisted since work is still underway. However, HCD anticipates that these projects will assist 24 extremely low income households with HTF funds and 27 households that are low income and extremely low income with HOME funds. Additionally, many more low income households are assisted in these projects through

other funding sources. HCD will continue to provide this support despite our inability to report accomplishments at this time.

The CDBG Method of Distribution mandates that each of the seven Association of Governments (AOG's) determine their project priorities on an annual basis. Most have chosen to make critical community infrastructure projects a priority for their region. All projects awarded with CDBG must be at least 51% LMI. Four regions have made decent, affordable housing a high priority and operate Single Family Housing Rehabilitation programs where eligibility is determined by income and other factors. Most clients served should be very-low income. The amount of funding allocated to each Single Family Housing Rehab program varies by the needs of each region. Two of the AOG's also offer Homebuyer Assistance programs for LMI homebuyers. CDBG State Staff and AOG Reps continue to work with housing authorities in rural Utah to acquire and/or rehab multi-family units to create more affordable housing stock. For CDBG-CV expenditures, many projects were identified as Low to Moderate Clientele, whose presumed LMI is 51% of AMI. Although we have demonstrated a count of beneficiaries for the CV funded activities, we do not have the resources to provide actual LMI information.

CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs

Evaluate the jurisdiction's progress in meeting its specific objectives for reducing and ending homelessness through:

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

The Office of Homeless Services funds individual street outreach teams in the large population centers of the state. These teams cover the majority of the metropolitan areas where individuals experiencing homelessness were identified during the most recent Point in Time count. During State Fiscal Year 2022 (July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022) there was an 8% increase in exits from street outreach program to permanent destinations. Progress towards the goal of making homelessness brief through better connection to unsheltered households is the result of an increased focus on street outreach with communities and an increased spotlight in the state on unsheltered homelessness as a whole.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

A majority of the funding provided by both state and federal sources that is specifically dedicated to the service needs of individuals experiencing homelessness in Utah goes toward emergency shelter. The State Annual Report on Homelessness that utilizes PIT and HIC data collected in January 2022 and highlights different system performance measures. This report shows the utilization rate for existing emergency shelter beds was 81% during the PIT and 78% for transitional housing. This shows that shelter and transitional housing resources are being utilized in the communities in which they exist. These measures do not identify the gap between existing resources and actual shelter/transitional needs in each community. This gap is a focus of the upcoming State Strategic Plan on Homelessness that will be released in fall 2022.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: likely to become homeless after 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); and, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

The State of Utah breaks down each area of the State into individual regions that are tasked with addressing and ending homelessness in their communities. These groups are called Local Homelessness Councils (LHC). Each LHC meets on a regular basis to assess what resources are currently available and

what opportunities for funding are upcoming. This results in better services that are tailored to the specific demographics of each area. Prevention efforts are a main focus of every LHC in the state, with recent Emergency Rental Assistance and ESG-CV funding highlighting the effective impact that this type of project can have. Assessing through data the direct impact any prevention funding has had on the specific subgroups identified above has been difficult. Through the Annual Report, we do know that individuals experiencing homelessness for the first time have been decreasing over the last three years. This indicates that existing prevention efforts as a whole may be effectively slowing the flow into the homeless response system. The State of Utah has contracted with a third party expert to begin integrating data from the criminal justice and medical services data systems to show direct impact on each of these systems in the very near future.

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

All ESG funded agencies must participate in their CoCs adopted coordinated entry (CE) system. This CE approach prioritizes individuals who were previously in a permanent supportive site for a new project, ensuring those most vulnerable do not fall back into homelessness whenever possible. The CE system also provides housing supports to individuals with subsidies that are struggling to find suitable apartments. This reduces the length of time someone is looking for housing after they have secured the financial means to sustain it.

Additionally, State of Utah ESG rapid rehousing funds are awarded to agencies in an effort to facilitate moving households experiencing homelessness into permanent housing quickly and appropriately. Funded agencies report progress towards goals of reducing length of time homeless and exits to permanent destinations on a quarterly basis. This consistent reporting and reviewing progress helps projects shift services as needed to maintain effective programs.

CR-30 - Public Housing

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing

Historically the State of Utah CDBG program provided funding to cities that pass through grants to rural housing authorities that administer public housing programs. In 2021 CDBG funding supported the Cedar City Housing Authority in acquiring existing units to rehabilitate for the purpose of becoming rental units.

Actions taken 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 newly funded CDBG homeownership assistance program at Tooele Housing Authority, we are unaware of any homeownership assistance programs being offered by the other housing authorities.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs

There are no troubled Public Housing Authorities in Utah that we are aware of.

CR-35 - Other Actions

Actions taken 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.

The main effort in Utah to overcome the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing has been the mandate from the State Legislature that all cities write affordable housing plans, and have those plans reviewed by HCD staff to ensure they meet the state criteria. These plans are meant to be updated every two years. Recently to give more force behind this requirement state bill SB34 was recently passed, in part to address Utah's housing affordability crisis. SB34 requires municipalities to adopt strategies aimed at encouraging affordable housing to be eligible to receive investment funds from the Utah Department of Transportation. In addition, SB34 also offers Utah municipalities an expanded menu of nearly 25 strategies they can pursue to encourage affordable housing, such as waiving development fees, allowing so-called mother-in-law apartments, revamping aging homes, and adopting zoning that encourages construction of high-density housing near transit lines. The bill requires cities to adopt at least three of those strategies as part of their state-mandated land-use and transportation plans to become eligible for funds from UDOT to invest in transportation corridors in their communities, known as Transportation Investment Fund (TIF) money. Those with a transit corridor within their boundaries would have to adopt four of the bill's affordable-housing strategies to be eligible for TIF money, estimated at about \$700 million per year. Municipalities will be submitting their progress on their updated housing plans to reflect these new measures starting 1 December 2020.

Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs.

The biggest obstacle to addressing underserved needs in 2020 was the lack of adequate funding. There is a huge shortage of affordable housing in Utah. This shortage is felt most acutely along the Wasatch Front where a majority of Utahans live. However, it also exists in rural communities. The lack of funding forces communities to assess their priorities as they look to the HUD program for projects that support the sustainability of rural Utah. Critical infrastructure projects; water, sewer, and public safety are typically a high priority.

CDBG funding primarily serves critical infrastructure projects that serve rural communities that have limited resources. AOG rating and ranking policies prioritize projects that serve higher LMI communities, those projects include: improving water and sewer systems, addressing fire department needs and in some cases supporting waste and water hook-ups for eligible LMI homeowners. CDBG is utilized for Meals on Wheels services, serving low income seniors. In 2020 CDBG served over 123 LMI homeowners by improving the habitability of the residences by replacing roofs, electrical systems, foundational issues, etc.

Actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards.

HCD complies with all HUD Lead Based Paint regulations when carrying out housing rehabilitation activities. Pre-1978 units are tested for LBP if the rehab activity involves disturbing painted surfaces.

The CDBG single-family housing rehab programs are limited by the state's relatively small annual HUD allocation. None of the units rehabbed with HUD funds required remediation. It is never the goal or expectation that the housing units rehabbed will be made "lead-free", instead CDBG is used to remediate exposure.

Other organizations, such as the Utah Lead Coalition, have been formed to increase blood lead testing, data gathering and community education.

Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families.

The majority of CDBG activities carried out in 2021 were related to public infrastructure and facilities such as water and sewer systems, fire stations and senior centers. While these activities *serve* poverty-level families by providing improved community facilities and improved housing, they do not actually *reduce* the number of poverty-level families. "Brick and Mortar" projects continue to score higher in regional rating and ranking than public service projects. Section 3 information is collected for each contractor carrying out a CDBG activity. In 2021 none of the contractors were Section 3 business concerns.

Actions taken to develop institutional structure.

The Utah CDBG program is successful because of the partnership between state staff, the policy committee and the AOG representatives. This partnership is critical to carrying out the CDBG program. CDBG Policy Committee responsibilities include: filtering recommendations from their local regional areas to be considered and included in state policy; determine and approve the method of distribution; ensure compliance with the consolidated plan; approve regional rating & ranking policies and procedures; approve annual award recommendations; facilitate public involvement and feedback; and approve the CDBG manuals that govern program policy and administration. State CDBG staff responsibilities include: fulfilling the responsibilities as the lead agency, advising the policy committee of program regulations and other federal requirements to ensure that policies and procedures adopted by the committee are in compliance; confer and coordinate with the AOG representatives to determine goals and priorities; prepare the five year consolidated plan; ensure annual grantee projects are eligible and align with national objectives; monitor grantee compliance and financial performance; complete the CAPER; ensure programmatic control remain with local elected officials; and maintain the implementation of federal legislation and state priorities. AOG Reps responsibilities include: create regional rating and ranking policies and procedures; ensure that the goals of the consolidated plan are being met; hold annual "How to Apply" workshops that provide technical and programmatic training to

	CAPER	25
--	-------	----

potential applicants; provide oversight during the application process; support regional planning that benefit local communities; and coordinate with other programs administered within their regional office - HEAT, Weatherization, Homelessness Services, etc.

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

The State ESG Program administering office coordinates with the Utah State Homelessness Coordinating Committee (SHCC). This decision making body is committed to ending homelessness in every area of the State. ESG funded agencies are required to coordinate with their local CoC, public housing authorities, private non-profits, and social service agencies to provide a cohesive coordinated entry system for those experiencing homelessness. The State's 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 regional Association of Governments (AOG's) conduct the CDBG "How to Apply" workshops annually in the fall. The 10 housing authorities located in the non-entitlement areas are encouraged to apply for funding through eligible applicants (cities and counties).

Identify actions taken to overcome the effects of any impediments identified in the jurisdictions analysis of impediments to fair housing choice.

Impediment to Fair Housing occurs primarily as a result of the individual actions of citizens, or the systematic result of policy. The State of Utah is active in training and education programs that aim to enlighten individuals and policy makers regarding the acts that are considered discriminatory and the policies which may result in impeding fair housing choice. As a state agency it is difficult to oversee local municipal policies. Due to the hold local governments have over local land use decision making, it is primary local leaders who can promote fair housing choice within their respective jurisdictions.

Nevertheless the State of Utah is an active participant in the Utah League of Cities and Towns, and has been involved in efforts to promote fair housing awareness and training. HCD also is active with the State Fair Housing Forum, and a donor to the Utah Apartment Association Annual Fair Housing Conference. HCD also provides numerous training regarding fair housing and promotes full adherence to fair housing regulations with all entities we partner with and fund.

State CDBG staff continue to educate housing providers receiving CDBG funding to ensure that they are in compliance with FHEO regulations. With limited funding and local funding decisions, actions are limited.

CR-40 - Monitoring

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

State HOME, HTF, ESG, HOPWA and CDBG staff monitor projects for program compliance using DWS's Pre-Award Assessment Process to identify a risk level, which identifies the depth of monitoring activities used to determine a projects alignment with all programmatic regulations such as Procurement, Davis Bacon Labor Standards, Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO), and HUD Environmental Reviews. This is carried out either by desk audit or onsite visits depending on the grantee's Pre-Award Risk Assessment score. ESG recipients are monitored annually based on that risk score and utilizing the HUD ESG monitoring exhibits posted on the HUD Exchange.

All CDBG recipients submit a closeout report when projects are complete, the beneficiary and minority business data is reported in HUD's IDIS system in a timely manner. A monitoring checklist and letter is utilized for each specific project type/IDIS activity. All requests for reimbursement go through a rigorous review for applicability before payment. Issues are addressed immediately so payments can be made quickly and efficiently.

Citizen Participation Plan

Describe the efforts to provide citizens with reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment on performance reports.

The following notice was posted on the Utah Public Notice Website on September 15th 2021:

The Utah Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) will hold a public hearing on September 30th, 2021, beginning at 9:00 am to hear comments about the 2020 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER). This meeting will be held virtually. Video call is available at: <https://meet.google.com/rsz-xmcb-kwo>

Or dial: (US) +1 262-468-7326 PIN: 929 052 228#

To comment on this report during this public comment period please contact Elias Wise at (385) 535-7952 or by email at ewise@utah.gov

CR-45 - CDBG

Specify the nature of, and reasons for, any changes in the jurisdiction's program objectives and indications of how the jurisdiction would change its programs as a result of its experiences.

There were no changes to the State Small Cities CDBG program for PY 2021, except that the CDBG-CV activities were a continued focus and took much more time and energy to ensure alignment with regulations and requirements, as stated previously. The CV funding did support a lot of economic development activities, which is not a standard priority for the State Policy Committee. The 2019 AAP was amended to include this activity and goal, and we feel it has been successful. The state continues to delegate the project selection process to the 7 Association of Governments (AOGs). Each region consults with local governments to prepare their portion of the Annual Action Plan (AAP). This information is collected by the state and incorporated into the new AAP each year. Through these consultations and needs assessments, regional rating and ranking scoring criteria is updated to reflect any changes. The objectives continue to be addressing the critical infrastructure needs in the rural areas along with promoting affordable housing.

Does this Jurisdiction have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants?

No

[BEDI grantees] Describe accomplishments and program outcomes during the last year.

N/A

CR-50 - HOME

Include the results of on-site inspections of affordable rental housing assisted under the program to determine compliance with housing codes and other applicable regulations

In FY21 HCD monitored 151 properties. For more information regarding properties monitored please see the attached monitoring spreadsheets. Also included in the monitoring attachment are the projects where corrections were needed. All projects are currently in compliance.

Provide an assessment of the jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions for HOME units.

The UTAH HOME Program which is operated by the OWHLF has created an Affirmative Marketing Plan. This Plan is found in the HOME Program Guidance and Rules which is online at: <http://jobs.utah.gov/housing/affordable/owhlf/documents/owhlfprogramguidance.pdf> This rule states: "In furtherance of the State of Utah commitment to nondiscrimination and equal opportunity in Housing, HOME-assisted project owners and contractors administering HOME programs for the state of Utah are required to establish procedures for affirmatively marketing their housing units and for affirmatively marketing loan or housing opportunities under any of the state housing sponsored programs." The program and rules give more details regarding the policy and procedures for affirmative marketing plans. These instructions are found in Exhibit W (Pgs. 130-131 of the HOME guidelines and rules page). Instructions include information regarding which projects are required to establish procedures for affirmatively marketing their housing units and affirmatively marketing loan or housing opportunities. Elements of the affirmative marketing plans include, (1) A process for informing the public and potential tenants/owners about federal Fair Housing laws and marketing policies, (2) A procedure to inform the public about vacant units or upcoming housing opportunities, (3) Special outreach suggestions, and (4) Requirements regarding the keeping of records for the duration of the HOME period of affordability. The HOME guidelines and Rules outline the monitoring which will take place in regards to these plans. OWHLF will monitor the plans to determine if good faith efforts have been made and determine the results of the efforts. OWHLF also outlines corrective actions which will take place should sponsors fail to carry out the required procedures. Corrective actions may include, but are not limited to, withholding unallocated funds, requiring the return of unexpended funds, requiring the repayment of expended funds or requiring the repayment program income. If, after discussing ways to improve procedures the project owners or program contractors continue to fail to meet the affirmative marketing requirements, OWHLF will also consider disqualifying them from future participation in the HOME Program. In FY20 all monitored facilities were monitored on their affirmative marketing plans. No facilities monitored by HCD staff were found to have inadequate Affirmative Marketing Plans, and no corrective action was undertaken as a result of monitoring efforts.

Refer to IDIS reports to describe the amount and use of program income for projects, including the number of projects and owner and tenant characteristics

HOME funded a number of projects using program income. These projects include:

	CAPER	29
--	-------	----

New construction of multi-family housing at 85 North Senior Apartments Phase I is being built by Provo City Housing Authority. The development will be for 44 units all of which will be low income units. The average AMI will be 39.57% AMI. Total program income expended will be \$677,688.

New construction of multi-family housing at 85 North Senior Apartments Phase II is being built by Provo City Housing Authority. The development will be for 30 units all of which will be low income units. The average AMI will be 54% AMI. Total program income expended will be \$386,544.

New construction of multi-family housing at Harris Community Village is being built by the Tooele County Housing Authority and Switchpoint in Tooele UT. The development will be for 66 units of which all 66 will be low income units. The average AMI will be 34.24% AMI. Total program income expended will be \$1,000,000.

New construction of multi-family housing at Residences at West Haven is being built by TWG Development/Weber County Housing Authority. The development will be for 40 units all of which will be low income units. The average AMI will be 46% AMI. Total program income expended will be \$1,000,000.

New construction of multi-family housing at Richmond Flats is being built by the Community Development Corporation of Utah. The development will be for 55 units, all of which will be low income units. The average AMI will be 43.98% AMI. Total program income expended will be \$750,000.

New construction of multi-family housing at Senior Living on Washington Blvd (Phase II) is being built by Canterbury Partners in Ogden UT. The development will be for 27 units all of which will be low income units. The average AMI will be 54.44% AMI. Total program income expended will be \$341,084.

Describe other actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing.

HCD partners closely with Utah Housing Corporations which manages LIHTC in Utah. In FY21 HCD funded 8 projects that have LIHTC.

85 North (Senior) Apartments (Phase I) received 9% tax credits and HOME and HTF funds

85 North Apartments (Phase II) received 4% tax credits and HOME funds

Canyon Park Apartments received 9% tax credits and HOME funds.

Colony B Apartments received 9% tax credits and HOME funds.

Harris Community Village received 9% tax credits and HOME funds.

Residences at West Haven received 9% tax credits and HOME funds.

Richmond Flats received 9% tax credits and HOME funds.

Senior Living on Washington Blvd (Phase II) received 4% tax credits and HOME Funds

CR-55 - HOPWA

Identify the number of individuals assisted and the types of assistance provided

Table for report on the one-year goals for the number of households provided housing through the use of HOPWA activities for: short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance payments to prevent homelessness of the individual or family; tenant-based rental assistance; and units provided in housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds.

Number of Households Served Through:	One-year Goal	Actual
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family	21	11
Tenant-based rental assistance	20	39
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	3	0
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	0	0
Total	44	48

Table 14 – HOPWA Number of Households Served

Narrative

HOPWA funding provided by the State is a relatively small amount in comparison to other funding sources. The existing HOPWA programs performed well during the performance period, with specific performance of projects being monitored quarterly over the course of the year. The Statewide HOPWA Steering Committee continues to meet monthly to review system performance and make recommendations for improvement. During this CAPER period, coordinated entry was a primary focus. The HOPWA steering committee worked with mainstream homeless providers to better understand the overlap with the homeless crisis response system and better accessing units accessible to HOPWA clients. The steering committee also partnered with the Utah Housing Corporation and landlords to connect the HOPWA subsidy providers with better housing resources.

CR-56 - HTF

Describe the extent to which the grantee complied with its approved HTF allocation plan and the requirements of 24 CFR part 93.

HCD has complied with our HUD approved HTF allocation Plan which meets the requirements found in 24 CFR part 93. Our allocation plan calls for the HTF funds to be used for the creation of extremely low income rental housing. This is an approved use of funds per 24 CFR part 93. So far all HTF funds have been used for this purpose.

No projects funded in 2021 with HTF funds have been completed as of yet. However many projects have been funded in FY21 and will be completed in FY22.

No emergency transfers were requested in FY21.

Tenure Type	0 – 30% AMI	0% of 30+ to poverty line (when poverty line is higher than 30% AMI)	% of the higher of 30+ AMI or poverty line to 50% AMI	Total Occupied Units	Units Completed, Not Occupied	Total Completed Units
Rental	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homebuyer	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 15 - CR-56 HTF Units in HTF activities completed during the period

CR-58 – Section 3

Identify the number of individuals assisted and the types of assistance provided

Total Labor Hours	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA	HTF
Total Number of Activities	11	0	0	0	0
Total Labor Hours	0	0	0	0	0
Total Section 3 Worker Hours	0	0	0	0	0
Total Targeted Section 3 Worker Hours	0	0	0	0	0

Table 1 – Total Labor Hours

Qualitative Efforts - Number of Activities by Program	CDBG	HOME	ESG	HOPWA	HTF
Outreach efforts to generate job applicants who are Public Housing Targeted Workers	0	0	0	0	0
Outreach efforts to generate job applicants who are Other Funding Targeted Workers.	0	0	0	0	0
Direct, on-the job training (including apprenticeships).	0	0	0	0	0
Indirect training such as arranging for, contracting for, or paying tuition for, off-site training.	0	0	0	0	0
Technical assistance to help Section 3 workers compete for jobs (e.g., resume assistance, coaching).	0	0	0	0	0
Outreach efforts to identify and secure bids from Section 3 business concerns.	0	0	0	0	0
Technical assistance to help Section 3 business concerns understand and bid on contracts.	0	0	0	0	0
Division of contracts into smaller jobs to facilitate participation by Section 3 business concerns.	0	0	0	0	0
Provided or connected residents with assistance in seeking employment including: drafting resumes, preparing for interviews, finding job opportunities, connecting residents to job placement services.	0	0	0	0	0
Held one or more job fairs.	0	0	0	0	0
Provided or connected residents with supportive services that can provide direct services or referrals.	0	0	0	0	0
Provided or connected residents with supportive services that provide one or more of the following: work readiness health screenings, interview clothing, uniforms, test fees, transportation.	0	0	0	0	0
Assisted residents with finding child care.	0	0	0	0	0

Assisted residents to apply for, or attend community college or a four year educational institution.	0	0	0	0	0
Assisted residents to apply for, or attend vocational/technical training.	0	0	0	0	0
Assisted residents to obtain financial literacy training and/or coaching.	0	0	0	0	0
Bonding assistance, guaranties, or other efforts to support viable bids from Section 3 business concerns.	0	0	0	0	0
Provided or connected residents with training on computer use or online technologies.	0	0	0	0	0
Promoting the use of a business registry designed to create opportunities for disadvantaged and small businesses.	0	0	0	0	0
Outreach, engagement, or referrals with the state one-stop system, as designed in Section 121(e)(2) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.	0	0	0	0	0
Other.	0	0	0	0	0

Table 2 – Qualitative Efforts - Number of Activities by Program

Narrative

For CDBG all contracts over \$200,000 awarded to a grantee and sub-grantees for the completion of housing rehabilitation, housing construction and other public construction contain a Section 3 Construction Clause (provided by the state office). CDBG staff provide all general contractors and those overseeing a CDBG project with a Section 3 Business Concern form. This form must be signed and returned to the state office before any funds can be expended. Evidence that the Section 3 Construction Clause is also required to be included in all bid specifications before any contractor is cleared to begin work.

For ESG the State of Utah Office of Homeless Services prioritizes ESG funding for services that support emergency housing, shelter, street outreach, prevention, and case management projects. No funding was allocated or utilized during the previous program year for new construction or rehabilitation. No section 3 requirements were triggered as a result of ESG spending.

For HOME/HTF all grantees that receive an award over \$200,000 for the new construction or rehabilitation of affordable housing projects receive notification of all Section 3 requirements.

CR-60 - ESG

ESG Supplement to the CAPER in *e-snaps*

For Paperwork Reduction Act

1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete

Basic Grant Information

Recipient Name	UTAH
----------------	------

Organizational DUNS Number	878147099
----------------------------	-----------

EIN/TIN Number	876000545
----------------	-----------

Identify the Field Office	DENVER
---------------------------	--------

Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance	UT-500, UT-503, UT-504
---	------------------------

ESG Contact Name

Prefix	Ms
--------	----

First Name	Tricia
------------	--------

Middle Name	A
-------------	---

Last Name	Davis
-----------	-------

Suffix	0
--------	---

Title	Assistant Director
-------	--------------------

ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	140 E 300 S
------------------	-------------

Street Address 2	0
City	Salt Lake City
State	UT
ZIP Code	84111
Phone Number	8018594805
Email Address	tadavis@utah.gov

2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

Program Year Start Date	07/01/2020
Program Year End Date	06/30/2021

3a. Subrecipient Form – Complete one form for each subrecipient

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Uintah Basin Association of Governments City: Roosevelt State: UT Zip Code: 84066, 2849 DUNS Number: Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$43,030
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: First Step House City: Salt Lake City State: UT Zip Code: 84102, 2705 DUNS Number: 093123115

<p>Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N</p> <p>Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization</p> <p>ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$133,889</p>
<p>Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Bear River Association of Governments</p> <p>City: Logan</p> <p>State: UT</p> <p>Zip Code: 84321, 4567</p> <p>DUNS Number: 168941839</p> <p>Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N</p> <p>Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization</p> <p>ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$140,438</p>
<p>Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Five County Association of Governments</p> <p>City: ST. GEORGE</p> <p>State: UT</p> <p>Zip Code: 84770</p> <p>DUNS Number:</p> <p>Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N</p> <p>Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization</p> <p>ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$49,000</p>
<p>Subrecipient or Contractor Name: St. Anne's Center DBA Lantern House</p> <p>City: Ogden</p> <p>State: UT</p> <p>Zip Code: 84401, 3417</p> <p>DUNS Number: 185519188</p> <p>Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N</p> <p>Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization</p> <p>ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$738,333.70</p>
<p>Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Salt Lake Community Action Program DBA Utah Community Action</p> <p>City: Salt Lake City</p> <p>State: UT</p> <p>Zip Code: 84104</p> <p>DUNS Number: 144483377</p> <p>Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N</p> <p>Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization</p> <p>ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$974,469</p>

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: The Road Home City: Salt Lake City State: UT Zip Code: 84101, 1104 DUNS Number: 870212465 Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$4,584,894.27
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Wasatch Behavioral Health (SSD) City: Provo State: UT Zip Code: 84601, 1690 DUNS Number: 167100721 Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$38,800
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA, UTAH City: Salt Lake City State: UT Zip Code: 84115 DUNS Number: 931851265 Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$3,661,479.68
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Catholic Community Services City: Salt Lake City State: UT Zip Code: 84102, 2256 DUNS Number: 093115772 Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$267,643
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Iron County Care and Share Inc City: Cedar City State: UT Zip Code: 84721, 2241 DUNS Number: 612667147 Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N

Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$261,046		
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Family Connection Center DBA Open Door City: Layton State: UT Zip Code: 84040 DUNS Number: 556422442 Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$57,153		
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Community Action Services and Food Bank City: Provo State: UT Zip Code: 84601, 5817 DUNS Number: 802215194 Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$106,700		
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Friends of Switchpoint City: St George State: UT Zip Code: 84770, 4965 DUNS Number: 075015755 Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$287,161		
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Six County Association of Governments City: Richfield State: UT Zip Code: 84701, 2158 DUNS Number: Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization		

ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$74,090	
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments City: Price State: UT Zip Code: 84501, 2909 DUNS Number: Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$ 120,280	
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Youth Futures City: Ogden State: UT Zip Code: 84403, DUNS Number: Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$106,700	
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Center for Women and Children DBA The Refuge City: Orem State: UT Zip Code: 84097 DUNS Number: 926058561 Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Y Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$78,910	
Subrecipient or Contractor Name: Uintah County City: Vernal State: UT Zip Code: 84078 DUNS Number: Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N Subrecipient Organization Type: County Government ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: \$48,500	

CR-65 - Persons Assisted

4. Persons Served

4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	369
Children	244
Don't Know/Refused/Other	1
Missing Information	0
Total	614

Table 16 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities

4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	319
Children	123
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	442

Table 17 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

4c. Complete for Shelter

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	6,124
Children	140
Don't Know/Refused/Other	5
Missing Information	0
Total	6,269

Table 18 – Shelter Information

4d. Street Outreach

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	528
Children	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	3
Missing Information	0
Total	531

Table 19 – Household Information for Street Outreach

4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	9,134
Children	495
Don't Know/Refused/Other	9
Missing Information	2
Total	9,640

Table 20 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

5. Gender—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Male	6,120
Female	3,384
Transgender	64
Don't Know/Refused/Other	4
Missing Information	18
Total	9,590

Table 21 – Gender Information

6. Age—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Under 18	495
18-24	730
25 and over	9,131
Don't Know/Refused/Other	9
Missing Information	2
Total	10,367

Table 22 – Age Information

7. Special Populations Served—Complete for All Activities

Number of Persons in Households

Subpopulation	Total	Total Persons Served – Prevention	Total Persons Served – RRH	Total Persons Served in Emergency Shelters
Veterans	512	28	15	378
Victims of Domestic Violence	537	14	51	341
Elderly	782	49	35	552
HIV/AIDS	72	10	2	35
Chronically Homeless	2,550	0	63	1,382

Persons with Disabilities:				
Severely Mentally Ill	1,726	81	147	1,289
Chronic Substance Abuse	1,333	80	93	959
Other Disability	1,989	123	138	1,519
Total (Unduplicated if possible)	5,048	284	378	3,767

Table 23 – Special Population Served

CR-70 - Assistance Provided and Outcomes

10. Shelter Utilization

Number of New Units - Rehabbed	0
Number of New Units - Conversion	0
Total Number of bed-nights available	266,396
Total Number of bed-nights provided	221,147
Capacity Utilization	83.01%

Table 24 – Shelter Capacity

11. Project Outcomes Data measured under the performance standards developed in consultation with the CoC(s)

The three key system measurements of progress in alignment with Home, Together and the HEARTH Act for HCD Homelessness Funding are to: 1. Reduce the rate of first time homelessness; 2. Reduce the time individuals and households remain homeless; and 3. Reduce returns to homelessness. State ESG recipient coordinates with each CoC to develop performance standards that will provide measures to evaluate each service provider's effectiveness including how well the provider succeeded at a) reducing the number of people living on the streets or emergency shelters, b) shortening the time people spend homeless, The impacts of COVID-19 and the additional CARES funding has allowed the state to improve on how Utah is: a) targeting those who need the assistance most, and b) reducing each program participant's housing barriers or housing stability risks.

CR-75 - Expenditures

11. Expenditures

11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2018	2019	2020
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	0	\$16,812
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	\$4,640
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	0	\$87,146
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Homelessness Prevention	0	0	\$108,598

Table 25 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2018	2019	2020
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	0	\$119,017
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	\$41,610
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	0	\$141,100
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing	0	0	\$301,727

Table 26 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2018	2019	2020
Essential Services	0	0	\$356,338
Operations	0	0	\$218,657
Renovation	0	0	0
Major Rehab	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0
Subtotal	0	0	\$574,995

Table 27 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter**11d. Other Grant Expenditures**

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2018	2019	2020
Street Outreach	0	0	\$89,790
HMIS	0	0	\$229,288
Administration	0	0	\$100,782

Table 28 - Other Grant Expenditures**11e. Total ESG Grant Funds**

Total ESG Funds Expended	2018	2019	2020
	0	0	320,864

Table 29 - Total ESG Funds Expended**11f. Match Source**

	2018	2019	2020
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	0	0	0
Other Federal Funds	0	0	0

State Government	0	0	\$1,305,178
Local Government	0	0	0
Private Funds	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0
Program Income	0	0	0
Total Match Amount	0	0	\$1,305,178

Table 30 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

11g. Total

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities	2018	2019	2020
			\$2,610,356

Table 31 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities