

## CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes

### Progress the jurisdiction has made in carrying out its strategic plan and its action plan. 91.520(a)

This could be an overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the program year.

Not all applicable indicators were used in the initial plan. Therefore when reporting outputs new fields are needed in order to accurately evaluate our performance. Because table 1 is static and cannot be altered we are reporting the outputs in this space. The following are the correct indicators and outputs associated with them:

Public Facility or infrastructure other than low/moderate income housing benefit: 21,915

Public service activities other than low/moderate income housing benefit: 570

### Comparison of the proposed versus actual outcomes for each outcome measure submitted with the consolidated plan and explain, if applicable, why progress was not made toward meeting goals and objectives. 91.520(g)

Categories, priority levels, funding sources and amounts, outcomes/objectives, goal outcome indicators, units of measure, targets, actual outcomes/outputs, and percentage completed for each of the grantee's program year goals.

Goal	Category	Source / Amount	Indicator	Unit of Measure	Expected – Strategic Plan	Actual – Strategic Plan	Percent Complete	Expected – Program Year	Actual – Program Year	Percent Complete
Decrease tenure of Homelessness	Homeless	ESG: \$	Other	Other	30	1	3.33%	30	2	6.67%

Increase Sustainability of Rural Utah	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	20000	0	0.00%			
Increase Sustainability of Rural Utah	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Households Assisted	0	0		4000	84	2.10%
Increase Sustainability of Rural Utah	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	5000	0	0.00%			
Increase Sustainability of Rural Utah	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Households Assisted	0	0		1000	49	4.90%
Increase Sustainability of Rural Utah	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Jobs created/retained	Jobs	50	0	0.00%	10	48	480.00%
Increase Sustainability of Rural Utah	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$	Businesses assisted	Businesses Assisted	15	0	0.00%	3	55	1,833.33%

New Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / HOME: \$	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	3500	0	0.00%	700	861	123.00%
New Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / HOME: \$	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	1200	0	0.00%	240	130	54.17%
New Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / HOME: \$	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	0	0		35	26	74.29%
New Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / HOME: \$	Housing for People with HIV/AIDS added	Household Housing Unit	20	0	0.00%			
New Affordable Housing	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	CDBG: \$ / HOPWA: \$ / HOME: \$	HIV/AIDS Housing Operations	Household Housing Unit	300	0	0.00%	61	58	95.08%
Prioritize Rapid Rehousing	Homeless	HOPWA: \$ / ESG: \$	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	8750	356	4.07%	1750	356	20.34%
Prioritize Rapid Rehousing	Homeless	HOPWA: \$ / ESG: \$	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	178750	8649	4.84%	35750	8649	24.19%
Prioritize Rapid Rehousing	Homeless	HOPWA: \$ / ESG: \$	Housing for People with HIV/AIDS added	Household Housing Unit	15	0	0.00%			

Prioritize Rapid Rehousing	Homeless	HOPWA: \$ / ESG: \$	HIV/AIDS Housing Operations	Household Housing Unit	175	0	0.00%			
----------------------------	----------	---------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------	-----	---	-------	--	--	--

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

**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.**

As stated in the beginning of this section additional indicators needed to be added to properly report all of our outputs. These outputs are not outside of the scope of the initial plan. Therefor the use of funds does address the priorities and objectives of Utah's Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan. The State Small Cities CDBG Program's method of distribution allows each of the 7 Association of Governments to develop their own priorities annually. Each receives a pre-determined allocation to fund eligible CDBG projects. Most of the funding is allocated to projects that target infrastructure needs and single fmaily housing rehabilitation. The expected outcomes for each goal and objective outlined in the Annual Action Plan may vary greatly depending on the regional priorities for that program year.

The HOME Program has done an excellent job of supporting affordable housing with its HUD funds while the ESG program has remained focus on ending homelessness in accordance with federal priorities.

## CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted

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

91.520(a)

	CDBG	HOME	HOPWA	ESG
White	0	99	0	8,035
Black or African American	0	2	0	1,118
Asian	0	0	0	141
American Indian or American Native	0	0	0	699
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	81
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10,074</b>
Hispanic	0	15	0	2,455
Not Hispanic	0	86	0	6,325

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

### Narrative

The CDBG program has recently been conducting more training to all grantees regarding outreach where direct beneficiaries are related. Staff have recently updated our analysis of all Utah communities to determine which communities have sizable non-english speaking minorities in which dual language outreach will be necessary.

## CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a)

### Identify the resources made available

Source of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG		18,758,600	4,914,650
HOME		30,093,392	8,237,672
HOPWA		613,500	
ESG		4,956,888	1,186,087

Table 3 – Resources Made Available

### Narrative

#### 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	4	6	
Bear River Association of Governments	6	6	
Five County Association of Governments	4	7	
Five County Association of Governments	6	7	
Five County Association of Governments	7	7	
Mountainland Association of Governments	6	10	
Mountainland Association of Governments	7	10	
Mountainland Association of Governments	10	10	
Six County Association of Governments	4	7	
Six County Association of Governments	6	7	
Six County Association of Governments	7	7	
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments	4	6	

Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments	6	6	
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments	10	6	
State of Utah	52	52	
State of Utah	70	52	
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	4	6	
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	6	6	
Wasatch Front Regional Council	4	6	
Wasatch Front Regional Council	6	6	
Wasatch Front Regional Council	7	6	

**Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments**

**Narrative**

## Leveraging

Explain how federal funds leveraged additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements were satisfied, as well as how any publicly owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that were used to address the needs identified in the plan.

The HOME program

<b>Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match</b>	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	1,897,544
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	60,000
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	1,957,544
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	1,393,750
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	563,794

**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
SMP1536/16-1665	01/28/2016	60,000	0	0	0	0	0	60,000

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 \$
7,668,912	3,858,633	5,529,417	0	5,998,128

Table 7 – Program Income

<b>Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises – Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period</b>						
	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
<b>Contracts</b>						
Dollar Amount	27,133,116	0	0	0	0	27,133,116
Number	9	0	0	0	0	9
<b>Sub-Contracts</b>						
Number	165	2	0	0	7	156
Dollar Amount	30,977,492	770,870	0	0	275,069	29,931,553
	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male			
<b>Contracts</b>						
Dollar Amount	27,133,116	40,000	27,093,116			
Number	10	1	9			
<b>Sub-Contracts</b>						
Number	200	13	187			
Dollar Amount	37,820,157	631,647	37,188,510			

**Table 8 – Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises**

<b>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</b>						
	Total	Minority Property Owners				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 9 – Minority Owners of Rental Property**

<b>Relocation and Real Property Acquisition</b> – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition						
Parcels Acquired		10		1,880,000		
Businesses Displaced		0		0		
Nonprofit Organizations Displaced		0		0		
Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced		0		0		
Households Displaced	Total	Minority Property Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	6	0	0	0	0	6
Cost	12,127	0	0	0	0	12,127

**Table 10 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition**

**CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b)**

**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.**

	<b>One-Year Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Number of Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	300	0
Number of Non-Homeless households to be provided affordable housing units	1,145	0
Number of Special-Needs households to be provided affordable housing units	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,445</b>	<b>0</b>

**Table 11 – Number of Households**

	<b>One-Year Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Number of households supported through Rental Assistance	359	0
Number of households supported through The Production of New Units	642	0
Number of households supported through Rehab of Existing Units	367	0
Number of households supported through Acquisition of Existing Units	77	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,445</b>	<b>0</b>

**Table 12 – Number of Households Supported**

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

During the 2014 program year the Utah HOME program made the decision to support the creation of a Transit Oriented Development Fund. 2.5 Million dollars has been set aside for this fund. This fund has already received commitments from numerous banks who are interested in using the fund as a means of expending CDA funds. While this fund is an excellent opportunity to leverage HOME dollars, it has not yet resulted in the completion of new units and as a result the actual production for the 2-14 program year is down.

**Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.**

The Utah HOME program expects that in coming years the TOD Fund will result in the production of a high number of affordable units. While current numbers are low, the State of Utah sees this as a temporary lag as we invest in improving future capacity.

**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.**

<b>Number of Persons Served</b>	<b>CDBG Actual</b>	<b>HOME Actual</b>
Extremely Low-income	0	0
Low-income	0	0
Moderate-income	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Table 13 – Number of Persons Served**

**Narrative Information**

## **CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs 91.220(d, e); 91.320(d, e); 91.520(c)**

**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 State of Utah has made concerted effort to outreach to and identify persons experiencing homelessness, especially those who are not currently accessing emergency shelter, and align them with services. We have a state-wide focus on housing first which is proven to be the most effective way to end a person's homelessness. This is evidenced greatly in how ESG and state matching funds are allocated and prioritized.

The State of Utah has allocated nearly all of its State homeless funding and all of its ESG funds to serve people experiencing category 1 homelessness in an unsheltered and/or sheltered housing situation and/or fleeing domestic violence. There are ten outreach teams throughout the state that focus exclusively on street outreach and all play a different role to fulfill the specific needs of the population they are serving. The state supports these efforts by allocating 32% of ESG funds to street outreach and 43% to rapid re-housing in FY15. This is to allow ongoing outreach to unsheltered and provide rapid rehousing to quickly move them back into permanent housing.

As programs identify persons experiencing homelessness through street outreach efforts or by offering emergency shelter, providers assess them for their need with an emphasis on aligning them with other resources that will lead to permanent housing. All three CoC's in the State of Utah have formally adopted the VI-SPDAT and SPDAT in some form as standardized assessment tools to allocate housing resources to those who are most vulnerable. These assessments are also integrated into HMIS where a prioritization list based on vulnerability is drawn from and services allocated based on those who are in most need.

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

There are homeless shelters in key locations throughout the state where those experiencing homelessness can access shelter services. Where facilities are not available there are motel voucher programs in place through State funding, local government agencies, non-profits, or religious institutions. In addition to two new emergency shelters opening in the state's northern and southern regions in the last two years, there have been efforts in the last year to open updated shelters to replace existing shelters in the Salt Lake County area. This includes a seasonal overflow shelter being torn down and reconstructed to increase livability of the facility and changed to a year-round family shelter. Also in Salt Lake county, a youth shelter has been opened to assist youths experiencing homelessness to connect with transitional housing, employment, mainstream benefits and other necessary resources.

HCD has played an active role in increasing shelter capacity in these facilities by allocating state funds in their construction, and has also allocated rapid rehousing funds either directly to organizations providing shelter or to partnering agencies within their communities. As more households are able to quickly exit shelter into permanent housing the shelters are able to increase the number served without increasing the number of beds available.

Transitional housing has been largely phased out of the homeless services system throughout the State of Utah. The remaining transitional housing units are primarily serving victims of domestic violence and youth. Facilities that formerly offered transitional housing have been converted to permanent and permanent supportive housing.

**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**

In many of the communities state-wide there are several systems in place to assist 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. 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. HCD 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. VOA also assists youths with transitional housing to provide stability as they are working towards self-sufficiency.

Utah Department of Corrections in conjunction with the Utah Board of Pardons and Parole commit to not release state inmates on parole to a homeless shelter or into a homeless situation. Paroling inmates must have a residence that has been verified by AP&P agents prior to release or be assigned to a UDC Community Corrections Center for housing. Efforts are made to ensure that the residence is suitable housing. Additionally, services are provided to inmates to reduce recidivism and housing stability. There have been several programs implemented to provide additional layers of support as well. Women's Assistance and Reentry Mentoring (WARM), Re-Entry Assistance Program (REAP), and Your Parole Requires Extensive Preparation (YPREP) are a few examples of programs that assist those transitioning from incarceration.

Intermountain Healthcare (IHC) is one of the largest hospital systems in the State and is an active participant in the State Homeless Coordinating Committee. IHC discharge policies require initiation of a discharge plan for every patient upon admission. Local homeless serving non-profits work with hospitals to work towards nobody being discharged into homelessness. Hospitals are able to contact them and align patients with housing options through geographically relevant shelters. TriCounty Services coordinates with local providers to ensure individuals being discharged from long-term nursing facilities have resources to prevent homelessness.

The Utah Department of Human Services participates on the State Homeless coordinating Council's Discharge Planning Sub-Committee, in conjunction with the continuums of care, coordinate resources and develop discharge plans to assure individuals being discharged from mental health facilities are not exiting into homelessness. The Utah Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health (DSAMH) promotes home and community based services and supportive services provided by the local community mental health centers and substance abuse agencies to help decrease risk factors and link patients to services. DSAMH uses a tracking system to document needed services that are received by patients ready for discharge from State Hospital.

**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**

As previously stated, our communities are seeking to rapidly rehouse individuals and families experiencing homelessness and have prioritized these activities. With the State providing TANF homeless prevention and rapid rehousing, ESG and state funds to non-profits and AOGs there are resources available to prevent and end homelessness throughout most of the populous in the state. These programs have financial assistance and supportive services to assist their participants connect with resources and fully integrate back into their communities.

As HUD has released system performance measures that will inspect how our state's homeless service delivery system is performing as a whole, we have adopted many of these measures and incorporated them into a quarterly reporting requirement in our programs. This method has allowed us to look at specific programs and track how quickly they are moving families out of homelessness into permanent housing. This effort will greatly inform the areas of need within the state and show the level at which our current programs are performing. The areas examined will be inclusive of the performance measures, but also examine the effect of various funding sources on our systematic approach to ending homelessness. Rapid Rehousing programs will have retention in permanent housing over 6 months, 6-12 months, and 12-24 months as an integral focus in their service delivery. As these are reviewed on a quarterly basis we will be able to examine length of assistance, cost per client, exits to permanent

housing, increase in non-employment and employment income, enrollments in mainstream benefits and length of homelessness prior to entry which will show the true outcome and effect of the program dollars being expended.

All three CoC's have continued to work with Community Solutions to set goals toward ending chronic homelessness and veteran homelessness. There are strides being made to adopt and adapt coordinated assessment policies and procedures specific to veterans through the state. There is a lot of progress that has been made in the efforts surrounding veteran homelessness specific to creating a systems approach to prioritization and housing.

## **CR-30 - Public Housing 91.220(h); 91.320(j)**

### **Actions taken to address the needs of 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. For 2016, \$150,000 has been awarded to Beaver City HA to complete their office building construction and to renovate a single family home that will be used as an LMI rental unit.

### **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 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. CDBG does not provide assistance to troubled housing authorities.

## **CR-35 - Other Actions 91.220(j)-(k); 91.320(i)-(j)**

**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. 91.220 (j); 91.320 (i)**

As a state agency it is difficult to remove or ameliorate any possible negative effect local policies have. 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 trainings. 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 trainings regarding fair housing and promotes full adherence to fair housing regulations with all entities we partner with and fund.

### **Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

The biggest obstacle to underserved needs in the small cities CDBG program in 2014 was the lack of adequate funding. The 2014 CDBG allocation was \$4,398,980, down from a high of \$8.5 million in 2003. The reduced funding forced the communities to reassess their priorities as they looked to the CDBG program for projects that support the sustainability of rural Utah. Critical infrastructure projects; water, sewer, and public safety were a high priority. Our method of distribution limited the regional funding to \$400,000 - \$900,000 and as the rating and ranking committees worked to stretch these dollars, the size and scope of each project was limited. The regional rating and ranking systems awarded additional points for leveraged funds and this encouraged applicants to seek matching funds for their projects. This system maximized the CDBG impact throughout the state.

### **Actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

The biggest obstacle to underserved needs in the small cities CDBG program in 2014 was the lack of adequate funding. The 2014 CDBG allocation was \$4,398,980, down from a high of \$8.5 million in 2003. The reduced funding forced the communities to reassess their priorities as they looked to the CDBG program for projects that support the sustainability of rural Utah. Critical infrastructure projects; water, sewer, and public safety were a high priority. Our method of distribution limited the regional funding to \$400,000 - \$900,000 and as the rating and ranking committees worked to stretch these dollars, the size and scope of each project was limited. The regional rating and ranking systems awarded additional points for leveraged funds and this encouraged applicants to seek matching funds for their projects. This system maximized the CDBG impact throughout the state.

### **Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

The small annual CDBG allocation combined with Utah's method of distribution made it difficult to fund programs designed to reduce the number of poverty level families in rural Utah. By statute, the state's

allocation is divided amongst seven regional organizations and these organizations have the authority and control over which projects are funded. Since public service type projects are limited to 15% of the annual allocation, job training programs are uncommon. Instead, the priorities for 2014 continued to be community infrastructure improvements and affordable housing programs such as single family housing rehab programs carried out in four regions. These programs helped to preserve the affordable housing stock in the rural areas and improved the housing conditions for poverty-level families. But these programs do not reduce the number of poverty level families.

### **Actions taken to develop institutional structure. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) method of distribution (MOD) is a decentralized system. Funding is allocated to seven regional organizations that determine the local community needs. Points are awarded to applications through each organization's rating and ranking system. These systems and processes are reviewed and revised annually to ensure that projects that address the local priorities and make the greatest impact will be funded each year.

The CDBG program allocates funding to seven regional organizations. Annual application workshops were held throughout the state and the 10 housing authorities located in the non-entitlement areas were invited to apply for funding through eligible applicants (cities and counties). Decent, safe, affordable housing continued to be a priority in Utah and in 2014 CDBG funding was used by the housing authorities to acquire, retain and rehabilitate affordable housing throughout the state. Since CDBG funds cannot be used to construct housing, acquisition projects were often leveraged with other federal funds for new single and multi-family housing projects carried out by private developers. Area social service agencies were invited to apply and in 2014 CDBG funds were used to purchase a van to make home nursing and hospice visits throughout the Bear River region.

### **Actions taken to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)**

The State ESG Program was a partner on the Utah State Homelessness Coordinating Committee. The State Homeless Coordinating Committee is committed to coordinating the efforts of public private and social service agencies in addressing homelessness. HCD's efforts have been a valuable contribution towards achieving the goal of overcoming chronic homelessness. However, equally important this Committee has pioneered efforts in Utah in showing 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 were 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, retain and rehabilitate

affordable housing throughout the state. Since CDBG funds cannot be used to construct housing, acquisition projects were leveraged with HOME funds for new single and multi-family housing projects carried out by private developers. Area social service agencies were invited to apply and in 2015 CDBG funds were used to purchase a meals on wheels truck for an aging services program.

**Identify actions taken to overcome the effects of any impediments identified in the jurisdictions analysis of impediments to fair housing choice. 91.520(a)**

Impediment to Fair Housing occur primarily is a result of the individual actions of citizens, or the systematic result of policy. The State of Utah is active in trainings 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 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. Nevertheless the State of Utah is an active participate in the Utah League of Cities and Towns, and has been involved in efforts to promote fair housing awareness and trainings. HCD also is active with the State Fair Housing Forum, and a doner to the Utah Apartment Associate Annual Fair Housing Conference. HCD also provides numerous trainings regarding fair housing and promotes full adherence to fair housing regulations with all entities we partner with and fund.

## **CR-40 - Monitoring 91.220 and 91.230**

**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**

### **CDBG**

The State CDBG staff monitors all projects for compliance with all programmatic regulations such as 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 size and complexity of the project. The Housing & Community Development Division (HCDD) has hired a financial monitor to assist with monitoring recipients for proper financial processes and internal controls. This will improve our ability to oversee the recipients and ensure proper compliance. All recipients submit a Close Out document when projects are complete and the beneficiary data is reported in HUD's IDIS system in a timely manner.

### **HOME**

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 insures that projects continue to target low-income populations for the duration of the loan term (generally 30 years). For 2015-16, HCD staff completed 171 compliance monitoring visits to individual multifamily properties.

During the program year, HCD focused monitoring on occupancy of set aside units. This focus insures that property originally targeted for a certain population group (disabled, chronically mentally ill, developmentally delayed, victims of domestic violence, elderly, homeless, AIDS victims, and persons needing transitional housing) are occupied by residents of that group. The results of HCD's focus show that units are occupied by income eligible households. However, only 79% of the units are occupied by residents of a targeted special needs population. HCD staff has established protocols for property managers to better fill units with special needs residents.

### **ESG**

Part of the ESG pre-application process was a state-wide training to familiarize agencies with the requirements and expectations of the ESG grant. Efforts were made to allocate ESG funds to our most experienced and best administered subrecipients. HCD provided followed by on-going training and technical assistance as needed. Each agency has been required required to provide an ESG Policy and Procedure Manual for review by the State ESG Program Specialist and it is reviewed again before each monitoring visit. Agencies were given a list of required policies and procedures as well as an ESG Monitoring Tool that was used by the state specialist during yearly on-site and/or desk top monitoring

inspections. Agencies were required to submit online requests for reimbursement with back-up documentation at least quarterly. Every subrecipient's request for reimbursement was reviewed in detail by the SCSO Field Audit Supervisor. Quarterly outcomes reports were required from each participant which required them to pull data from HMIS and submit it to the ESG program specialist for review. Desktop monitoring was done on these submissions at this time. When applicable, ESG monitoring was conducted in conjunction with CoC monitors and fellow ESG recipients to sub recipients who receive ESG funding from multiple sources.

HOPWA contracts have received both desktop and on site reviews during this fiscal year with no findings to be reported.

### **Citizen Participation Plan 91.105(d); 91.115(d)**

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

As required HCD notified the public of the CAPER being published on HCD's website. This 30 day public comment period began on August 31. HCD conducted a public hearing on Sep 30th, 2015. The following is the text of the public notice as posted in local newspapers:

The Utah Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) will hold a public hearing on September 30, 2015, beginning at 8:00 am at 1385 So State St., Room 157A, to hear comments about the 2014-15 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER). HCD will receive comments until 5:00 pm that same day. A copy of the report is posted on <http://housing.utah.gov/owhlf/report.html>. Equal Opportunity Employer Program - Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities by calling 801-526-9240. Individuals with speech and/or hearing impairments may call the Relay Utah by dialing 711. Spanish Relay Utah: 1-888-346-3162

Aside from this public notice, additional notices were placed in the state public notice registry found online at: <http://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html>. Also community partners and were notified through email of the CAPER being published online and available for comment.

**CR-45 - CDBG 91.520(c)**

**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.**

The CDBG program goal and objective is “to assist in developing viable communities by providing decent housing, a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities, principally for persons of low and moderate income (LMI)”. To that end, the de-centralized program enables regional planning districts to determine the project priorities for their region. This method of distribution has been very successful for the past 34 years and there is no indication that there is any desire by our community partners to modify our program. The only threat to our program structure is the very real possibility that future annual allocations could be reduced to less than \$3 million. Under that scenario, in order for the program to remain viable, the responsibility of determining state-wide priorities would have to be transferred to the state.

<b>Does this Jurisdiction have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants?</b>	No
--	----

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

## **CR-50 - HOME 91.520(d)**

### **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**

Please list those projects that should have been inspected on-site this program year based upon the schedule in §92.504(d). Indicate which of these were inspected and a summary of issues that were detected during the inspection. For those that were not inspected, please indicate the reason and how you will remedy the situation.

Please list those projects that should have been inspected on-site this program year based upon the schedule in §92.504(d). Indicate which of these were inspected and a summary of issues that were detected during the inspection. For those that were not inspected, please indicate the reason and how you will remedy the situation.

The State HOME Program has a dedicated staff member who conducts all on site inspections of affordable housing to ensure compliance with housing codes and other regulations. During the program year 171 inspections were completed. A complete list of properties inspected can be found attached to this report. All properties are in compliance with regulations.

### **Provide an assessment of the jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions for HOME units. 92.351(b)**

The UTAH HOME Program which is operated by the OWHLF has created an Affirmative Marketing Plan. This Plan is found in the HOME program Guidelines and rules which is online at:  
<http://jobs.utah.gov/housing/owhlf/documents/owhlfguiderule.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 gives more details regarding the policy and procedures for affirmative marketing plans. These instructions are found in Exhibit W (Pgs. 108-109 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 outlines 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 the past year two sponsors were found to have insufficient affirmative marketing plans. The sponsors have since been brought into compliance with our policies.

**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**

Total of \$2,773,117 in program income committed to four multifamily projects:

- 1) Central Park Station (Provo) - \$750,000; 59 total units. Aggregate AMI 43.46%
- 2) Ninth East Lofts (Salt Lake City) - \$803,851; 68 total units. Aggregate AMI 43.61%
- 3) Station Square (Roy) - \$469,266; 31 total units. Aggregate AMI 43.56%<%
- 4) Station at Midvale I (Midvale) - \$750,000; 102 total units. Aggregate AMI 43.97%

All four of these projects also received 2015 allocations of low-income housing tax credits from UHC.

**Describe other actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing. 91.220(k) (STATES ONLY: Including the coordination of LIHTC with the development of affordable housing). 91.320(j)**

The state has undertaken a unique effort to foster affordable housing by investing in the creation of a Transit Oriented Development Fund. This fund is unlocking the development potential of Utah's large banking sector by using HCD funds as seed funds which are drawing sizable pledges in Bank CRA funds. This TOD fund will result in high leveraging ratios for HCD funds and a growth in investment in affordable housing in Utah.

HCD works closely with the Utah Housing Corporation which is the entity that manages Utah's LIHTC funds. Historically, about 75% of recipients of HOME funds from HCD are also recipients of LIHTC funds. HCD has a joint application process with the Utah Housing Corporation. This simplifies the process for

applicants and ensures that applicants are forthright with their numbers so as to not play with each organizations unique rating and ranking system.

**CR-55 - HOPWA 91.520(e)**

**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.

<b>Number of Households Served Through:</b>	<b>One-year Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family	40	24
Tenant-based rental assistance	35	26
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	16	0
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	5	8

**Table 14 – HOPWA Number of Households Served**

**Narrative**

## CR-60 - ESG 91.520(g) (ESG Recipients only)

### 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	Salt Lake City & County CoC

##### ESG Contact Name

Prefix	Mr
First Name	Andrew
Middle Name	0
Last Name	Gray
Suffix	0
Title	ESG Program Specialist

##### ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	1385 S State St. Suite 400
Street Address 2	0
City	Salt Lake City
State	UT
ZIP Code	84115-
Phone Number	8014280109
Extension	0
Fax Number	0
Email Address	andrewgray@utah.gov

##### ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix	
First Name	
Last Name	
Suffix	
Title	
Phone Number	
Extension	
Email Address	

#### 2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

**Program Year Start Date** 07/01/2016  
**Program Year End Date** 06/30/2017

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

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** ST. ANNES CENTER  
**City:** Ogden  
**State:** UT  
**Zip Code:** 84401, 3417  
**DUNS Number:** 185519188  
**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N  
**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization  
**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 135000

**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:** 255034

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** WASATCH MENTAL 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:** 12750

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA  
**City:** Salt Lake City  
**State:** UT  
**Zip Code:** 84101, 1116  
**DUNS Number:** 931851265  
**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N  
**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization  
**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 347784

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Family Promise Salt Lake

**City:** Salt Lake City

**State:** UT

**Zip Code:** 84110, 0996

**DUNS Number:** 126327969

**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N

**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization

**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 55150

**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:** 38000

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Family Connection Center

**City:** Clearfield

**State:** UT

**Zip Code:** 84015, 1611

**DUNS Number:** 556422442

**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N

**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization

**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 62500

**Subrecipient or Contractor Name:** Valley Mental Health

**City:** Murray

**State:** UT

**Zip Code:** 84121, 1720

**DUNS Number:** 177304805

**Is subrecipient a victim services provider:** N

**Subrecipient Organization Type:** Other Non-Profit Organization

**ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount:** 140000

## CR-65 - Persons Assisted

### 4. Persons Served

#### 4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
<b>Total</b>	

Table 15 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities

#### 4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
<b>Total</b>	

Table 16 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

#### 4c. Complete for Shelter

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
<b>Total</b>	

Table 17 – Shelter Information

**4d. Street Outreach**

<b>Number of Persons in Households</b>	<b>Total</b>
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
<b>Total</b>	

**Table 18 – Household Information for Street Outreach**

**4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG**

<b>Number of Persons in Households</b>	<b>Total</b>
Adults	
Children	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
<b>Total</b>	

**Table 19 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG**

**5. Gender—Complete for All Activities**

	<b>Total</b>
Male	
Female	
Transgender	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
<b>Total</b>	

**Table 20 - Gender Information**

**6. Age—Complete for All Activities**

	<b>Total</b>
Under 18	
18-24	
25 and over	
Don't Know/Refused/Other	
Missing Information	
<b>Total</b>	

**Table 21 – Age Information**

**7. Special Populations Served—Complete for All Activities**

**Number of Persons in Households**

<b>Subpopulation</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Total Persons Served – Prevention</b>	<b>Total Persons Served – RRH</b>	<b>Total Persons Served in Emergency Shelters</b>
Veterans				
Victims of Domestic Violence				
Elderly				
HIV/AIDS				
Chronically Homeless				
<b>Persons with Disabilities:</b>				
Severely Mentally Ill				
Chronic Substance Abuse				
Other Disability				
Total (unduplicated if possible)				

**Table 22 – Special Population Served**

## CR-70 – ESG 91.520(g) - 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	319,813
Total Number of bed-nights provided	316,426
Capacity Utilization	98.94%

Table 23 – Shelter Capacity

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

The state of Utah developed activity-specific performance measures which incorporate the HUD system performance measures for all State and ESG funding. These measures have also been adopted by two out of the three continua throughout the state. Over the first year of their implementation we were able to provide technical assistance to agencies as they have pulled these measures quarterly to verify data accuracy and quality. These data pulls have been used to project future outcomes in contracts and set goals to improve performance. The performance measures are specific to funding type. The items being tracked as they relate to ESG are:

- New enrollments from a place not meant for human habitation
- Percent of households served in Street Outreach that are chronically homeless persons or persons determined vulnerable by the VI-SPDAT and/or SPDAT
- Percent of those served who received an assessment using the coordinated assessment tool
- Exits from Street Outreach to Emergency Shelter, Transitional Housing, or Permanent Housing destinations
- Average length of stay in Emergency Shelter
- Percent of exits into Permanent Housing from Rapid Re-housing
- Percent of participants who increases income from employment and non-employment sources.
- Percent of participants who are enrolled in mainstream benefits
- Average length of participation in Rapid Re-housing programs
- Average cost per client in Rapid Re-housing program
- Average length of homelessness prior to entering Rapid Re-housing
- Percent of those who do not return to homelessness within 6, 6-12, and 12-24 months after exiting to a permanent housing destination

Through consistent tracking of these measures, agencies are more prone to seek to improve the outcomes that will most benefit those they serve. We couple these measures with a housing first

philosophy where the most vulnerable and needy are served to ensure that no outcomes are improved based on client selection or screening.

## CR-75 – Expenditures

### 11. Expenditures

#### 11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2014	2015	2016
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	0	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	0	0
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal Homelessness Prevention</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 24 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

#### 11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2014	2015	2016
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	25,641	397,875	345,607
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	16,871	128,475	109,179
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	7,106	133,672	75,240
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing</b>	<b>49,618</b>	<b>660,022</b>	<b>530,026</b>

Table 25 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

#### 11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2014	2015	2016
Essential Services	549,026	79,960	87,027
Operations	44,130	225,154	18,327
Renovation	0	0	0
Major Rehab	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>593,156</b>	<b>305,114</b>	<b>105,354</b>

Table 26 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

**11d. Other Grant Expenditures**

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2014	2015	2016
HMIS	100,000	0	84,647
Administration	82,571	180,635	74,116
Street Outreach	0	171,995	391,944

Table 27 - Other Grant Expenditures

**11e. Total ESG Grant Funds**

Total ESG Funds Expended	2014	2015	2016
	2,765,259	825,345	1,145,771
			794,143

Table 28 - Total ESG Funds Expended

**11f. Match Source**

	2014	2015	2016
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	0	0	0
Other Federal Funds	0	0	0
State Government	823,705	1,317,766	1,029,957
Local Government	0	0	0
Private Funds	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
Fees	0	0	0
Program Income	0	0	0
<b>Total Match Amount</b>	<b>823,705</b>	<b>1,317,766</b>	<b>1,029,957</b>

Table 29 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

**11g. Total**

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities	2014	2015	2016
	5,936,687	1,649,050	2,463,537
			1,824,100

Table 30 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities



# Attachment

## eCART Submission



eCart For HUD  
Submission.xlsm