



# SOUTHEASTERN UTAH ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS 2005-2009 CONSOLIDATED PLAN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Characteristics Of The District's Communities and Residents:

The southeastern Utah district includes four counties (Carbon, Emery, Grand and San Juan). The residents in each county are generally concentrated in the nineteen small towns and unincorporated communities that have developed along the major highway that runs through each county<sup>1</sup>.

This is a large district of approximately 17,400 square miles and makes up almost 21% of the total geographic area of the state of Utah. However, this is a sparsely populated district, and its 53,075 residents comprise only 2.2% of the state's population.

Population growth in this district has generally been stagnant over the last five years.

<b>Southeast Utah District Population 1990 and 2000 through 2003<sup>2</sup></b>					
	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>
Carbon	20169	20422	19760	19812	19764
Emery	10329	10863	10644	10607	10651
Grand	6591	8485	8590	8710	8759
San Juan	12488	14413	13615	13853	13901
<b>District Totals</b>	<b>49577</b>	<b>54183</b>	<b>52609</b>	<b>52982</b>	<b>53075</b>

Table ES1

As can be seen from Table ES1, while Grand county has experienced an overall growth rate of 24.7% between 1990 and 2003, the other counties in the district have either lost population since the

<sup>1</sup> Maps of each county are in Appendix A

<sup>2</sup> Source: U.S. Bureau of Census - 1990 and 2000 Census

2000 Census or are experiencing a period of no growth. Even in Grand County, most of growth in population took place between the 1990 and the 2000 Census. Grand County's overall growth rate since the 2002 Census is between one-half percent and one percent. The district as a whole has lost 2% of its population since the 2000 Census.

Very little increase in the district's population is projected over the next five years<sup>3</sup>

<b>Carbon County Components of Population Change 2005 through 2009</b>				
	Beginning	Natural Increase	Residual Migration	Ending Population
2005	20461	137	-36	20562
2006	20562	141	-57	20646
2007	20646	141	18	20805
2008	20805	144	47	20996
2009	20996	147	273	21417
<b>Emery County Component of Population Change 2005 through 2009</b>				
2005	10657	131	-121	10667
2006	10667	134	-132	10669
2007	10669	138	-96	10710
2008	10710	137	-78	10769
2009	10769	138	39	10945
<b>Grand County Component of Population Change 2005 through 2009</b>				
2005	8583	49	-37	8596
2006	8596	70	-43	8602
2007	8602	48	-10	8640
2008	8640	47	4	8691
2008	8691	45	100	8837
<b>San Juan County Component of Population Change 2005 through 2009</b>				
2005	14621	220	-107	14734
2006	14734	227	-127	14834
2007	14834	232	-81	14987
2008	14987	238	-61	15164
2009	15164	242	99	15505

Table ES2

<sup>3</sup> Source: Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, Components of Population Change 2003 -2030

As can be seen from Table ES2, all counties, including Grand County, are expected to experience negative net migration. San Juan County is expected to experience the greatest growth, but most of that will be on the Navajo Reservation. During the next five years the overall average annual growth rate for the district is projected to be only .79%

<b>Average Annual Growth Rates For the S.E. District 2005 - 2009<sup>4</sup></b>					
	<b>Carbon</b>	<b>Emery</b>	<b>Grand</b>	<b>San Juan</b>	<b>State</b>
Overall Growth	.92%	.53%	.59%	1.12%	2.4%

Table ES3

As detailed in the Economic Development Plan, undoubtedly the primary reason for this stagnant population growth is the slow growth projected in new jobs and employment opportunities. Between 2005 and 2010 data from the Governor's Office of Planning and Budgets predicts that the growth in employment district wide will be less than 1%.

As one would presume from the small population numbers, population density in the southeast districts is quite low.

<b>Southeast District Population Densities</b>			
	<b>Square Miles</b>	<b>2003 Population</b>	<b>Pop Per Sq. Mile</b>
Carbon	1479	20422	13.80
Emery	4452	10860	2.44
Grand	3682	8485	2.30
San Juan	7821	14413	1.84

Table ES4

While low population densities might mean that there is plenty of room for growth, in actuality, most of the land area in the southeast district is owned and/or controlled by entities other than private citizens or local government.

As Table ES5 below shows, there really is very little land available for development. In the southeast district "land management planning" means working with state and federal government agencies to maintain multiple use policies on public lands, not just deciding when or where to allow the construction of a manufacturing plant or housing development.

---

<sup>4</sup> Source: Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, Components of Population Change 2003 -2030

Land Ownership Percentages By County				
	Federal	State	Reservation	Private or Local Government
Carbon	47.3%	13.1%	0%	39.3%
Emery	79.8%	11.9%	0%	8.3%
Grand	71.7%	15.7%	8.4%	4.2%
San Juan	60.2%	5.2%	25.2%	8.1%
Total	64.75%	11.5%	8.4%	15%

Table ES5

When and if decisions are made about how public lands in the southeast district will eventually be managed has a critical impact on when and how the district's population growth and employment opportunities begin to improve.

Along with stagnant population growth, the social/economic characteristics of the district's residents changed very little between the 1990 Census and the 2000 Census. Generally, residents in the southeast district are older, poorer, and less well educated than residents of the state as a whole.

Selected Socio/Economic Characteristics <sup>5</sup>								
	65Yrs of Age and Older		School Age - 5Yrs to 17Yrs.		Poverty Rate		Less Than High School <sup>6</sup>	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
Carbon	13%	13%	36%	29%	14%	13%	27%	19%
Emery	8%	10%	45%	35%	9%	12%	18%	16%
Grand	12%	13%	33%	27%	14%	15%	19%	17%
San Juan	7%	8%	45%	31%	35%	31%	40%	31%
State of Utah	9%	9%	38%	24%	11%	9%	15%	12%

Table ES6

While the poverty rate district wide was lower in 2000 than in 1990, in the years since the 2000 Census it is estimated to have risen an average of 2% in each county<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, 1990 and 2000 Census

<sup>6</sup> Percentage population 25 years and older

<sup>7</sup> Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, *Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance in the United States: 2003*

The southeast district is home to a significant number of single head of household families. As shown in the Statistics of Income table in Appendix A, single female head of household families have the lowest incomes of all family groups and are more apt to living in poverty than other types of families.

<b>Single Head of Household Families<sup>8</sup></b>				
	<b>Carbon</b>	<b>Emery</b>	<b>Grand</b>	<b>San Juan</b>
Total Families	<b>5424</b>	<b>2797</b>	<b>2198</b>	<b>3251</b>
Total Single Female Head of Houshold	422	178	241	466
Percentage	8%	6%	11%	14%
With Children under 6yr	107	31	59	57
With Children 6yrs to 18yrs.	215	147	182	409

Table ES7

Because of fixed income and lack of medical insurance, households where grandparents are raising their grandchildren are another demographic group that may be living well below median income

<b>Households Where Grandparents Are Caregivers<sup>9</sup></b>					
	<b>Carbon</b>	<b>Emery</b>	<b>Grand</b>	<b>San Juan</b>	<b>State</b>
Grand Parent as Caregiver	237	99	66	335	15,989
% of Total Housholds	4%	3%	3%	8%	2%

Table ES8

A significant percentage of the district's households depend on either public assistance or Supplemental Security Income

<b>Households With Public Assistance or SSI Income<sup>10</sup></b>				
	<b>Carbon</b>	<b>Emery</b>	<b>Grand</b>	<b>San Juan</b>
SSI	302	118	131	434
Public Assistance	346	167	211	436
Percentage of Hshlds	9%	8%	10%	21%

Table ES9

<sup>8</sup> Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, 2000 Census

<sup>9</sup> Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, 2000 Census Summary File 3

<sup>10</sup> Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, 2000 Census Summary File 3

Although, most of the residents of the southeast district are white, the district is also home to a significant number of people of Hispanic descent and a very large Native American Population.

Race and Ethnic Origins <sup>11</sup>								
	Carbon		Emery		Grand		San Juan	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
White	19250	97%	10419	98%	8164	99%	5273	41%
Black	70	004%	27	003%	29	003%	18	001%
Am Indian	262	01 %	85	007%	475	05%	8103	55%
Asian	78	004%	43	004%	22	003%	34	002%
Pac Islndr	2	0001%	7	0006%	0	0 %	0	0%
Other	24	001%	9	0008%	8	0009%	11	0007%
Hispanic	1938	10%	570	05%	503	06%	460	03%

Table ES9

Generally, the incomes of white district residents are higher than the incomes of minority residents.

Median Income by Racial or Ethnic Group <sup>12</sup>				
	Carbon	Emery	Grand	San Juan
All Races	<b>34,036</b>	<b>39,850</b>	<b>32,387</b>	<b>28,137</b>
White	34,971	40,175	32,681	36,088
Black	N/A <sup>13</sup>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Am Indian	N/A	N/A	23,333	16,051
Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pa Island	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	28,672	26,806	N/A	27,500
Hispanic	27,250	31,071	39,808	28,429

Table ES10

<sup>11</sup> Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, 2003 Estimates of Population, Race and Ethnic Origin

<sup>12</sup> Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, 2000 Census Summary File 4

<sup>13</sup> N/A means the information is **Not Available** because there are too few responses to tabulate and release the data.

## Summary of Consolidated Planning Process

The following priorities in the area of housing, community, and economic development were determined during the year-long Consolidated Planning process as outlined in the Public Participation section and in each section listed below.

These priorities were established in order to efficiently allocate the extremely limited funding opportunities available in the southeast district. Organizations and agencies seeking Housing and Urban Development funds, including matching and gap financing from state and private programs, should be evaluated on the priorities listed below. The southeast district's Community Development Block Grant Rating and Ranking Policies will also be based on these criteria.

### Performance Outcome Measurement Criteria

Beginning with the 2005/2006 funding year, grant recipients will be required report on how their project has achieved measurable goals and the impact(s) the project had on the community, families, and/or individuals. As in previous funding cycles, grant recipients are required to report on the performance output of their project. Henceforth, grant recipients will also be required to report on the benefit or effect (outcome) of the project using one of the five outcome criteria listed below:

1. Availability and/or Accessibility  
Possible Outcome Measures
  - a. New service/facility provided or existing service not discontinued
  - b. Improved existing service or facility, i.e, improved safety, health conditions and/or availability of the service or facility
2. Affordability  
Possible Outcome Measures
  - a. Increased number of low-income housing units
  - b. Decreased user fees
3. Sustainability and/or Livability  
Possible Outcome Measures
  - a. Improved or increased service and facilities
  - b. Decrease slum and blight
  - c. Housing and community facilities made accessible
4. Community Health, Safety and Quality

Possible Outcome Measures

- a. Improved emergency response capabilities
- b. Improved access to health care
- c. Decrease substance abuse, crime, truancy, etc.

5. Economic Opportunity

Possible Outcome Measures

- a. Number of businesses (and jobs) retained
- b. New businesses created
- c. Businesses assisted with training, obtaining contracts, and new revenue sources, etc.

Each priority listed in the Priority Summary section has been assigned two or three of the above criteria : Using the following sample model, grant recipients will be required to include in their final applications how they intend to report and document performance based outcomes:

1. **Goal:** How the project addresses a priority or need identified in the Consolidate Plan-
  - a. Increase recreational opportunities for residents
2. **Inputs:** What resources were used on the project-
  - a. CDBG Grant
  - b. Local or other funds committed to project
  - c. Applicant staff time
  - d. Technical assistance provided by SEUALG and state staff
  - e. Other inputs that may be identified during the preparation of the final application scope of work.
3. **Activities Undertaken:** (this is the heart of the scope of work)-
  - a. Design/engineer the project.
  - B. Prepare construction specifications and bid packets
  - c. Choose contractor
  - d. Construct sports courts/fields, install playground equipment, etc.
4. **Outputs:** What were the grant funds spent on-
  - a. Number and size of sports fields and their intended use
  - b. Description of installed playground equipment and play surfaces
  - c. Size/capacity of new swimming pool and/or description of ancillary facilities (changing rooms, showers, concession stands, etc.)
  - d. Number, description, size, etc., of new restrooms, pavilions parking lots, curb-cuts, etc.

5. **Outcomes and Outcome Measurements:** How did this project benefit the community, families and/or individuals-
- a. Increased availability or accessibility for recreational opportunities (Outcome Criteria No. 1)
    - i. Number of new participants in youth soccer leagues
    - ii. Skate board club member that now have a place to practice
    - iii. Increased number of community events and recreational activities (sponsored tournaments, holiday celebrations, etc)
    - iv. Decreased complaints to police about youth using other public and private property and facilities for inappropriate recreation: OR -
  - b. Improved Community Livability and/or Service Sustainability (Outcome Criteria No. 3)
    - i. Amount of blighted land now available to the entire community for recreational purposes.
    - ii. Amount of open space and/or green belt areas preserved or increased.
    - iii. Decreased fees, especially for low-income residents, because improvements lowered operating and maintenance costs

In order to be meaningful and measurable, each application must have a performance outcome measurement component designed to document outcome benefit for that specific project. Applicants in the pre-application stage must consider the performance outcome reporting requirements when deciding on a project, developing a project plan, and completing the pre-application. However, while the pre-application process does require information related to numbers one through four in the model detailed above in order to document an eligible activity and compliance with a national objective, a specific performance outcome measurement method will not be required unless the project is awarded funding.

Funded pre-applicants will work closely with staff from the Southeastern Utah Association of Governments to develop an acceptable performance outcome measurement and reporting method component, based on the model described above, for the scope of work submitted with the final application. The performance outcome measurement method detailed in the final application will become part of the contract executed between the applicant and the State of Utah, and will be the standard under which the grantee will report outputs and outcomes to the state. State staff will also use the performance outcome measurement method detailed in the contract to monitor the grantee for contract compliance and project completion and success.

## **Housing Development Summary:**

As detailed in the Housing Development Chapter, housing throughout the district is a major issue. Much of the district's housing is older and in less than acceptable condition. Decent, affordable housing not only benefits the families that live in it, the community itself benefits when housing units in slum and blighted areas are eliminated and replaced with pleasant, safe neighborhoods.

The Housing Development Priorities were determined by researching the issues, income levels and housing situation of the district's residents; conducting a district-wide survey of housing quality, quantity, and type; and with input and coordination from agencies and organizations that provide housing services to the district's low-income, disabled, and elderly residents; and by soliciting comments and input from the clients of these agencies and organizations along with district residents.

### **Outcome Performance Criteria Assigned to All Housing Projects:**

- A. Affordability (Criteria No. 2)
- B. Sustainability and/or Livability (Criteria No. 3)

#### **1. Increase the number and value of the district's Section 8 rental assistance subsidies:**

Very low-income renters suffer the biggest affordability gaps and are unlikely to ever become home-owners. Federal rental subsidy programs are the best most efficient way to provide safe, decent, affordable housing for these families/households. Even though this priority cannot be funded from the standard HUD competitive and entitlement programs, this issue is so critical to the district's low-income residents that it has been given the highest priority.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No. 2 (Affordability)

- a. Decrease or eliminate long wait lists
- b. Decrease in number of homeless
- c. Decrease in number of households/individuals who must live doubled-up

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No. 3 (Sustainability and/or Livability)

- a. Decrease in number of children that transfer from school to school as their families try to find affordable housing

- b. Increase the number of people who can now improve their job situation, job training, education levels, etc. because they no longer use so many of their resources on housing

## **2. Increase the number of units available to low and very low-income residents:**

Projects for new single and multi-family units are highly ranked, and include everything from additional housing authority owned/operated units to mutual self-help owner occupied units.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No. 2 (Affordability)

- a. Decrease in the number of households/families that must pay more than 30% of their income in housing costs.
- B. Increase in the number of homeless and doubled-up people moved into permanent housing
  - I. Families with children
  - ii. Disabled
  - iii. Elderly
- d. Elderly and disabled moved from nursing homes to more independent living situations.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No. 3 (Sustainability and/or Livability)

- a. Increase in number of units meeting minimum habitation standards
- b. Number of households with improved living conditions
- c. Decrease heating and cooling cost to residents because of improved energy efficiency

## **3. New housing units for persons with physical disabilities and senior citizens.**

Because of the general lack of commercial rental housing in this district, very few units have comprehensive disability adaptations for low-income disabled (including senior citizens) renters, these projects are highly ranked. Projects that provide major adaptive rehabilitation to existing owner-occupied housing units are also highly ranked.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No. 2 (Affordability)

- a. Number of disabled and elderly now able to afford independent, non-institutional housing
- b. Cost of supportive services reduced or eliminated
- c. Housing costs reduced to 30% or less of disposable income

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No. 3 (Sustainability and/or Livability)

- a. Improved health and well being of residents
- b. Improved participation in social, community and neighborhood activities by residents
- c. Decrease in the number of unacceptable units in the community

**4. Housing Rehabilitation/Replacement:**

As identified in the housing quality survey a very large percentage of the district's housing units are in less than acceptable condition. Many of these units are pre-1976 mobile homes. Besides being generally less than acceptable for habitation, these units are also usually not energy efficient and put an additional housing cost burden on low-income residents in the form of higher utility bills. Unacceptable housing may also cause health problems, especially for very young children and the elderly.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No. 2 (Affordability)

- a. Net worth of residents increased
- b. Property values increased
- c. Decreased housing costs through improved energy efficiency and decreased resource consumption

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No. 3 (Sustainability and/or Livability)

- a. Community improvement through the elimination of slum and blighted conditions.
- b. Improved health and safety of residents
- c. Code violations remedied

**5. Permanent supportive housing for people with chronic mental illness:**

Because Items 1 through 4 above directly effect a most of the district's low-income residents, permanent supportive housing for people with chronic mental illness

is a more moderate priority. While this type of project is usually associated with chronic homelessness, in this district the average chronically mentally ill person is usually housed, but is either doubled-up or lives with family and friends. Often these people are not eligible to rent from housing authorities, participate in the Section 8 rental assistance program, or have such a bad renter history that landlords will not accept their vouchers. Permanent supportive housing programs not only provide more acceptable housing, but can also help the client stabilize their illness, stay in treatment, and live independently from extended family.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No. 2 (Affordability)

- a. Decreased cost for providing mental health services and case management
- b. Decreased cost of housing for residents
- c. More funds available for supportive services

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No. 3 (Sustainability and/or Livability)

- a. Decreased homelessness
- b. Improved self-sufficiency and independence of residents
- c. Improved health, safety, life-style stability, and well-being of residents.
- d. Decreased use of illicit drugs and alcohol
- e. Reduction in jail bookings and police calls

## **6. Transitional Housing:**

Again, because of actual numbers, while important, transitional housing is ranked lower than other housing projects. However, until/unless there is an increase in rental subsidies and units for low-income families, a few transitional housing units in each county would benefit those citizens having the most difficulty moving from homelessness, domestic violence, and dependent housing to a more independent status.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No. 2 (Affordability)

- a. Number of families that can now break away from the abuser because affordable housing and support services are available
- b. Foster self-sufficiency and independence
- c. Increased educational levels and incomes for families

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No. 3 (Sustainability and/or Livability)

- a. Improved health and safety of victims
  - i. Improved lives for families' children
- b. Decrease the possibility of the next generation becoming either victims or victimizers.
- c. Decreased homelessness
- e. Reduction in jail bookings and police calls
- f. Decreased alcohol and drug abuse in client families

## **7. Emergency Homeless and Domestic Violence Shelters:**

Because homelessness (as defined by HUD) is a relatively minor problem in actual numbers when compared to higher ranked housing issues, these projects rank lower than other housing projects for CDBG funding. Because homelessness, especially chronic homelessness, is such a serious problem for both the individual and the community, homeless shelters, especially those that provide support programs to their clients are a priority in at least two of the counties in the district.

Most of the homelessness in the southeast district does not fall strictly within the HUD definition/guidelines. The majority of homeless in this district are homeless for a very short period of time because of low-incomes (coupled with poor job skills), economic crisis, and the lack of affordable housing. The availability of the programs identified in priorities 1 through 4 above usually removes the individual/family from homelessness permanently.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No. 2 (Affordability)

- a. Decreased homelessness
- b. Increased educational and job skill levels for homeless people
- c. Increased health, safety, and well-being for homeless clients
- d. Increased income opportunities for homeless people

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No. 3 (Sustainability and/or Livability)

- a. Opportunities to reconnect with extended family

- b. Decrease in the number of jail booking and police calls
- c. Reduction in the severity of mental illness in homeless clients

### **Community Development Summary:**

The priorities for funding community development projects were established during the last year by meeting with elected officials and/or planning and community development staff from every city and county in the district to discuss what issues each entity determined to be the most critical and important. Reviews of each entity's capital improvement lists were also conducted. Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments planning and community development staff also participated in the cities' and counties' budgeting and capital improvement public hearing process. Additional information was obtained in meetings with senior citizen groups, mental and public health organizations, educational system staff, and through regular meetings of the district's Interagency Coordinating Councils

Because of the limited CDBG funding, and the limitations of using this source of funding, many of the expensive, highly ranked projects will be funding with other monies, or CDBG/HUD funds will be used for the engineering component and/or gap financing.

#### **1. Community Planning:**

Planning is extremely important to the district's communities. Even though the southeast district hasn't yet faced the "quality growth" problems of the state's more urban areas, planning is vital to preserving the character of the district's communities. protecting the natural environment, providing adequate public services, public safety, health and well-being services, education, and transportation, etc.

Planning activities also allow the district's communities to become and remain eligible for funding through grants and low-interest loan programs and to identify special needs for disadvantaged and disenfranchised citizens.

### **Outcome Measurement Criteria Assigned to Community Planning:**

- A. Availability and/or Accessibility (Criteria No. 1)
- B. Sustainability and/or Livability (Criteria No. 3)
- C. Community Health, Safety and Quality (Criteria No. 4)

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No. 1 (Availability and./or Accessibility)

- a. Limited public resources are more efficiently used and more readily available when following a solid plan.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No. 3 (Sustainability and/or Livability)

- a. Public services are located where they are most needed in the amount/capacity they are needed
- b. The needs of a community's poorest, most disadvantaged residents are more apt to be identified and addressed by planning and research actions.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No. 4 (Community Health, Safety and Quality)

- a. Public safety is increased when natural obstacles, hazards, and unintended consequences are avoided
- b. Both cost savings and increased public service are realized when required maintenance is recognized and performed before a situation becomes critical.

## **2. Water projects (culinary and secondary):**

The climate of the southeast district is primarily desert and this area is currently in a severe drought. As detailed in the Community Development Plan, water is the single most critical issue facing the southeast district's communities. Many of the district's communities have aging, inadequate water distribution systems and infrastructure. Projects that improve water supply, distribution, and conservation are the highest priority. Secondary water projects should demonstrate how they will contribute to an overall increase of water to the communities' residents.

**Outcome Measurement Criteria Assigned to Culinary and Secondary Water Projects:**

- A. Sustainability and/or Livability (Criteria No. 3)
- B. Community Health, Safety and Quality (Criteria No. 4)

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No. 3 (Sustainability and or/Livability)

- a. Increased affordable housing units because water is available
- b. Ability of a community to retain existing business and industry and/or attract new business
- c. Number of households with adequate water supply

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No. 4 (Community Health, Safety and Quality)

- a. Number of citizens with improved water quality
- b. Improved health and safety of citizens, including the ability to fight fires

**3. Sewer and Storm/Run-Off Drainage Projects:**

These types of projects are a high priority to the district's communities for several reasons: 1-Many communities are still dependent on aging septic or cesspool systems that are no longer adequate or do not meet current code. 2-Waste water treatment can play a critical role in overall conservation plans. 3-Waste water treatment systems are critical for the development of industry. 4- Despite the desert environment, regular severe rainfall and heavy snow melt combined with impervious soils cause frequent flooding in some communities, making run-off and storm drainage projects a very high priority. 5-Open secondary water canals used to also handle run-off. As these canals have been piped these run-off channels have been lost: and 6- Many of the smaller, older communities have not constructed these projects previously because they did not recognize the need.

**Outcome Measurement Criteria Assigned to Sewer and Storm/Run-off Drainage Projects:**

- A. Sustainability and/or Livability (Criteria No. 3)
- B. Community Health, Safety and Quality (Criteria No. 4)

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No. 3 (Sustainability and/or Livability)

- a. Increased water conservation
- b. Increased property values.

Possible Outcome Measure to Consider for Criteria No. 4  
(Community Health, Safety and Quality)

- a. Number of households hooked to sewer lines and removing septic/cesspool systems.
- b. Increased clean water released into the environment
- c. Increased public health

**3. Medical Services and Public Safety:**

The Community Development Chapter details how the southeast district is medically underserved, especially for its low-income public insurance or uninsured citizens. Projects that increase medical services to these citizens are a high priority. Ambulance, emergency response services, and fire safety projects are also a high priority. Fire safety projects are especially critical in communities with a high percentage of deficient housing and low-income residents

***Outcome Measurement Criteria Assigned to Medical Services and Public Safety***

- A. Availability and/or Accessibility (Criteria No. 1)
- B. Affordability (Criteria No. 2)
- C. Community Health, Safety and Quality (Criteria No. 4)

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No. 1  
(Availability and/or Accessibility)

- a. Increased immunization of children
- b. Better school performance because children have fewer missed days
- c. Increased life-span because disease and illness is treated earlier

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No 2  
(Affordability)

- a. Low-Income persons that now have access to affordable medical services
- b. Decreased overall cost because conditions are caught early
- c. Decreased insurance costs because of improved fire protection

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No. 4  
(Community Health, Safety and Quality)

- a. Decreased drug and alcohol use
- b. Improved public safety because accidents and fires are handled more quickly
- c. Improved safety and efficiency for volunteer public safety personnel because of improved training, equipment, and supplies.

#### **4. ADA, Accessibility, and Visitability Projects:**

While only an occasional public facility is still found to be out of the compliance with the law, additional and enhanced disability access projects enable the districts large percentage of senior citizens and people with disabilities have full access to their communities and public services.

#### **Outcome Measurement Criteria Assigned to ADA, Accessibility, and Visitability Projects**

- A. Availability and/or Accessibility (Criteria No. 1)
- B. Sustainability and/or Livability (Criteria No. 3)
- C. Community Health, Safety and Quality (Criteria No. 4)

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No. 1 (Availability and/or Accessibility)

- a. People with improved ability to access public functions.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No. 3 (Sustainability and/or Livability)

- a. More people moving into self sufficiency
- b. People with improved access to medical care, shopping, and recreational opportunities

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No. 4 (Community Health, Safety and Quality)

- a. Improved well-being because people are no longer isolated
- b. Enhanced economic development because of improved services to tourists and other visitors to district communities.

#### **5. Community and Human Service Centers:**

Projects such as senior centers, food banks, low-income day care and Head-Start facilities, disability services centers, and family support centers are all high priorities to the district's communities.

Because the cities/towns in the southeast district are so small and isolated, community type centers that provide services to residents throughout a region or county are an efficient, economical way to provide needed services to the district's low-income, senior citizen, and disabled citizens.

**Outcome Measurement Criteria Assigned to Community And Human Services Center Projects**

- A. Availability and/or Accessibility (Criteria No. 1)
- B. Community Health, Safety and Quality (Criteria No. 4)

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No 1 (Availability and/or Accessibility)

- a. Number of meals served to senior citizens
- b. Number of low-income residents receiving food assistance
- e. Number of low-income residents receiving emergency assistance and utility assistance payments

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No 4 (Community Health, Safety and Quality)

- a. Number of home-bound residents placed on a "meals-on-wheels" program
- b. Number of children able to participate in an after school program instead of being home alone or unsupervised

**6. Transportation, Street, and Highway Projects:**

Projects in this category are critical to both community development and economic development. Communities in the southeast district are not only rural, they are very remote. Public highways and streets are the primary, and for many communities, the only way to move goods and services in and out of the district.

If public highways and streets are the transportation arteries of the district, the private car/truck is the life-blood. There are no public transportation systems for people who either can't afford a car or who are not able to drive. This is especially problematic for low-income residents who are most apt to live in affordable outlying communities and have jobs that require shift work, making it difficult to car-pool.

**Outcome Measurement Criteria Assigned to Transportation, Street, and Highway Projects**

- A. Availability and/or Accessibility (Criteria No. 1)
- B. Sustainability and/or Livability (Criteria No. 3)

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No 1 (Availability and/or Accessibility)

- a. Number of people who can now obtain and keep jobs
- b. Number of people shuttled to medical and mental health services

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No. 3 (Sustainability and/or Livability)

- a. Improved public safety because fewer people are walking along highways, or hitchhiking
- b. More housing choice for low-income residents because transportation is available from outlying areas to jobs, shopping, and services

## **7. Parks and Recreation Projects:**

Because of the district's small population very few commercial recreation facilities exist. While not as costly and as high a priority as many of the higher ranked projects, these projects are vitally important to district residents. In the district's more remote communities public parks and playgrounds, rodeo and fair grounds, and sport fields, etc. provide all of the recreation opportunities for the residents. Often these facilities function as a community center where residents gather to celebrate holidays and turn things such as birthdays and anniversaries into community wide functions.

### ***Outcome Measurement Criteria Assigned to Parks and Recreation Projects***

- A. Availability and/or Accessibility (Criteria No. 1)
- B. Sustainability and/or Livability (Criteria No. 3)

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider For Criteria No 1 (Availability and/or Accessibility)

- a. Number of children able to participate in team sports.
- b. Number of children that have a safe, central location to play
- c. Increases in participation in recreational sports teams, and public events such as rodeos, stock shows, car racing, etc.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Criteria No 3 (Sustainability and/or Livability)

- a. At risk youth "have something to do"
- b. Improved health because of increased exercise opportunities
- c. Improved community well being because citizens now have a place to come together, without regard for ability to pay

## **8. Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter, Lighting, and Miscellaneous Public Facilities Projects:**

While most district cities and towns now require these facilities for all new development, many older towns have large sections where these amenities don't exist. Besides making nicer communities and neighborhoods, these projects also address public safety concerns, ADA compliance, and storm/run-off problems.

### ***Outcome Measurement Criteria Assigned to Sidewalk, Curb and Gutter, Lighting, and Miscellaneous Public Facilities Projects***

- A. Sustainability and/or Livability (Criteria No. 3)
- B. Community Health, Safety, and Quality (Criteria No. 5)

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Sustainability and/or Livability (Criteria No. 3)

- a. Increase handicap accessibility for residents
- b. Improved property values
- c. Elimination of slum and blight conditions.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Community Health, Safety and Quality (Criteria No 5)

- D. Increased traffic control
- E. Increased public safety
- F. Decreased crime

## **Economic Development Summary:**

Priorities and ranking policies were established for economic development projects in conjunction with information provided by the Southeastern Utah Economic Development District (SEUEDD), the county economic development practitioners, the Small Business Development Centers, elected officials, the Department of Workforce Services and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, etc.

The economy of the southeast district and the ability of residents to obtain decent jobs that pay a living wage and include benefits such as health insurance and retirement savings options are key to all other issues facing communities in this district. People with adequate incomes and health benefits are able to provide decent housing, health care, and education for themselves and their families, along with paying the taxes necessary for public infrastructure and public safety and services.

The residents of this district have long suffered the effects of low wages, high unemployment, lack of job growth and an overall stagnant economy. While all forms of economic development will be pursued, the emphasis will be on the development of small, home-grown business.

## **Outcome Measurement Criteria Assigned to All Economic Development Projects**

### **A. Economic Opportunity (Criteria No. 5)**

#### **1. Continue to Operate and Fund the District's Revolving Loan Fund Program:**

This program provides critical capital and seed money to small start up businesses and has been very successful in creating jobs for the district's low-income residents.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Economic Opportunity (Criteria No. 5)

- a. Number of successful business started.
- b. Number of businesses helped to continue in operation
- c. Number of jobs created by these businesses, especially those available to people from low-income households.
- d. Decrease the number of loans that have to be written off

#### **2. Participate In and Provide the Match for the SEUEDD and the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy Planning Process:**

This document identifies needs and enables communities to apply for millions of dollars in funding for projects that increases economic development and job opportunities for the district's low-income residents.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Economic Opportunity (Criteria No. 5)

- a. More efficient use of scarce resources
- b. Number of new companies encouraged to locate or relocate into the district
- c. Number of existing companies able to expand their operations
- d. Number of new jobs created or retained.

#### **3. Operate and Expand the District's Business and Technical Assistance Center (BTAC).**

Besides providing needed office and light manufacturing space to district businesses in an area that covers two county, the BTAC staff also provide technical assistance to off-site businesses throughout the district and coordinates access to the district revolving loan funds and business planning resources.

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Economic Opportunity (Criteria No. 5)

- a. Number of businesses incubated both on and off-site
- b. Number of businesses assisted to access capital resources
- c. Number of jobs created, especially for low-income people.
- d. Number of businesses prevented from closing

**4. Maintain the Planning and Technical Assistance Activities Provided Through the Business Assistance Center and the Small Business Investment Strategy Advisory Council:**

This program, now de-funded, provided seed capital grants to very low-income residents for business start-up and provided business training and counseling for ensure their success. As detailed in the Economic Development Chapter, a significant number of very low income households were helped to become self-sufficient through this program

Possible Outcome Measures to Consider for Economic Opportunity (Criteria No. 5)

- a. Number of people who successfully complete the business training courses.
- b. Number of low-income people who obtain grants and start new businesses
- c. Number of businesses that are still successful after twelve months
- d. Number of jobs created

**CDBG Rating and Ranking Policies:**

The Community Development Block Grant Rating and Ranking Committee (RRC), which is also the governing board of the Southeastern Utah Association of Local governments and consists of elected officials from throughout the district, was actively involved with the Consolidated Planning process.

Based on the needs and issues identified in the planning process, the Rating and Ranking committee set the following basic policies to determine how CDBG funding will be allocated:

The RRC, recognizing the different needs in each of the district's remote counties, has decided to maintain the county by county allocation based on the formula used at the state level. This method has also proven to be the best way to ensure that the district's smaller communities remain competitive against the larger entities with professional staff, and have an opportunity to complete their critical projects.

1. \$25,000 base allocation
2. The balance of each county's allocation will be distributed based on a per capita formula

The RRC recognizes the need to provide technical assistance at the local level to district communities for project development, contract management, and project management. The RRC also recognizes that some types of projects have a priority throughout the district, or that some types of projects are better operated at the district rather than local level.

Therefore, each year the RRC allocates a set amount for the operation of the district's revolving loan funds, technical assistance to be provided to district communities for the successful completion of HUD funded programs and grants, technical assistance for project development and the Consolidated Planning process, and to operate the district's housing rehabilitation programs and low-income lead based paint testing program.

The RRC has also determined that a 15% set aside should be allocated each year for entities to use for major projects that provide direct benefit to the housing units of income qualified district residents. Applications for the housing set-aside will be accepted from all eligible entities throughout the district.

From time to time the RRC may also set-aside funds to be used for major projects that have critical importance to district residents, even if the project provides primary benefit to one community or county.

Further, the RRC has determined that generally projects will be rated and ranked in the following order:

### **1. Housing Development**

Projects must increase units or provide improvements to existing housing. These projects include infrastructure necessary for new housing and lateral line installation to existing units to allow sewer/water hook-ups, and septic system repairs, etc.

### **2. Economic Development**

Projects that provide permanent full time jobs to income qualified district residents. Temporary jobs created during a community development project will not receive points.

### **3. Community Development**

- A. Water projects
- B. Sewer projects
- C. Medical care and public safety, including public and emergency communication and addressing projects
- D. ADA Projects
- E. Community and Human Services Centers, including transportation projects - Because of limited funding these projects will be restricted to construction and purchase of fixtures, furnishing, and equipment.
- F. Parks, playgrounds, sports fields, skate and bike parks, and recreational facilities
- G. Sidewalks, curb, gutter, GIS projects, street lights, etc.

#### **Public Participation Process**

Under the direction of the governing board of the Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (which also functions as the Community Development Block Grant Rating and Ranking Committee) the Consolidated Planning process is an ongoing collaboration between the SEUALG staff and the district's cities and counties, along with organizations that provide services to people with low incomes, people with disabilities, and senior citizens.

Although the issues and needs of housing, community, and economic development are often interrelated, generally, the needs assessments, solutions and actions described by this Consolidated Plan were determined with public participation as follows:

#### **Housing Development**

While SEUALG staff directed the housing survey process and actually surveyed parts of many communities, the work was coordinated through the various county and city GIS departments. Contracts to perform actual surveys and tabulate the data were executed at the county and city level. County and city staff performed most of the survey work and provided detailed reports on the results.

County GIS also used their participation in the housing survey project to update/upgrade their systems and the information they contain.

The two Continuum of Care committees and the three district housing authorities also participated in the Consolidated Planning Process and SEUALG staff reciprocated by participating in the Continuum of Care committees' planning process and the Five Year

Planning required of the housing authorities. Planning documents from these agencies and organizations are incorporated by reference into this Consolidated Plan.

### **Community Development**

Meetings were conducted with elected officials and staff from every city, town, and county within the district to determine community and capital improvement needs and priorities. Additional input was obtained through meetings with building inspectors, city administrators and engineering, and community development directors. SEUALG staff also participated in many district communities' public planning and budget hearings.

SEUALG staff worked in close coordination with cities and counties to identify needs and advance project development for both housing and general community development projects.

### **Economic Development**

Needs and priorities for economic development issues were determined through close coordination between the economic development practitioners in each county, staff from the Department of Workforce Services, the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Small Business Development Center, the Business and Technical Assistance Center, the district's revolving loan fund board and various advisory councils such as the Small Business Investment Council.

### **Human Service and Social Needs**

Organizations and agencies that provided input into the Consolidate Planning process were:

- Active Re-Entry - Independent Living Center
- The Area Aging on Agency Council
- The Community Services Advisory Council
- Housing Authority Resident Advisory Council
- The Interagency Coordinating Councils
- The district FEMA advisory board

### **Outreach Efforts:**

As part of the Community Development Block Grant Program funding cycle, the SEUALG sent letters to non-profit organizations and advocacy groups explaining how to participate in their community's public planning process.

Copies of the draft Consolidated Plan were made available to all interested organizations and individuals. Copies of relevant

sections were sent to each of the groups that participated in the planning process with a request for input and comment. An outline of the plan was included in the board mailer and advertised on the SEUALG's public agenda which is posted on the website. The outline was presented to the SEUALG governing board during their public meeting in November 18, 2004. Finally, a public hearing was held on November 22, 2004. This public hearing was advertised in all the district's newspapers between seven and ten days prior to the hearing. The public hearing was also the start of a 30 day comment period during which time all written comments concerning the Consolidated Plan were received and incorporated in the document.

### **Public Hearings and 30 Day Comment Period Results**

One additional comment was made at the public board meeting. The suggestion that there be more coordination of projects between San Juan County, the State of Utah, and the Navajo Reservation was included in the Community Development Chapter.

There was no attendance at the public hearing and no additional comments were received during the comment period.