



SOUTHEASTERN UTAH ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS 2005 - 2009 CONSOLIDATED PLAN 2009 ACTION PLAN

Prepared by
Deborah L. Hatt
CDBG Program Manager
December 2008

COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENTS

William D. Howell, Executive Director
(SEUALG and SEUEDD)

Marilyn Vogrinec - Housing Rehabilitation Manager
Jackie Butkovitch - Community Services/HEAT Program Manager
Michael Bryant - Community Planner
Deborah L. Hatt - Revolving Loan Fund Manager
Delia Paletta - Business and Technical Assistance Center and Procurement

WITH COMMUNITY AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Entity Planners, District Housing Authorities, District Tri-Partite Board, District Homeless and Housing Coordinating Committees, Elected Officials and City/County Administrators, the Department of Workforce Services, Southeastern Utah Health District, Four Corners Behavioral Health District, Active Re-Entry/Independent Living Center, the Area Agency on Aging, Food Bank Survey Participants, Citizens Who Participated In the Public Hearing Process



**SOUTHEASTERN UTAH ASSOCIATION
OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
2005-2009 CONSOLIDATED PLAN
2009 ACTION PLAN**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>I. Executive Summary</u>	1
A. Evaluation of Current Needs	1
B. Evaluation of Past Performance	2
C. Funding Priority Decision Making Process	3
D. Summary of Citizen Participation and Consultation	
E. Priorities	4
 <u>II. Annual Housing and Homeless Needs Assessment</u>	 7
A. Multi-family Rental Housing, Public Housing, Other	7
B. Single-family	7
C. Description and Status of Regional Homeless Coordinating Councils	8
1. Continuum of Care Consistency Assessment	9
2. Needs Assessment Narrative	9
3. Implementation Plan	10
D. Overall Housing Needs Assessment	11
E. Barriers To Affordable Housing	13
F. Special Needs Housing (Non-Homeless)	15
G. Overall Housing Needs Implementation Strategy	15
H. Lead Based Paint Strategy	16
 <u>III. Annual Non-Housing Community Development Needs Assessment</u>	 19
A. Community Development Status and Needs Assessment	19
B. Economic Development Needs	21
 <u>IV. Communities/Neighborhoods Focus Assessment</u>	 23
A. Needs Indicators	23
B. Identification of Cities/Towns and/or Distress Types	24
C. Geographic Distribution Based On Need	27

D. Solution Strategy _____	27
E. Priority By Location or Type of Need _____	27
<u>V. Method of Distribution</u> _____	29
A. Program Summary _____	29
B. Rating and Ranking Updates _____	29
<u>VI. Annual Performance Measures</u> _____	31
<u>VII. Public Involvement</u> _____	33
A. Consultation _____	33
B. Coordination _____	33
1. Business Community _____	33
2. Other State and Federal Agencies _____	33
3. General Public _____	34
<u>VIII. Attachment</u>	
A. Table A _____	35
B. Table C _____	37
C. Capital Improvement Project Lists _____	41



SOUTHEASTERN UTAH ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS 2005-2009 CONSOLIDATED PLAN 2009 ONE YEAR ACTION PLAN

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Evaluation of Current Needs

While each community within the four counties served by the Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) determines its own needs and priorities, the council of governments (COG) process in each county and the technical assistance provided by the SEUALG helps consolidate those needs into the region-wide priorities outlined in this document.

1. Housing

Communities in southeastern Utah have not generally experienced the population or housing development growth seen in other parts of the state. The positive side of this lack of development is that housing costs have also not seen the extreme escalation experienced in other areas of the state. However, costs have increased while the lack of development has meant a decrease in the number of acceptable units available to the districts less advantaged households. Priorities common to all four counties include:

- a. Communities in southeastern Utah served by the SEUALG recognize the need for increased units (especially multi-family rental) to serve the range of needs of low-income, working-poor, elderly, and special needs households.
- b. In most communities in southeastern Utah 40% of the single family housing units are more than 50 years old. In many southeastern Utah communities 60%-90% of the single family housing units are over 50 years old. Because many of these older homes are deteriorated and even dilapidated, rehabilitation of these units is a high priority.
- c. Replace or eliminate unacceptable mobile units, especially those built prior to 1976.

2. Community Development

With the expected growth in the district's energy resource extraction industries in the next decade, adequate public infrastructure and the maintenance of existing facilities is a high priority for communities in southeastern Utah. While basic infrastructure (water, sewer, roads/highways, power transmission, etc.) remains the top priority, District entities also recognize that a community's livability and quality of life require investment in projects that provide for and enhance human and community services.

- a. Development or replacement of food bank facilities, children's justice centers, senior centers, children's and elder day-care centers, etc.
- b. Development or expansion of recreational facilities and opportunities within the District's communities
- c. Region-wide planning activities/processes that help communities develop needs assessment and prioritization processes so that

community development needs can be coordinated with limited funding availability.

3. Economic Development

While the southeastern Utah region has experienced an expanding economy during the last few years, the majority of the jobs created pay only minimum wage or slightly above and are part-time and/or seasonal. District economic development needs continue to center around:

- a. Technical assistance for businesses that provide jobs to LMI person.
- b. Coordination of business assistance programs and services
- c. Continued operation of the District's revolving loan fund program to provide needed capital and gap financing.

B. Evaluation of Past Performance

The following CDBG and HOME projects were funded in program years 2008. Not all these projects have been completed, however. When they are completed they will be included in the Annual Performance Measures section. Technical assistance was also provided to district CDBG applicants for the successful operation of their grants, the district's homeless/continuum of care committees to update their plans and apply for funding.

2008 Southeastern Utah CDBG and HOME Funded Projects					
Entity	Project	CDBG Amount	HOME Amount	CoC Amunt	Performance Measurement*
SEUALG	Single Family Hsg Rehab	\$180,000	\$250,000		DH-2
SEUALG	Planning/TA	\$40,000			SL-1
Blanding	Water Treatment Plant	\$1,000			SL-1
Moab	Replace asbestos water line	\$90,105			SL-1
Price/SEUALG	Renovate old hotel for permanent supportive housing	\$100,000	\$150,000		DH-1
Carbon Co/SEUALG	Rehab existing homeless shelter	\$100,000	\$150,000		DH-3
4-Corners Mental Health	Operate permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless mentally ill residents			\$153,980 (2 years)	DH-3

*Performance Measurement Codes

	Availability/Accessibility	Affordability	Sustainability
Decent Housing	DH - 1	DH - 2	DH - 3
Suitable Living Environment	SL - 1	SL - 2	SL - 3
Economic Opportunity	EO - 1	EO - 2	EO - 3

2008 CDBG and HOME Projects - Projected Benefits						
Project Type	CDBG Allocated	HOME Allocated	CoC	Number Benefiting	LMI Benefit	LMI %
Housing Rehab	\$180,000	\$250,000		22	22	100%
Homeless Prjts			\$76,991	8	8	100%
Emergency Shelter	\$100,000	\$100,000		35	35	100%
Permanent Hsg	\$100,000	\$100,000		300	300	100%
Water Treatment Plant	\$100,000			3165	1994	63%
Water Line Replacement	\$90,105			4868	2492	51%

Overall, CDBG funded projects in the southeastern Utah district have an LMI benefit rate of 85%. Also, for the last several years at least 35% of the district's CDBG allocation has been spent on housing. In 2008 almost 70% of the district's allocation was awarded to housing projects.

C. Funding Priority Decision Making Process

During the 2008 - 2009 program year, no changes were made to the funding prioritization or decision making process in the southeastern Utah region.

1. Community Development Block Grant Program

Pre-applications for the regional CDBG allocation are accepted during the fall application period. Each year the rating and ranking committee establishes the criteria by which the pre-applications are ranked. The Rating and Ranking policies are based directly on the outcome of the annual Consolidated Plan needs assessment process. Points are earned for how much the project benefits low-income residents, where the project falls on the priority lists, how much other funding is being leveraged, etc. While projects that are lower on the priority lists are often funded, (i.e., park or sidewalk projects) it is because the projects applied for have a better fit to the CDBG program requirements (LMI benefit, eligible activity, Davis-Bacon requirements) than a higher prioritized project might (i.e., large water and sewer project) and, no applications are received for the higher priority projects. Under the southeastern Utah region's rating and ranking process a low ranked application would not be funded over an application that received a higher number of points.

2. HOME, HOPWA, and Emergency Shelter Grant programs

The State of Utah determines which projects/applications are funded for HOME single and multi-family funding, Emergency Shelter Grants, and HOPWA funding. Information about the state's funding process can be found at:

HOME/HOPWA

<http://housing.utah.gov/owhlf/programs.html>

Emergency Shelter Grants

<http://housing.utah.gov/scso/esg.html>

3. Local Home/Rural Development/CDBG Single Family Housing Rehabilitation Program

The State of Utah contracts a set amount of its single-family rehabilitation funds to the Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments to provide owner-occupied housing rehabilitation services in southeastern Utah. The SEUALG uses these funds in conjunction with CDBG funding and Rural Development monies to rehabilitate or replace deficient and deteriorated owner-occupied housing units. Although the SEUALG does not currently have a waiting list, the basic criteria to prioritize clients to participate in this program is:

- a. Very Low and Low (65% or less) Income
- b. Disability
- c. Serious Health and safety issues with the unit
- d. Children under ten years of age living in the home
- e. Senior Citizens.

D. Summary of Citizen Participation and Consultation

As has been the practice in previous years by the SEUALG when updating and developing the one year action plans, priorities for HUD funding are established during an ongoing process that starts with the county and city capital improvements planning processes, in which Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments staff actively participates. This planning also includes numerous public hearings during which input from district citizens is actively sought. Further input is obtained from the district's housing authorities, tenant advisory groups, low-income advocacy groups, disability services organizations, senior citizen groups, surveys of food bank and community services clients, the United Way. Information contained in the TRACKER, HMIS (homeless management information system), and HEAT program data bases is also used to help determine priorities.

SEUALG staff also conducts regular, ongoing outreach to local planners, city and county administrators, and community/economic development directors. SEUALG staff serve on and coordinates with the various continuum of care committees, affordable housing committees, interagency coordinating councils, and community services councils, etc. The various boards for many of the district's programs (Community Services Tri-partite board, Area Agency on Aging Board, the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy Committee, etc.) also participate in the needs assessment and prioritization process. Public participation is solicited from the public at large and from the clients of the various community and human services agencies. Finally, an advertised annual public hearing is held to review the Consolidated Plan and Action Plans, and a draft copy of the plan and updates are posted on the SEUALG website for public comment. Copies of the draft action plan are also sent directly to the other agencies and advocacy groups for comment.

E. Priorities

Based on the needs assessments and analysis in the 2009 Action Plan, the following prioritized needs have been established region-wide for CDBG, HOME, Emergency Shelter Grants, Stewart McKinney Homeless Funding

1. Housing

- a. Development of housing for VLMI medium to large families (rental and owner occupied)
- b. Development of housing for LMI medium to large families (rental and owner occupied)
- c. Development of housing for seniors and/or people with physical disabilities
- d. Rehabilitation/replacement of existing deficient housing units
- e. Down-payment assistance
- f. Development of permanent supportive housing for people with mental

- g. illness and substance abuse issues (both homeless and non-homeless)
- g. Rehabilitation of existing emergency shelters
- h. Development of transitional housing units
- i. Development of additional emergency shelter/units

2. *Community Development*

- a.. Human services facilities that focus on low and very low income residents (food banks, senior centers, disability services, children's facilities, etc.)
- b. Culinary Water
- c. Sewer Projects (including installation of lateral lines on private property)
- d. Medical facilities and equipment
- e.. Fire protection and emergency/rescue
- F. ADA compliance and disability access
- g. Storm Drainage
- h. Recreation Projects, including multiple use community centers
- i. Sidewalk, curb, gutter and other similar public infrastructure

3. *Economic Development*

- a. Technical Assistance to businesses that create and retain jobs available to LMI persons.
- b. Continued operation of the district's revolving loan funds, with the primary goal of job creation
- c. Projects that would ordinarily be considered housing or community development, but that contribute to increased economic development activity and/or increased jobs.

4. *Summary of One Year Performance Measures*

During the 2009 funding year it is expected that the following activities will be accomplished

- a. Housing (Decent Housing/Affordability):
 - i. Rehabilitation of an existing emergency shelter facility, to include approximately 18 transitional units and up to five emergency shelter beds.
 - ii. Rehabilitation of an empty hotel building to provide approximately 24 permanent supportive units available to very-low and low income households
 - iii. Rehabilitation of 15 to 20 single-family, owner occupied housing units
- b. Community Development (Suitable Living Environment/Availability-Accessibility)
 - i. Price City completed a park improvement project in the south end of town that had a neighborhood LMI benefit of 63%
 - ii. Moab City completed a park improvement project the provided community wide LMI benefit of 52%
 - iii. Blanding City will complete and upgrade of their water treatment plant with a community wide LMI benefit of 62%
 - iv. Monticello City will complete the construction of a new pavilion in the main city park. This project has a community wide LMI benefit of 60%
- c. Economic Development (Economic Opportunity/Availability-Accessibility)
 - i. Technical assistance activities are expected to result in the creation of 5 jobs for LMI individuals

II. ANNUAL HOUSING AND HOMELESS NEEDS ASSESSMENT

A. Multi-family Rental Housing, Public Housing, Other

1. Multi-family rental housing is somewhat limited in southeastern Utah. Because of the rural character of most of the district, the single family home has been preferred housing choice. Most of the multi-family units built in the last ten years have been in Grand County and have been primarily condominium units that are used for tourist room rentals and vacation time-share sales.

While every county in the district could benefit from additional affordable multi-family units, the projects needed are very small; generally an 8-plex, or scattered site four/ duplex units, not the minimum 35 to 50 unit developments usually required in order for the developer to even consider the project. Because of the cost/benefit limitations of very small rental projects there is a limited number of privately owned multi-family housing units available for rent in all four counties. The majority of the units available to many low-income renters are deficient mobile homes or deteriorated very old single family homes.

2. Low and very low income resident are served by the limited public housing programs operated by the three housing authorities. The waiting list time at all three housing authorities has increased by an average three month over the last year. Because of the current world-wide mortgage/credit crisis, private non-profit developers are finding it difficult to sell their LIHTC awards at all, let alone for the historical 90-95 cents on the dollar, and two multi-family projects are delayed while the developer secures additional funding..

The inventory of public/subsidized housing and vouchers in the southeast Utah district is:

Public Housing Units					
	Housing Auth of Carbon County	Emery County Housing Authority	Grand County Housing Authority	Grand County Housing Authority-SJC	Coal County Hsg Develop
3BRM	20				1
2BRM	46	12	20	0	8
1BRM	66	12	6	0	2

Number of Vouchers Available				
	Housing Auth of Carbon County	Emery County Housing Authority	Grand County Housing Authority	Grand County Housing Authority-SJC
3BRM	47	0	16	0
2BRM	157	63	27	0
1BRM	76	5	30	0
No. on Wait List	40	23	37	N/A no wait list maintained
Time on Wait Lis	9-12 months	30 months	+12 months	N/A no wait list maintained

B. Single-Family Housing

Because the economy in southeastern Utah did not see the explosive growth experienced in the rest of the state, the housing markets in southeastern Utah also did not experience the unchecked speculation and creative financing schemes that are now plaguing the rest of the state. While the foreclosure rates in southeastern Utah have increased compared to previously, there are still only 3 or 4 foreclosure reports per quarter.

However, many single family units in southeastern Utah have been purchased by companies and individuals and held for short term rental either for temporary workers (gas fields and power plant maintenance) or for tourist room sales. Also many of the units built in the last few years are vacation homes owned by people from other areas or states. In other words, many of the empty single family units are not available for long-term family rentals.

Over the last year both the number of units sold and the average selling price have dropped substantially

3 rd Quarter Market Statistics - Year Over Comparisons ¹								
	3 rd Qtr 2005		3 rd Qtr 2006		3 rd Qtr 2007		3 rd Qtr 2008	
Carbon/Emery	108	\$84,314	88	\$104,653	96	\$108,753	79	\$106,410
Grand/San Juan								
Homes	52	\$156,163	61	\$181,653	26	\$260,012	8	\$238,437
Condos	8	\$226,317	15	\$268,329	11	\$277,762	4	\$231,625
San Juan Only					15	\$175,786	12	\$160,866

While lower house prices may benefit the average buyer, tight credit and higher downpayment requirements make it harder for lower income households to buy their first home. This is especially true now that down-payment assistance funding is no longer available.

C. Description and Status of Regional Homeless Coordinating Councils

1. Continuum of Care Consistency Assessment

There are three homeless coordinating councils that serve the four counties in southeastern Utah. The Carbon/Emery Council and the Grand County Affordable Housing Coalition (homeless council is a sub-committee) is chaired by a local elected official. The San Juan County Council is currently chaired by the President of the Blue Mountain Diné (a Native American organization).

Each council consists of representatives from the mental health districts, emergency shelters (general homeless and domestic violence), law enforcement, county/city planning and zoning departments, housing authorities, financial institutions, faith-based organizations, and at large community interest members. Each council has an executive board that meets bi-monthly and working sub-committees that meet during the alternate months. The southeastern Utah homeless coordinating committees are participating in the state planning process by using the state provided template to contribute information for the Balance of State Ten-Year and Continuum of Care Planning processes. Besides addressing the needs of the homeless, each council is actively involved in identifying and addressing general affordable housing needs.

¹ Source: Utah Association of Realtors

The regional homeless coordinating and continuum of care committees, along with the individual homeless service providers participate in the Balance of State Continuum of Care and follow the State committee's lead to coordinate services, share service and client information, and improve community awareness of homeless issues. The regional continuums of care and local service providers also participate in the HMIS system.

2. Homeless Needs Assessment

There has been very little change in the identified homeless needs assessment over the last year. Two major projects are under development in Carbon County. One is the rehabilitation of the emergency shelter located in Helper City. The rehabilitation will bring the 100 year old building up to code, make it energy efficient, and bring it into compliance with ADA regulations. The rehabilitation will also provide 15 units of supportive transitional housing and up to five emergency shelter beds. The second project will rehabilitate an unused hotel building in Price City. This building will also be energy efficient, ADA compliant and provide 24 to 30 units of permanent supportive housing. Chronically homeless residents of the emergency shelter/transitional housing program in Helper will be relocated to this facility when it is complete.

i. Emergency Shelters

There is one emergency homeless shelter (Carbon County) and three spouse abuse shelters (Carbon, Grand, and San Juan Counties) in the southeastern Utah region. While expansion of these facilities is not the highest housing need, the homeless shelter and two of the domestic violence shelter buildings are in need of either serious rehabilitation or replacement. The homeless shelter is not ADA compliant, is not fire-safe and generally is not up to code; the building is about one hundred years old. Two of the spouse abuse shelters are in converted homes that were built over forty years ago and have inadequate bathrooms, kitchens, and bedrooms, and other amenities. Even though emergency shelter projects are not as high a priority as permanent affordable housing projects, a need for at least one other emergency shelter (in Grand County) with between five and ten beds has been identified.

ii. Transitional Housing

There are no transitional housing programs/projects in the southeastern Utah district at this time. The homeless coordinating/continuum of care committees have identified a need for transitional units in each county, especially to house single convicted substance abusers trying to comply with court requirements that participants have stable housing before they can be released from jail into the drug court system. Transitional housing units/programs are also needed for convicted substance abusing single parents who are participating in treatment and/or drug court programs so that they may be able to keep their families intact. People (individuals and heads of households with children) working their way through drug court and other substance abuse programs are seldom eligible to participate in "housing authority" programs. Since these people are also either unemployed or severely under-employed they cannot afford to rent a market unit. Transitional housing is needed for this group while they are working to become eligible for housing assistance or are able to afford housing on their own. Transitional housing is also needed for youth who have aged out of the foster-care system and young adults who are disconnected from their families and not participating in higher education opportunities. The over all need for transitional housing units depends on the housing market in each individual county. In Carbon, Emery, and San Juan Counties, more affordable housing in general is a very high priority and increases in truly affordable units would

solve a lot of the homeless/transitional problem. In Grand County, where the housing market is so tight and the average rent is too high, transitional housing would be a valuable resource help lower-income residents to move into the main-stream market.

iii. Permanent Supportive Housing

While there are a few small permanent supportive housing facilities in the district, this is the one “homeless” facility/program that is a high priority. Facilities are needed for people who may never be able to live completely independently because of severe mental illness. Along with supportive services, a need for assisted living services has been identified by several mental health offices. People who have suffered a life-time of mental illness and/or lived on the streets for years often also suffer from chronic physical illnesses that require ongoing, in-home care. Many mid-life chronically homeless, mentally ill individuals are physically twenty or more years older than their chronological age. While the chronically homeless often suffer from the same medical conditions (especially dementia, chronic heart problems, and diabetes, etc.) as the frail elderly, because many people who are homeless are not old enough to be considered “senior citizens” they are not eligible to live in most senior assisted living centers, and private assisted living centers and nursing homes are simply not affordable

3. Homeless Implementation Plan

The regional Homeless Coordinating and Continuum of Care committees coordinate their strategies and implementation plans with the Utah state Balance of State Homeless Coordinating Committee. While the three Continuum of Care committees have developed plans that are specific to the homeless and human services issues in each county and community resources available to address local issues, in general, the three regional committees have adopted the following objectives:

GOAL: Reduce the number of homeless individuals and families, and improve services			
Objective	Activity	Responsible to Implement	Outcomes
Resource and referral for services	Maintain lines of communication between service agencies, assign resource and referral duties to designated staff.	All committee members	Reduced numbers of unsheltered, quicker entry into service system
Coordination of Services	Train staff to be familiar with services offered by other agencies, participate in LICC meetings/briefings, keep HMIS systems updated and provide ongoing training to staff	Committee members, HMIS system	Reduced duplication of services, reduced gaps in services
Increase the supply of permanent, supportive and affordable housing	Identify needs and gaps	Committee members, SEUALG	Accurate data for plan development and grant application
	Assist housing developers and supportive service providers to develop and/or create new supportive housing units	Committee members, SEUALG, city/county officials	Increase in number of units, decrease in number homeless and emergency shelter clients.
	Assist housing developers to develop and/or create additional VLMI housing	Committee members, SEUALG, CHDO's, city and county officials	Increase in the number of affordable housing units, decrease in the number of homeless and/or inadequately housing families and individuals

GOAL: Reduce the number of homeless individuals and families, and improve services			
Maintain and or increase existing programs and services	Continue participating in all available and appropriate application processes, work to keep and/or expand all existing funding, educate the general community about the issue of homelessness and the goal to end homelessness	Committee members, service providers, SEUALG	Existing programs continue to operate and perhaps expand, more clients are moved out of homelessness
Provide short and long term resources to assist in the prevention and recovery from homelessness	Provide supplemental food, utility and rent deposits, short-term utility and rent payment assistance, rental vouchers, etc.	Church programs, SEUALG community service programs, housing authorities.	Prevent at risk households from becoming homeless, increase the number of households obtaining housing
Increase participation in mainstream support programs	Provide assistance to clients to access mainstream programs such as food stamps, health insurance, disability support, etc.	Faith based programs, SEUALG community Service programs, homeless service providers, aging programs	Increase participation rate in permanent support programs, increase in the number of people who successfully recover from homelessness.

Generally, the homeless housing priority needs are:

1. Development of new/additional permanent, supportive housing units.
2. Rehabilitation work on the existing emergency and permanent units
3. Development of transitional housing units
4. Development of additional emergency shelter units

D. Overall Housing Needs Assessment

1. Housing Affordability

As determined in the 2005 Housing Development Update² the highest priority housing need continues to be the development of additional units available to very low-income families (60% - 65% and below of median income). While there has been improvement in job growth, unemployment rates, and general economic activity over the last twenty-four months across the southeast Utah region, the improved economies have only increased the pressure on housing availability and affordability. Since 2006 there have no new rental units developed for senior citizens, people with disabilities, or affordable multi-family units. Even though housing markets in three of the district's counties (Carbon, Emery, San Juan) were not unduly effected by the recent housing price escalation boom/bust, speculation and increased land costs continue to effect affordability. All the district housing authorities report that their wait-list times have increased significantly, as have their new applications. The housing authorities also continue to report that it is very difficult for voucher clients to find units that rent for close to the fair market limits and meet the HUD habitability standards.

Most housing advocates and city/county officials in the region now consider the development of affordable "workforce" housing the highest housing need and priority. Many elected officials and economic development professionals also consider the lack of affordable housing to be a barrier to continued economic development and expansion. For the first time in decades several of the district's most remote and disadvantaged communities have real economic development opportunities knocking on their door. However, because housing development of any kind has been non-existent for a very long time in much of the region, the lack of decent, safe, and affordable housing could become a real impediment to economic growth.

²http://www.seualg.dst.ut.us/COMMDEV/2005_ConPlan/conplan.htm

Average Rent Costs				
	Carbon	Emery	Grand	San Juan
1 bedroom	\$550	\$350	\$675	\$500
2 bedrooms	\$675	\$550	\$875	\$675
3 bedrooms	\$875	\$700	\$1,075	\$850

Average Owner-Occupied Housing Costs ³				
	Carbon	Emery	Grand	San Juan
Avg Sales Price	\$106,410	\$100,250	\$238,437	\$160,866
Mortgage	\$673	\$634	\$1,507	\$1,017
Taxes & Ins	\$162	\$147	\$195	\$152
Utilities	\$350	\$350	\$315	\$305
Total	\$1,185	\$1,131	\$2,017	\$1,474

In order for housing costs to be at or below 30% of income a family would need to earn:

Income Needed to Afford Average Housing Costs												
	Carbon			Emery			Grand			San Juan		
	1brm	2brm	3brm									
Rental Units	550	675	875	350	550	700	675	875	1075	500	675	850
Annual Income	19800	24300	29700	12600	19800	25020	24300	31500	38700	18000	24300	30600
Owner Occupied	\$1,185			\$1,131			\$2,017			\$1,474		
Annual Income	\$42,600			\$40,716			\$72,612			\$53,064		

However, the median adjusted gross income for households in 2006⁴ was

	Carbon	Emery	Grand	San Juan
Single	\$22,249	\$18,446	\$22,398	\$16,960
Head of Household	\$25,729	\$25,701	\$24,795	\$23,629
Married-Joint	\$64,158	\$56,755	\$64,702	\$55,984
Married-Separate	\$26,127	\$38,779	\$23,578	\$21,745
All	\$43,329	\$41,200	\$38,682	\$36,363

³Based on average price of a 3 bedroom home, 30 year fixed mortgage at 6.50APR

⁴

Source: Utah State Tax Commission, Federal Return Data: 2006

2. Housing Quality

Along with affordable, “safe and decent” is the biggest issue facing the district’s moderate and low-income households. The 2004 housing quality windshield survey indicated that a large percentage of the housing units in the four counties are more than fifty years old, are older mobile homes, and/or are in less than acceptable condition. Most of the housing units in the worst condition are mobile homes. Unfortunately, for those with incomes at or below 60% of median, housing that is deficient or dilapidated is often the only housing that is affordable. If just the 1,860⁵ units estimated to be in dilapidated or worse condition were rehabilitated or replaced at an average cost of \$50,000 per unit, the minimum estimated cost would be more than \$93 million.

Much of the district’s housing (approximately 56%) is more than thirty years old. In some communities as much as 65% of the housing is over fifty years old. Many of the district’s smaller communities have a high percentage of senior citizen and low-income homeowners. While the many senior citizens’ households may no longer bear the burden of mortgage payments, the ongoing repairs and major rehabilitations and upgrades necessary to keep the housing in acceptable condition are beyond the financial means of the owners. Recognizing this need, in 2007 the Southeastern Utah Association of Governments Rating and Ranking Committee increased the amount of Community Development Block Grant money designated for the region’s housing rehabilitation program.

E. Barriers to Affordable Housing

All of the district’s counties and cities/towns (except Castle Valley, which was incorporated under restrictive covenants) has adopted an affordable housing resolution. As these affordable housing plans have been developed and updated most regulatory barriers to affordable housing have been eliminated. In general, because affordable housing is recognized throughout the district as critical to future community and economic development, there is little official opposition to any type of housing development. In order to encourage the development of affordable housing, entities have forgiven building permit fees, impact fees, and connection fees. Local governments often use scarce community and economic development grant funding to help pay for site improvements and infrastructure development for affordable housing projects. However, there are several impediments to affordable housing over which local elected officials have very little control or effect.

1. Market Forces

The primary barrier to the development of affordable housing in southeastern Utah is the market. The unavailability of affordable land in two of the district’s four counties has driven the cost of housing above the ability of the even the median income household to pay.

Much of the land in southeastern Utah is publically owned and not available for private development. This fact coupled with the region’s incredible geographic features make the available land especially appealing to tourist and recreational uses, and as second homes. Also, even in the counties with the least housing market pressure, many landlords have discovered that they can increase profits by reserving their properties for tourist room sales and/or temporary worker rentals.

2. Low Wages

Because many jobs in southeastern Utah are in the travel/tourism and services industries the average monthly wage/income is not high enough so that the household pays no more than 30% of its income for rent. Home ownership is not possible for most lower income households.

Average Wages Compared To Average Housing Costs ⁶					
	Est Mean Renter Wage	Wage Needed for 1 Bdrm	Wage Needed for 2 Bdrm	Wage Needed for 3 Bdrm	% of Renters Unable to Afford 2Bdrm FMR
Carbon	\$9.95	\$8.88	\$10.67	\$14.02	45%
Emery	\$11.90	\$9.63	\$10.67	\$13.85	40%
Grand	\$7.20	\$9.63	\$10.67	\$13.75	43%
San Juan	\$11.55	\$9.63	\$10.67	\$13.85	32%

3. NIMBYism (Not In My Backyard)

Although it was released seventeen years ago, the report published by the federal Advisory Commission on Regulatory Barriers to Affordable Housing, *Not In My Back Yard: Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing* (July 1991) is still relevant. Several of the reason listed for NIMBYism are applicable to communities in southeastern Utah.

- i. Development may change community characteristics. Even when development could raise property values, residents may oppose them because they fear added traffic, commercial development, and destruction of the natural beauty or historic character of the surrounding area. People are attracted to southeastern Utah even though economic opportunities and community resources are limited because they appreciate the character and low-population lifestyle of rural communities.
- ii. New development may raise taxes. Residents especially worry about paying for new schools, boulevards, and sewer systems. While, all communities in southeastern Utah require that new development pay for required infrastructure, additional public services and water sources are a shared cost.
- iii. New housing may compromise the quality of public services. An increasing number of residents could require wider streets or a new highway, place excessive demands on water, sewer, and waste treatment capacities and bring new children into already crowded or underfunded public schools.

F. Special Needs Housing (Non Homeless) Including HOPWA

1. Senior and Disabled Housing

The communities of southeastern Utah have a relatively high percentage of senior citizens, up to 30% county-wide, and many of the smaller, remote towns have

⁶Source: National Low-Income Housing Coalition - *2007-2008 Out Of Reach*

an even higher elderly population. Along with an aging population, up to 8% of the district residents report having a limiting physical disability⁷. A major focus of the SEUALG's rehabilitation grant programs has been to target funds to very low-income senior citizens and people with disabilities. A need for approximately 35 adaptive units has been identified district-wide.

2. HIV/AIDS Housing (HOPWA)

Because there are so few people with HIV/AIDS within the southeastern Utah district at this time (fewer than one person per county), there are no plans to develop projects specific to this population group. However, should a need be identified in the future, HOPWA funds would be applied for as projects were developed.

G. Overall and Special Needs Housing Implementation Strategy

Recognizing the importance that safe, decent, affordable housing plays in both healthy communities and health economies, the Southeastern Utah Association of Governments Board has directed the SEUALG to take an active role in housing development, rehabilitation, and planning and technical assistance programs on a region-wide basis. To that end the Rating and Ranking Committee has dedicated a significant portion of the region's CDBG allocation to affordable housing activities and projects, and has further directed that the CDBG funds be coordinated with HOME and other HUD funding, Rural Development programs, and Weatherization/HEAT programs in order to maximize the limited available resources. So that citizens access to housing programs are not limited by an individual county or town's ability to provide needed underwriting services, these services are provided the SEUALG to the entire southeastern Utah region.

GOAL: Increase the number of units available to low-income household and improve the general quality of existing housing units.			
Objective	Activity	Responsible to Implement	Outcomes
Identify needs, existing housing and gaps	Collect housing cost data, track building permits, review info from low-income service providers	County level affordable housing committees, SEUALG Planning and CD staff	Improved ability to obtain funding and target resources to real needs
Identify and remove barriers to affordable housing	Review and update required city/county affordable housing plans	Local P/Z commissions, affordable housing committees, SEUALG, city/county officials	Additional affordable units
Encourage developers to include affordable units in projects	Provide technical assistance to potential developers to make them aware of P/Z regulations that "reward" affordable units	City/County officials, P/Z commissions, Realtors, SEUALG staff	Increased cooperation, more mixed income neighborhoods, additional units
Encourage developers to consider new affordable housing projects in region	Apply for grants to mitigate the costs of development, infrastructure construction, buy-down interest, etc.	City/County officials, SEUALG, P/Z Commissions	Decrease housing costs, more units for VLMI residents.
Develop housing for special needs and very low income residents	Apply for grants, low-interest loans, tax credit funding, RCA monies, etc.	Housing authorities, CHDO's, SEUALG, etc.	Stronger partnerships between stakeholders, housing resources targeted to the greatest need.
Improve quality of existing affordable units	Rehabilitate owner/occupied units, public hsg units, provide replacement units where needed	SEUALG, Housing authorities, developers, CHDO's other non-profits	Increased health and safety, and livability for residents

Objective	Activity	Responsible to Implement	Outcomes
Improve energy efficiency	Coordinate rehabilitation activities with Weatherization programs, emphasis Energy Star standards whenever possible	SEUALG, Housing authorities, developers CHDO's other non-profits	Decreased housing costs, increased sustainability of rehabbed units.
Increase home-ownership opportunities	Coordinate ADDI, HOME, and CDBG funding for homebuyer assistance with available mortgage programs. Coordinate rehabilitation programs with homebuyer programs	SEUALG, Housing authorities, Realtor groups, banks, etc.	Increased homeownership opportunities for low-income residents, preservation of existing housing stocks
Maintain eligibility to apply for housing and community development funds	Participate in updates of the region's Consolidated Plan and Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy	SEUALG, cities/counties, housing advocates, other stakeholders	Identification of community needs, gaps, a development of possible mitigation actions

Homeless, overall, and special needs housing priorities continue to be:

1. Development of housing for VLMI medium to large families (rental and owner occupied)
2. Development of housing for LMI medium to large families (rental and owner occupied)
3. Development of housing for seniors and/or people with physical disabilities
4. Rehabilitation/replacement of existing deficient housing units
5. Down-payment assistance
6. Development of permanent supportive housing for people with mental illness and substance abuse issues (both homeless and non-homeless)
7. Rehabilitation of existing emergency shelters
8. Development of transitional housing units
9. Development of additional emergency shelter/units

H. Lead Based Paint Strategy

Because a significant percentage of housing units in the southeastern Utah district are more than forty years old, it is assumed that a comparable percentage of units have lead based paint issues. Each city/county government is responsible for adopting local lead based paint policies, however for region-wide housing programs operated by the Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments, HUD policies will be followed. In, the operation of the district's housing rehabilitation and weatherization programs the SEUALG will require that all contractors and their sub-contractors follow safe work practices. The SEUALG also provides XRF gun services to income qualified programs and the clients of such programs through-out the district.

While following the federal lead based paint regulations is important for public health, the regulations can have an adverse effect on efforts to promote affordable housing, i.e. in many communities in southeastern Utah the housing stock, once owned by mine operators, was built between 1924 and 1945. The homes average 700-800 square feet in size and are wood framed. Over 75% of the homes in these communities have extensive lead based paint. In addition a large percentage of the population (and homeowners) in these communities are very-low to moderate income (i.e. elderly on fixed income, disabled on fixed income). It is estimated that over 60% of these homes are in need of rehabilitation, but

with the extensive lead based paint issues is almost impossible to rehabilitate these home within the budgetary constraints for the Single Family Rehabilitation Program.

Housing Tested For Lead Based Paint 7/07 through 8/08		
County	Number of Units	Lead - Y/N
Carbon	11	Y-9 N-2
Emery	0	N/A
Grand	1	Y-All
San Juan	1	Y - All

III. ANNUAL NON-HOUSING COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

A. Community Development

As in previous years, the priorities for community development projects are derived from the annual community capital improvements planning process and the bi-annual infrastructure/needs assessments. Many of the highest priority projects in the southeast Utah district are very large, and serve an entire city, county or region. Generally, these projects aren't a HUD/CDBG eligible activity, don't meet a national objective, and/or don't meet the qualified income guidelines.

The priorities are determined from the district's capital improvement lists along with projects considered important by advocacy groups such as housing authorities, food bank, disability agencies, senior citizen organizations, etc. The overall priorities for community development projects have not changed much from previous years. However, for the 2010-2011 funding cycle the highest priority project is the replacement of the Emery County Food Bank as the existing facility is housing in a dilapidated building that does not even comply with basic health department regulations covering the storage, handling, and distribution of food.

There are many more projects on the capital improvement lists than shown in project summary chart. Projects that are not eligible for HUD funding have not been included in the chart below and are not considered when setting HUD project priorities or the district's CDBG rating and ranking system. The projects include the construction of city halls, city or county maintenance buildings, police stations and county jails, road maintenance and equipment, water meters, GIS equipment and systems, general government computer equipment and software, etc.

In general, the community development priorities determined for HUD funded programs follows any given community's overall development priorities and goals. However, some types of projects have a higher priority in the Consolidated Plan than they do in an individual entity's general plan because those types of projects better fit the national objective requirement and/or have a more direct benefit to low-income residents.

In general, projects applied for in 2009 will be funded based on the following priorities:

- | | | |
|----------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Housing | 5. Waste/Storm Drainage | 9. Parks/Recreation
Projects/Community Centers |
| 2. Food Banks/Human Serv
Facilities | 6. ADA Projects | 10. Sidewalk/curb/gutter, etc. |
| 3. Culinary Water | 7. Fire/Public Safety | |
| 4. Sewer | 8. Medical Services | |

The following table shows the type of projects the district's communities have found important enough to list on their short and medium term capital improvement lists.

2008 Capital Improvement Projects - Short-Term Summary

Entity	Culinary	Sewer	Stormwater	Water	Drinking	Public Safety	Projects	Arts	Historic	Recreation	Community	CE	Health	Transportation	Affordable	Housing
Carbon Co.							2		2			3			2	
CC-SSD's	2	2														
CEU							3									
HACC															4	
E. Carbon							2									
Helper							1									
Price	8	3	6									5				
Scotfield	1	2			1		1					2				1
Sunnyside	1											2				
Wellington	2															
Emery Co															1	
EC SSD's	3	2			1		1		1			3				
ECHA															2	
Castle Dale												2				
Clawson																
Cleveland												1				
Elmo					1			1				1				
Emery				1				1	1							
Ferron	1											1				
Green River	3	1		1			3	1		1		2			1	
Huntington							1	1								
Orangeville							1	1				1				
Grand Co.					1		1		1			2				
GC SSD's	3	2			2	1	1					1			1	
GCHA															7	
Castle Valley			1													1
Moab			2									1				2
San Juan Co																
SJC SSD's	1	1				1						1				
Blanding	4	1			1							1				
Bluff			3	1								1				
Mexican Hat	1															
Monticello	3	2		1				1		1		1	1			
SEUALG															15	
Totals	33	16	12	4	7	2	17	6	5	2	1	30	1	33	4	

B. Economic Development

While compliance with the LMI benefit requirements make it difficult to use HUD funds for direct economic development activities, communities have begun to consider the development of affordable housing, especially workforce housing, as directly related to economic development. Communities also consider amenities such as parks and other recreational facilities to be directly related to economic development, especially when communities wish to attract families to relocated into their area.

District entities are encouraged to apply for HUD funds to help produce additional affordable units and improve the condition of existing housing units. Entities are also encouraged to apply for HUD funding for infrastructure development that will directly encourage business to locate within the district and provide new job opportunities. All other direct economic development activities will be conducted by the Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments and will be available to the entire district. The Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments will continue to utilize CDBG funds to provide technical assistance to new and existing businesses in order to foster the creation of new jobs and/or the retention of existing jobs.

IV. Communities/Neighborhoods Focus Assessment

A. Needs Indicators

Because the remoteness and rural character of the southeastern Utah district very few communities have the kind of neighborhood distinctions (concentrations of low-income, minority populations, deficient housing quality/value) that is often found in more urban areas, and is used to designate specific geographic areas of distress or to determine the need for community revitalization. In the southeastern Utah district it is not unusual to find that the high-income company manager and the low-paid service worker live next door to one another. Except in Price City and Moab City, it is very difficult to determine areas of “neighborhood distress” using urban criteria such as slum/blight, abandoned cars, concentrations of housing dilapidation, empty store fronts, graffiti, etc. Also, because of the sparse population and rural character of the district’s communities, most public infrastructure development is done on a regional or even county wide basis not on a neighborhood level, so determining neighborhood infrastructure deficiencies can be problematic.

During the 2007/2008 funding cycle, SEUALG staff conducted an assessment of the communities in the southeastern Utah district using the criteria listed below. Income levels and housing quality were chosen as the primary criteria, as these indicators allow a fairly accurate picture of what resources a community may have to address issues and needs.

1. Poverty rates
2. Income levels (by zip code as available)
3. Housing quality & type (2005 Housing Windshield Survey)
4. Availability of services for low-income and disadvantaged citizens
5. Review of locally available resources for unincorporated areas where published data isn’t available.

Because communities in the southeastern Utah region have access to mineral lease funds (Permanent Community Impact Board funding) to help pay for major infrastructure projects (culinary water, sewer/water lines, recreation/entertainment facilities, etc.), HUD funding will be focused on projects that provide a primary benefit to income qualified individuals and household, i.e. affordable and special needs housing, comprehensive human and medical services facilities, and universal disability access.

Finally, many of the communities identified in the following tables as being the most disadvantaged or low-income are located on Native Reservation lands and as such are not eligible to apply for Utah State Small Cities CDBG funding or participate in the OWHLF Single Family Rehabilitation program operated by the SEUALG (these communities are eligible for funding through the Navajo Nation, however). These communities will not be included in the targeted communities listings, although the state of Utah and communities in southeastern Utah, and the Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments coordinates programs and funding with tribal entities.

B. Identification of Cities/Towns and Distress Type

District Poverty Rates⁸			
	Population	Poverty Rate	Number of People
CARBON COUNTY	19205	15.1%	2900
East Carbon	1265	16.9%	214
Helper	1856	12.7%	236
Price	7987	15.0%	1198
Scofield	26	9.1%	3
Sunnyside	372	14.7%	57
Wellington	1541	14.7%	227
EMERY COUNTY	10365	13.8%	1430
Castle Dale	1563	9.5%	148
Clawson	168	25.5%	43
Cleveland	493	8.1%	34
Elmo	356	11.2%	40
Emery	291	13.1%	38
Ferron	1522	13.1%	199
Green River	921	15.6%	142
Huntington	1992	13.8%	275
GRAND COUNTY	8713	16.3%	1420
Castle Valley	364	21.9%	80
Moab	4793	15.7%	753
SAN JUAN COUNTY	13896	32.5%	4516
Blanding	3092	17.8%	550
Monticello	1886	8.2%	155
Utah State		10.3%	

⁸ Source: U.S. Census Bureau-2000 Census (cities) and 2005 Small Area Income & Poverty Estimates

INCOME LEVELS⁹								
Carbon County	No. Of Rtns	Single	No. Of Rtns	Married Joint	No. Of Rtns	Married Separate	No Of Rtns	Head of House hold
84526-Helper, Spring Glen, Scofield, No. Carbonville	672	\$20,861	804	\$62,928	12	\$28,367	142	\$25,722
84529-Kenilworth	47	\$20,997	33	\$45,258	0	\$0	5	NA
84520-East Carbon	170	\$21,456	212	\$45,200	5	NA	63	\$19,952
84501-Price, So. Carbonville	1968	\$23,129	2487	\$67,729	44	\$26,653	559	\$26,274
84539-Sunnyside	39	\$20,381	73	\$54,182	1	NA	10	\$21,654
84542-Wellington & east county	252	\$19,161	365	\$56,193	5	NA	96	\$25,581
Emery County								
84513-Castle Dale	211	\$17,897	339	\$59,983	6	NA	34	\$23,531
84516-Clawson	17	\$21,696	43	\$46,612	0	0	3	NA
84518 -Cleveland	100	\$16,424	190	\$54,813	0	0	8	NA
84521-Elmo	82	\$21,307	140	\$61,643	0	0	16	\$25,237
84522-Emery	32	\$23,327	71	\$50,775	1	NA	9	NA
84532-Ferron	212	\$19,712	383	\$56,836	3	NA	42	\$21,366
84515/25-Green River	189	\$14,900	187	\$41,619	3	NA	42	\$21,366
84518-Huntington	100	\$16,424	190	\$54,813	0	0	8	NA
84537-Orangeville	157	\$17,251	326	\$65,370	0	0	34	\$31,572
Grand County								
84532-Castle Valley/Moab	1984	\$22,110	1459	\$64,562	40	\$38,779	426	\$24,795
84540-Thompson	13	\$24,267	8	NA	0	\$0	0	\$0
San Juan County								
84510-Aneth	38	\$11,854	21	\$51,850	0	\$0	37	\$23,574
84511-Blanding	442	\$16,032	692	\$54,772	4	NA	148	\$22,490
84512-Bluff	93	\$18,926	63	\$47,394	2	NA	39	\$22,213
84530-LaSal	46	\$12,913	69	\$44,608	1	NA	10	\$18,945
84531-Mexican Hat	46	\$15,630	34	\$39,983	0	\$0	46	\$22,897
⁹ 84534-Montezuma Creek	134	\$16,388	118	\$63,555	0	\$0	63	\$33,619
84535-Monticello	336	\$19,963	459	\$61,841	8	NA	58	\$26,406
Utah State		\$24,538		\$83,465		\$42,249		\$29,378

⁹ Source: 2006 Statistics of Income, Data by Filing Status and Zip Code
SEUALG - Consolidated Plan - 2009 Action Plan

YEAR HOUSING UNITS WERE BUILT				
	Carbon	Emery	Grand	San Juan
Total Units	8741	4093	4062	5449
1970-1979	1974	1389	1141	1443
1960-1969	730	330	711	587
1950-1959	940	293	509	509
1940-1949	1460	199	107	229
1939-Earlier	165	736	156	293
% 30yrs or Older	60.3%	72.0%	62.1%	56.2%
% 50yrs or Older	29.3	30.0	19.0	18.9

US Bureau of Census, 2000 Census Summary File 3

COMPARISON OF MOBILE UNITS AND OTHER HOUSING UNITS				
	Carbon	Emery	Grand	San Juan
Total Units	8578	2638	4187	3055
Mobile Units	922	1123	1246	701
Percentage	11%	43%	30%	23%
Mobile Units that are less than Acceptable	539	831	894	390

From the 2005 Housing Quantity/Quality Survey

HOUSING UNITS THAT NEED REPAIR				
	Carbon	Emery	Grand	San Juan
Total Units	8578	4138	4187	3055
Deficient Units	3134	1736	1131	914
Percentage	37%	41%	27%	30%
Dilapidated or Worse	1015	352	282	221

From the 2005 Housing Quantity/Quality Survey*

¹¹Most of the housing units in the worst condition are mobile homes (pre 1976) Unfortunately, for those with incomes at or below 40% of median, housing that is deficient or dilapidated is often the only housing that is affordable. If just the 1,860 units estimated to be in dilapidated or worse condition were rehabilitated or replaced at an average costs of \$50,000 per unit, the minimum estimated cost would be more than \$93 million.

C. Geographic Distribution Base on Need

As the data charts above show several distressed communities can be identified in each county in the southeastern Utah. However, when determining where to target limited funds simply identifying a certain number of distressed/targeted communities is not as easy as it would be in an entitlement community. In very rural areas consideration must also be given to those communities that show less distress but have actual higher populations of low income or special needs individuals and households.

Also, while a remote targeted community could benefit from community development funding, limited housing funding should be targeted where it will most benefit the residents of the housing. For instance, because there is no public transportation in the southeastern Utah district, and most of the most neediest communities are far removed from the employment and retail centers and medical/human services in each county, developing new affordable housing in the communities identified as the neediest may only cause further isolation of the district's least advantaged residents.

D. Solution Strategy (Focused Communities and Issues)

To further the goal of addressing housing as the highest priority issue, the Rating and Ranking Committee set aside a significant portion of the district's annual CDBG allocation for a district-wide housing rehabilitation program. The Rating and Ranking Committee also awards CDBG funding to applications from communities that demonstrate higher distress, whose project provides the most benefit to very-low and low income populations, and are for projects that address the highest priority issues

E. Priority By Location Or Type of Need

Unlike entitlement cities or major metropolitan centers, because of the remote, rural nature of southeastern Utah, it is very difficult to label specific communities or neighborhoods as distressed or in particular need. For instance, Moab City (Grand County) as a whole could not be considered distressed, but because of the extremely low average wage and the high cost of housing, housing projects are a high priority for this community. On the other hand, many of the very small towns in Emery County do not have a high need for additional housing units or basic infrastructure, but much of the existing housing is over 50yrs old, dilapidated, and occupied by senior citizens who do not have the resources to maintain their units in acceptable condition. Most of the very small communities in southeastern Utah lack adequate community facilities to serve the community's low-income residents and that make communities liveable, sustainable and contribute to economic opportunity. The following issues have been identified as high priorities no matter where in the district potential projects might be located. These issues should receive the highest points when rating and ranking projects

One or two focused communities (incorporated and unincorporated) have been identified in each county, and as eligible and appropriate projects are identified funds should be targeted towards these communities. However, the southeastern Utah district will concentrate its efforts and funding resources on mitigating the issues identified as high priorities.

High Priority/Targeted Issues

1. New Housing Units
2. Replacement of Mobile Units
3. Rehabilitation of Single Family Units
4. Development of Community and Human Resources Facilities
5. Culinary Water Projects

Targeted Communities			
CARBON	EMERY	GRAND	SAN JUAN
Kenilworth	Green River	Thompson	Mexican Hat
East Carbon/Sunnyside	Emery	S. Moab/Spanish Valley	LaSal

V. METHOD OF FUNDS DISTRIBUTION

A. Program Summary

The only HUD program funds that are distributed by the Southeastern Utah Association of Local Government are the CDBG Program funds. The SEUALG Rating and Ranking committee uses the information provided by the Consolidated Planning and Update process to determine the region's rating and ranking policies. In general, projects will be awarded funding based on the following priorities:

1. Housing projects
2. Human Services facilities (daycare, senior centers, food banks, community centers)
3. Economic Development projects that provide permanent jobs
4. Water Supply/Quality
5. Sewage Treatment
6. Medical facilities & ambulances (including fixtures and equipment)
7. Fire protection facilities (including fixtures and equipment)
8. ADA compliance and access
9. Recreation facilities (parks, playgrounds, restrooms, pavilions, skate and sports facilities, general community centers etc.)
10. Public facilities (sidewalks/curb/gutter, street signs, etc.)

Additional points are awarded to projects that have the highest direct benefit to very-low and low-income citizens, that leverage other funds, and that are submitted by entities that have the fewest resources available to fund projects.

While the SEUALG operates a district-wide housing rehabilitation program funded with HOME monies, the State of Utah determines the funding methodology for HOME, HOPWA, and Emergency Shelter Grant funds. The SEUALG coordinates the regional HOME, CDBG housing funds, and Rural Development Funds to provide a comprehensive grant/loan program to local residents. The State's program requirements and allocation plans can be found at:

http://community.utah.gov/housing_and_community_development/index.html

The HUD homeless funding is also distributed at the state level. Several agencies in the southeast district depend on these funds to provide housing and services to the district's chronically and/or mentally ill residents. The SEUALG is a member of the Balance of State prioritization committee. Information about the State of Utah Continuum of Care and Balance of State Homeless Coordinating Committee can be found at:

<http://www.utahcontinuum.org/index.htm>

B. Rating and Ranking Updates

A copy of the current Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments Rating and Ranking Policies can be found at:

http://seualg.dst.ut.us/COMMDEV/2009-10_R&R_Policies.pdf

VI. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES

A detailed listing of the District's performance measures can be found in the Appendix in Table 2C, however the following table summarizes the measures accomplished in 2008.

FIVE YEAR GOALS	2008 Performance Measure
Housing Goals	
Goal 4. Housing Rehabilitation and Major Repair	
T/A & Underwriting	23 Households
Units Rehabilitated	9 units rehabilitated
Goal 5. Homebuyer Assistance	3 household were assisted
Community Development Goals	
Goal 1. Water/Sewer/Drainage Projects	
Replace manhole covers-Green River	121 households/105 were LMI or VLMI
Goal 6. Parks & Recreation	
Improvement to So. Park-Price City	381 Households/311 were LMI or VLMI
Replace Bleachers-Moab City Park	1010 Households/624 were LMI or VLMI
Economic Development Goals	
Goal 2. Revolving Loan Fund Program	3 New jobs filled by LMI persons were created.

VII. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

A. Consultation

During the Consolidated Planning update process SEUALG staff regularly consults with and maintain close working relationships with:

1. The Housing Authority of Carbon County
2. The Housing Authority of Southeastern Utah
3. The Emery County Housing Authority
4. The Colleen Quigley Women's Shelter
5. Seekhaven Family Resource Center
6. Gentle Ironhawk Women's Shelter
7. Active-ReEntry, Independent Living Center
8. The Southeastern Utah Health Department
9. Four-Corners Behavior Health Department
10. The San Juan Counseling Center
11. InterAct Clubhouse in Moab
12. InterAct Clubhouse in Price
13. Golden Rule Mission (Avalon House)
14. Carbon Emery County Homeless Coordinating Committee
15. Grand County Homeless Coordinating Committee
16. San Juan County Homeless Coordinating Committee
17. The Red Cross
18. City and County Planning and Zoning Commissions
19. The Department of Workforce Services
20. Division of Children and Family Services
21. The Area Agency on Aging/In-Home Services
22. Community Services Tri-Partite Advisory Board
23. FEMA Advisory Board
24. The United Way

B. Coordination

1. Business Community

SEUALG and the Southeastern Utah Economic Development District belongs to both the Carbon Chamber of Commerce and Grand County Chamber of Commerce and regularly attend the monthly meetings. SEUALG staff also serve on the boards of the Carbon County and Emery County Economic Development Councils. The SEUALG also participates in the B.E.A.R (Business Expansion and Retention) programs and with the Small Business Development Centers. The Southeastern Utah Economic Development District operates a small business revolving loan fund with the SEUALG as it operating partner.

Needed services to the district's businesses are coordinated between the various agencies and input about business needs and issues addressed in the Consolidated Plan is solicited from the district's business organizations and agencies.

2. Other State and Federal Agencies

The Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments acts as a clearinghouse to coordinate services and programs throughout the districts. The clearinghouse function is used to provide input into the Consolidated Plan and annual update process and to coordinate services provided through the various state and federal grant programs.

SEUALG staff also participate in the various interagency coordinating councils that operate in three of the four district counties. These councils meet monthly to coordinate services to shared clients, exchange information and requirements for and about each agency's available programs.

The SEUALG also coordinates the programs it operates in order to provide "one-stop shopping" services to its clients and use limited funding and other resources to their best advantage, i.e. housing rehabilitation services are coordinated with the district's weatherization program; elderly food bank clients are provided information about aging services available through the SEUALG; HEAT clients are provided information about the weatherization programs, etc.

The SEUALG coordinates with the following state and federal agencies and includes information provided by these agencies and organizations in the district's Consolidated Plan and Annual Updates.

1. Department of Workforce Services
2. Human Services/Foster Care
3. Early Childhood Education Programs
4. The Southeastern Utah Economic Development District
5. Rural Development
6. Castleland Resource Conservation & Development District
7. Area Agency on Aging and In-Home Services Program
8. The congressional delegation staff assigned to this district
9. The Small Business Development Administration

3. General Public

During its ongoing consolidate planning process, SEUALG staff actively seeks input from the general public by participating in the client workshops held by its partner agencies, soliciting input form and surveying clients of its own programs and by participating in annual community resource fairs in each county where the public are invited to discuss issues and concerns, and are provided information about available programs and services and how the Consolidate Plan addresses these issues.

Copies of the Consolidated Plan and annual updates are posted on the SEUALG's website and the public were invited to comment on the document(s).

Finally, a public hearing for the 2009 Action Plan Update was held on December 9, 2008 and the comment period ran from December 9, 200 through January 9, 2009. This public hearing was advertised in the five county newspapers December 2nd through the 4th, 2008. Copies of the 2009 Action Plan were also sent to all district organizations, entities, and interested individuals for comment

Appendix A

TABLE 2A
Priority Housing Needs/Investment Plan Table

Section 1: Priority Housing Needs (households)		Priority		Unmet Need
Renter	Small Related	0 - 30%	H	75 Units
		31 - 50%	H	50 Units
		51 - 80%	M	50 Units
	Large Related	0 - 30%	H	15 units
		31 - 50%	H	25 units
		51 - 80%	M	10 units
	Elderly	0 - 30%	M	15 units
		31 - 50%	M	10 units
		51 - 80%	L	8 units
	All Other	0 - 30%	H	25
		30 - 50%	H	15
		51 - 80%	L	5
Owner	Small Related	0 - 30%	L	2
		31 - 50%	L	2
		51 - 80%	L	2
	Large Related	0 - 30%	M	10
		30 - 50%	H	50
		51 - 80%	H	75
	Elderly	0 - 30%	L	5
		31 - 50%	L	5
		51 - 80%	L	5
	All Other	0 - 30%	L	5
		51 - 50%	L	5
		51 - 80%	L	5
Non-Homeless Special Needs	Elderly	0 - 80%	See Renter/Owner Above	See Renter/Owner Above
	Frail Elderly	0 - 80%	See Renter/Owner Above	See Renter/Owner Above
	Severe Mental Illness	0 - 80%	H	10
	Physical Disability	0 - 80%	H	35
	Developmental Disability	0 - 80%	L	3
	Alcohol/Drug Abuse	0 - 80%	L	2
	HIV/AIDS	0 - 80%	L	0
	Domestic Violence	0 - 80%	H	20

**Table 2A
Priority Housing Activities**

Section 2: Priority Need	5Yr Goal	1 st Yr	2 nd Yr	3 rd Yr	4thYr Expected	5 th Yr
CDBG						
Acquisition of existing rental units	0					
Production of new units	0				24	
Rehab of existing rental units	15				45	
Rental Assistance	0					
Production of new Owner Units	0					
Rehab of existing Owner Units	45				8	
Homeownership Assistance	0				3	
HOME						
Acquisition of existing rental units	0					
Production of new rental units	20				24	
Rehab of existing rental units	0				19	
Rental assistance	0					
Acquisition of existing owner units	0					
Production of new owner units	5					
Rehab of existing owner units	35				8	
Homeownership assistance	15				3	
HOPWA						
Rental Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	
Short term rent/mortgage/utility payments	0	0	0	0	0	
Facility based housing development	0	0	0	0	0	
Facility based housing operation	0	0	0	0	0	
Supportive Services	0	0	0	0	0	
OTHER						

APPENDIX B

**Table 2C
Summary of Specific Performance Objectives**

Obj #	Outcome/Objective	Priority	Source of Funds	Proposed Allocation - FY 08	Performance Indicators	Program Year	Expected Number	Actual Number	Percent Completed
	Specific Objective								
DH - 1	Availability/Accessibility of Decent Housing								
DH-1.1	Provide fully accessible rental housing	H			Household assisted (new units for persons having physical disabilities)	2005	0		
			2006	0					
			2007	0					
			2008	0					
			2009	0					
			MULTI-YEAR GOAL						
DH-1.2	Provide housing for households with special needs (mental illness, seniors, etc.	M			Number of new units funded	2005	5		
			2006	5					
			2007	5					
			2008	5					
			2008	5					
DH -	Affordability of Decent Housing								
DH 2.1	Develop more affordable rental housing	H			Household Assisted (new and rehabilitated multi-family units)	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			CDBG			2005	10		
						2006	10		
						2007	10		
						2008	10		
						2009	24		
DH-2.2	Provide housing solutions to end chronic homelessness	H			Number of new units funded	MULTI- YEAR GOAL			
			CDBG	\$100,000		2005			
						2006			
						2007			
						2008	24	0	10%
						2009			

Obj #	Outcome/Objective	Priority	Source of Funds	Proposed Allocation - FY 08	Performance Indicators	Program Year	Expected Number	Actual Number	Percent Completed
	Specific Objective								
DH-2.3	Increase homeownership opportunities for low income families	M			Number of new homes created	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			2005	5					
			2006	5					
			2007	5					
			2008	5					
			2009	5					
DH2.4	Provide housing for households with HIV/AIDS (through shortterm rental assistance, TBRA, etc.)	L			Number of households served with rental assistance	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			2005	0		0			
			2006	0		0			
			2007	0		0			
			2008	0		0			
			2009	0		0			
DH-2.5	Increase capability of local agencies to plan and develop housing projects	L			Number of workshops and formal trainings provided	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			2005	0		0			
			2006	0		0			
			2007	0		0			
			2008	0		0			
			2009	0		0			
DH-2.6	Prevent homelessness through rental assistance	L			Number of households served with rental assistance	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			2005	0		0			
			2006	0		0			
			2007	0		0			
			2008	0		0			
			2009	0		0			
DH-3	Sustainability of Decent Housing								
DH-3.1	Preserve more affordable housing	H			Households assisted (SF units preserved and rehabilitated including lead based paint abatement	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			CDBG	\$450,000		2005	5		100%
			HOME			2006	5		100%
						2007	5	8	100%
						2008	10	10	90%
						2009	10		

Obj #	Outcome/Objective	Priority	Source of Funds	Proposed Allocation - FY 08	Performance Indicators	Program Year	Expected Number	Actual Number	Percent Completed
	Specific Objective								
SL-1	Availability/Accessibility of Suitable Living Environment								
SL-2.1	Provide more and upgraded public facilities primarily benefitting low-income citizens	H			(LMI) persons being served	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			CDBG	\$40,000		2005			
						2006			
						2007			
						2008			
			2009						
SL-2.2	Provide warm and safe shelter for the homeless	H			Shelter nights	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			CDBG	\$100,000		2005	5000	6935	100%
						2006			
						2007			
						2008			
			2009						
SL-2.3	Remove barriers to disabled persons utilizing public facilities	M			Disabled persons being served	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			CDBG	\$150,000		2005			
						2006			
						2007			
						2008			
			2009						
SL-2.4	Provide other public infrastructure improvement	H			(LMI) persons being served	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			CDBG	\$500,000		2005			
						2006			
						2007			
						2008			
			2009						
EO-1	Availability/Accessibility of Economic Opportunity								
EO-1.1	Create economic opportunity	H			Number of jobs created	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			CDBG	\$60,000		2005	2	3	100%
						2006	2	5	100%
						2007	2	2	100%
						2008	2	3	90%
			2009	2	2				

Obj #	Outcome/Objective	Priority	Source of Funds	Proposed Allocation - FY 08	Performance Indicators	Program Year	Expected Number	Actual Number	Percent Completed
	Specific Objective								
EO1.2	Support services to increase self sufficiency for the homeless	L			Hours of Case Management	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			2005	0		0			
			2006	0		0			
			2007	0		0			
			2008	0		0			
			2009	0		0			
EO-2	Affordability Economic Opportunity								
EO-2.1	Increase available affordable units of workforce housing	H			Number of units created	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			2005	0					
			2006	0					
			2007	0					
			2008	0					
			2009	0					
EO-3	Sustainability of Economic Opportunity								
EO-3.1	Insure that projects support LMI population	L			Number of LMI persons benefitting	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			2005						
			2006						
			2007						
			2008						
			2009						
CR-1	Community Revitalization								
CR-1.1	Plan for better communities and utilization of funds	H			No of LMI persons benefitting	MULTI-YEAR GOAL			
			CDBG	\$200,000		2005	24000	24000	100%
						2006	24000	24000	100%
						2007	24000	24000	100%
						2008	24000	22000	90%
						2009	24000	0	0%

2009 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT LISTS

ENTITY	ENTITY PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL COST	FUNDING SOURCE(S)	PROJECT DATE
<i>CARBON COUNTY-SHORT TERM</i>					
Carbon County Building Authority	A	Fairgrounds shops & equipment building & caretaker dwelling	\$1,300,000	Local/CIB	2009
“	A	New senior center	\$9,000,000	Local/CIB/CDBG	2009
“	A	Carbonville road improvements	\$4,800,000	Local/CIB	2009
“	B	Fairground bleachers	\$1,100,000	Local/CIB/Other	2009
“	B	Jet Refuel Truck	\$200,000	Local/CIB/Other	2009
“	B	Cross country trail	\$1,100,000	Local/CIB/Other	2009
“	B	Courthouse & administration building	\$20,000,000	Local/CIB/Other	2009
College of Eastern Utah	A	Bio Diesel Incubator	\$60,000	Local/CIB/EDA/Other	2009
East Carbon City	A	Water system repairs & upgrades	\$700,000	Local/CIB/CDBG	2009
“	B	Industrial Park Improvements	\$250,000	Local/CIB/Other	2009
“	B	New Cemetery	\$200,000	Local/CIB/Other	2009
Helper City	A	Railroad & Mining Museum Improvements	\$1,400,000	Local/CIB/Other	2009
Helper City	A	Water Tank Repair	\$520,000	Local/CIB/Other	2009
Price City	A	Street Improvements	\$250,000	Local/CIB/Other	2009
“	A	Water & Sewer Improvements	\$4,000,000	Local/CIB/Other	2009
“	A	River recreation improvements	\$855,000	Local/CIB/Other	2009
“	A	Install pump system in sewer line to serve S Price	\$150,000	Local/CDBG/Other	2009
Price River Water & Sewer SSD	A	Water/Sewer system improvements & facility reconstruction/equipment	\$485,000	Local/CIB/Other	2009
Scofield Town	A	Water and Sewer	\$750,000	CIB/Other	2009
“	A	Fire engine/building	\$1,000,000	CIB/Other	2009
“	B	Park improvements/restrooms/fence/ & landscaping	\$200,000	CIB/CDBG	2009
Sunnyside City	A	Cemetery expansion	\$250,000	CIB/Other	2009
“	A	Pederson remodel into a city hall	\$2,500,000	Local/CIB/Other	2009
Wellington	A	Water tank restoration or replacement	\$500,000	Local/CIB/CDBG	2009

2009 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT LISTS

ENTITY	ENTITY PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL COST	FUNDING SOURCE(S)	PROJECT DATE
<i>EMERY COUNTY - SHORT TERM</i>					
Emery County Building Authority	A	Replace food bank facility	\$500,000	CIB/Local/CDBG	2009
“	B	Assisted living center	\$3,000,000	CIB/Local/Other/CDBG	2009
“	B	Huntington airport improvements	\$400,000	CIB/Local/EDA	2009
“	A	Weed & mosquito shop and storage	\$3,000,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
“	C	Aquatic center park/sprinkler project	\$350,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
Castle Dale City	A	Finish equestrian center	\$40,000	CIB/Other	2009
“	B	Purchase park property	\$65,000	CIB/Other	2009
“	B	Cemetery Improvements	\$100,000	2009	2009
Castle Valley SSD	A	Combined prjct for roads, drainage, curb & gutter	\$2,000,000	CIB/Local	2009
Cleveland Town	A	Fire station	\$300,000	CIB/Other/CDBG	2009
Clawson Town	C	Ballfield improvements	\$40,000	CIB/Other/CDBG	2009
Elmo Town	A	Sidewalk, curb, gutter	\$300,000	CIB/Other/CDBG	2009
“	B	Equipment purchase	\$125,000	CIB/Other	2009
“	C	Skate park	\$50,000	CIB/Other/CDBG	2009
Emery County Fire District	A	Fire trucks	\$2,400,000	CIB/Other	2009
Ferron City	C	Cemetery improvements	\$80,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
“	A	Sidewalk construction	\$300,000	CIB/Local/CDBG	2009
“	C	Community center	\$750,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
“	B	Fairground improvements	\$170,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
“	C	Mayor’s park improvements	\$25,000	CIB	2009
Green River City	B	Sewer & water master plan	\$100,000	CIB/CDBG/Other	2009
“	B	Fire station	\$800,000	CIB/CDBG/Other	2009
“	A	Generator for water plant	\$50,000	CIB/CDBG/Other	2009
“	A	Engineering of water/sewer line replacement	\$120,000	CIB/CDBG/Other	2009

2009 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT LISTS

ENTITY	ENTITY PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL COST	FUNDING SOURCE(S)	PROJECT DATE
“	B	Street improvements	\$6,000,000	CIB/Other	2009
“	C	Golf course expansion	\$3,500,000	CIB/Other	2009
“	B	Sewer lagoon expansion	\$900,000	CIB/Other/CDBG	2009
“	C	Community Center	\$1,000,000	CDBG/CIB/Local/	2009
Huntington City	B	Ambulance building	\$350,000	CIB/CDBG/Local	2009
Orangeville City	A	Curb, gutter & sidewalk	\$500,000	CIB/Local	2009
“	C	Skate park	\$150,000	CIB/Local	2009
	C	Ball complex restroom improvements	\$175,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
Emery County Housing Authority	A	Rehabilitate existing housing units	\$300,000	CDBG/Other	2009-10
<u>GRAND COUNTY - SHORT TERM</u>					
Canyonlands Healthcare SSD	A	Nursing/assisted living center	\$4,950,000	CIB/Local/CDBG/Other	2009
Grand County Health Department	A	Purchase and remodel health department building	\$1,500,000	CIB/Local/CDBG/Other	2009
Thompson Springs Water SSD	A	Replace water lines	\$493,000	CIB/Local/CDBG	2009
Castle Valley Town	A	Update 1998 drainage study	\$35,000	CIB/Local	2009
Thompson Springs Fire SSD	A	Helicopter Pad	\$15,000	CIB/Local	2009
Grand Co. Water Conservancy District	A	Purchase SITLA land at the toe of Ken's Lake	\$130,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
Moab Valley Fire District	A	Purchase fire engine	\$300,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
Moab City	A	Hwy 191 gateway plan & storm drainage improvements	\$1,000,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
“	A	Replace additional asbestos water line	\$200,000	CIB/CDBG/Other	2009-10
Moab City/Grand Co	A	South corridor study	\$100,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
Grand County	A	Information technology network upgrade	\$200,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
Grand County School District	A	VoTech center for adults & high schools students	\$5,000,000	CIB/Other/Local	2009
Housing Authority of Southeastern Ut.	A	Rehabilitate Virginian Apartments	\$350,000	CDBG/Other	2009
“	A	Develop 35 units of affordable housing	\$3,000,000	CDBG/Other	2010
4-Corners Behavioral Health	A	Develop 5 additional units for chronically mentally ill	\$1,000,000	CDBG/Other	2010

2009 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT LISTS

ENTITY	ENTITY PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL COST	FUNDING SOURCE(S)	PROJECT DATE
<u>SAN JUAN CO. - SHORT TERM</u>					
Blanding City	A	City water line project	\$2,250,000	CIB/CDBG/Local/Other	2009-10
“	A	Expansion of existing water treatment plant project	\$150,000	CIB/CDBG/Local/Other	2009
“	A	Remodel, refurbish city offices	\$150,000	CIB/Local	2009
Bluff SSD	A	Phase I storm water infrastructure	\$590,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009-10
“	A	Waste water design & construction	\$2,525,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
“	A	Phase II storm water infrastructure	\$450,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009-10
Mexican Hat	A	Culinary water upgrades	\$100,000	CIB/CDBG/Other	2009-10
Monticello City	A	Aquatic/recreation center	\$5,000,000	CIB/CDBG/Local/Other	2009-10
“	A	ADA improvements to city hall	\$150,000	CDBG/CIB/Local/Other	2009-10
“	A	Add 2 additional bays to fire station	\$300,000	CDBG/CIB/Local/Other	2009-10
“	A	Big-4 tractor enclosure	\$120,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
“	A	ADA compliant restrooms in park pavillion	\$100,000	CIB/Local/CDBG/Other	2009-2010
“	C	Main and Center St. lighting enhancements	\$500,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
“	D	Computer hardware upgrades	\$30,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
“	D	Storm drainage systems & other engineering services	\$900,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009-10
“	D	Raw water storage expansion	\$1,000,000	DWQ/CIB/Local/Other	2009
“	D	Parking lot paving-ballfield	\$110,000	SJTD/CIB/Local	2009
“	D	Bring fiber optic line into Monticello	\$5,000,000	CIB/Local/Other/EDA	2009-10
“	D	Public works/fire station expansion	\$1,000,000	CIB/USDA/Other	2009
“	D	Golf storage building	\$1,000,000	CIB/Local	2009
“	D	Welcome center parking expansion	\$85,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009-10
“	A	New airport	\$6,750,000	CIB/EDA/Local/Other	2009-10
“	C	New fire truck	\$360,000	CIB/CDBG/Local	2009-10
San Juan County	A	Bluff swinging bridge	\$500,000	CIB/CDBG/EDA/Other	2009-10

2009 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT LISTS

ENTITY	ENTITY PRIORITY	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	TOTAL COST	FUNDING SOURCE(S)	PROJECT DATE
“	A	Fire equipment	\$400,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
San Juan Hospital SSD	A	New roof	\$225,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009-10
“	C	Physicians clinic design/engineering	\$55,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
“	D	Physicians clinic	\$775,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
San Juan Building Authority	A	Fairgrounds	\$4,000,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
“	A	Jail expansion	\$22,000,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
“	A	Courthouse expansion	\$4,000,000	CIB/Local/Other	
“	D	Welcome parking expansion	\$85,000	CIB/Local/Other	2009
<u>DISTRICT-WIDE AGENCIES - ST</u>					
Eastern Utah Technology Association of City Counties & Tribes	A	Purchase and install end user equipment for interoperability of public communications	\$6,200,000	CIB/Other	2009-10
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments	A	Rehabilitate owner occupied housing to make it habitable, energy efficient, and affordable. Replace units when necessary	\$400,000	HOME/CDBG/RD	2009-10
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments	A	Provide Consolidated Planning, CoC Planning, Homeless and other planning services, provide technical assistance for grant operation, community and economic development activities.	\$70,000	CDBG	2009-10