

Consolidated Plan

For July 1 2015 - June 30 2020

Prepared by: Todd Thorne

Organization Name: Southeastern Association of Local Governments

Address: 375 South Carbon Ave. Price, UT

Phone: 435-637-5444

Fax: 435-637-5448

Email: tthorne@seualg.utah.gov

Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Outreach	7
Consultation	7
Citizen Participation	8
Needs Assessment	9
Demographics	9
Non-Housing Needs Assessment	9
Program Beneficiaries	10
Market Analysis.....	11
Number of units	11
Cost of units	12
Condition of Housing	12
Year built	13
Non-Housing Community Assets	13
Goals & Objectives	16
Allocation priorities.....	17
Expected Resources	18
Method of Distribution	18
Barriers to Affordable Housing	31
Other	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Protected Classes	32
Appendix I Communities Served	34
Appendix II Previously Approved Projects	35

Executive Summary

EVALUATION OF CURRENT NEEDS:

Housing

While developing this action plan, SEUALG staff meet regularly with the region’s housing and service provider agencies, and city/county planning officials. Housing needs in the southeastern Utah region have changed little over the last few years. The district’s owner-occupied rehabilitation program renovates between 12 and 15 homes per year, the identified housing needs across the entire district continues to be:

1. Increase the number of rental housing units affordable for low and very low income residents
2. Preserve existing affordable housing by rehabilitating owner occupied and rental units, with an emphasis on energy efficiency
3. Develop “Workforce Housing,” both rental and owner-occupied in Grand County.
4. Renovate or replace existing pre-1976 and dilapidated mobile/manufactured housing units, both rental and owner-occupied.
5. Develop housing for people with disabilities and other special needs, including supportive housing services and programs.

General Community Development

As part of the process to develop the district’s capital improvements prioritization lists, SEUALG staff regularly meets with city and county entities and gather needs assessment information. While projects will be completed as funding becomes, or is, available, the overall community development needs and priorities are:

1. Culinary water projects.
2. Sewer projects.
3. Public safety (fire protection), emergency and general medical care.
4. Road improvements curb & gutter, sidewalks, etc.
5. Storm water projects
6. ADA and accessibility projects (i.e. special purpose sidewalk or scooter trails and public facilities access).

7. Multi-purpose community centers
8. Recreation projects (parks, playground equipment, skate-parks, sports facilities, ball fields/courts, bike & hiking trails, etc.)
9. Construction or rehabilitation of facilities that provide services to “limited clientele” populations
10. General community or master planning.

Community & Human Services

The SEUALG uses ongoing communication with other district entities along with information gathered from public surveys, public forums, hearings and the data collection and reporting systems of various social services programs to determine priorities for this category.

1. Develop, replace or rehabilitate public facilities so services that directly benefit income qualified citizens can be improved and/or increased.
2. Increase the ability of social services programs to serve income qualified clients.
3. Develop transportation systems that meet the needs of the district’s senior, low-income, and disabled populations.

Economic Development

While very little HUD funding is used in the southeastern Utah district for economic development activities, economic development is the primary component of the district’s ability to sustain its residents. SEUALG staff coordinated closely with the Southeastern Utah Economic Development District and the economic development professionals in all four counties to determine the following needs.

1. Develop projects that directly provide jobs and other economic benefit to income qualified district residents.
2. Continue to make the revolving loan fund programs available throughout the district
3. Expand the B.E.A.R program
4. Expand services offered by the SBDC and the Business and Technical Assistance Center

SUMMARY OF PAST PERFORMANCE

During the last funding year CDBG and other HUD funding has been used to improve the livability of the district's communities, provide accessibility to public services and improve affordable housing stocks. Often HUD funding was combined with other funding sources (OWHLF State of Utah, USDA-Rural Development, Economic Development Administration, Low Income House Tax Credits and Historical Preservation Tax Credits, TANF funding, Community Impact Board funding, Community and Social Services Block Grant funding, Weatherization and H.E.A.T funding and local and private resources, etc.) to leverage more comprehensive projects;

Housing and Homeless Projects

During the 2014-2015 funding year the following housing and homeless projects were completed:

1. Single family (owner occupied) rehab/reconstruction 22 owner-occupied homes.
2. Self-help acquisition/rehab completed 5 projects
2. Provided down payment assistance to 1 family
3. Weatherization program completed 64 homes in the district.

Community Development Projects

Because housing projects have become such a high priority in southeastern Utah, no community development projects were funded with HUD funds during 2014-2015. Numerous community development projects were completed throughout the district with funds from sources other than HUD.

Economic Development Activities

Almost 20 years ago the SEUALG applied for and received \$133,000 in CDBG funding to match \$400,000 of EDA funding to start a revolving loan fund. That program continues today and has developed an equity position of approximately \$906,000. The CDBG funding has been released from the HUD regulations and oversight and was added directly to the EDA fund. Although, this program no longer carries CDBG identification, activities and accomplishments are still reported in the Consolidated Plan. Last year (2014) the following economic development activities were achieved.

SEUALG made 6 loans (\$365,000) to new and existing businesses. SEUALG works closely with the SDBC in Blanding, Moab, and Price, along with the local county economic development directors and BEAR outreach specialist. The partnerships with the SDBC, county economic development directors and BEAR program is a pivotal relationship for to assist local business to in retaining jobs and creating jobs for our local economy.

Community and Human Services

SEUALG CSBG staff coordinated with district agencies and organizations to develop programs using CSBG & TANF funding that provided direct services to income qualified households:

1. Provided crisis utility assistance to 37 low-income households.
2. Provided 16,840 boxes of food through the district's food banks.
3. Provided 721,081 pounds of food to clients
4. Provided 15 Native American families with home delivered meals 3-5 times a week
5. Provided 501 clients tax preparation through VITA
6. Provided emergency rent to 25 clients
7. Provided TANF rapid re-housing and preventing homelessness funds to 27 clients.
8. Provided 4,089 households with utility assistance through the HEAT program
9. Volunteers donated 6,041 hours to help assist customers with agency programs

Funding Priority Decision Making Process In the southeastern Utah district, CDBG funding distribution is driven by the Consolidated Planning process which identifies the issues and needs of the district's communities and includes an emphasis on benefits to citizens with low and very low incomes. The Consolidated Plan process also helps housing and human services providers to participate in the local government planning process so that communities can identify and develop needs assessment and projects that benefit low-income citizens. During the annual update process the Consolidated Plan process determines priorities and goals for HUD funding. The information provided by the Consolidated Plan is then used to annually update the rating and ranking policies that determine which applications receive funding.

2015-2016 Priorities

Housing:

1. Build 10 units of mutual self-help housing in Grand and San Juan Counties
2. Rehabilitate up to 15 owner occupied homes throughout the district
3. Provide TANF program services to approximately 30 income qualified households
4. Develop a second 50-60 unit rental project targeted to lower income households in Grand County.
5. Develop housing for mixed income levels 80-100% AMI group.

Outreach

Consultation

While gathering information during the 2015-2016 funding year, the SEUALG consulted with all eighteen (18) district cities and the four (4) district counties. The SEUALG assisted Castle Dale, East Carbon, Green River, Price, and Carbon County with general planning and Helper, and Castle Dale with land use ordinance planning. The SEUALG also consulted and met with the following organizations/groups and agencies on a regular basis throughout the update year:

The Area Agency on Aging

The Housing Authority of Carbon County

Regional Planning Office (SEUALG)

Interagency Coordinating Councils (ICC)

The Emery County Housing Authority

The Housing Authority of S.E. Utah

Active Re-Entry – Independent Living Center

Colleen Quigley Domestic Violence Shelter

Seek Haven Family Crisis Center

Gentle Iron Hawk Domestic Violence Shelter

Four Corners Community Behavioral Health

San Juan County Behavioral Health District

Community Services Programs

The Grand County Homeless Coordinating Committee (and Continuum of Care Committee)

The Carbon/Emery Homeless Coordinating Committee (and Continuum of Care Committee)

The San Juan County Homeless Coordinating Committee

Balance of State Homeless Coordinating Committee

The Southeastern Utah Economic Development District

County Economic Development Offices

Tri-Partite (CSBG) Advisory Board

Carbon, Emery, Grand and San Juan County School Districts

Public safety agencies in all four (4) counties

The local Department of Vocational Rehabilitation Office

The local offices of the Department of Workforce Services

Solutions of Moab (non-profit homeless service agency)

Citizen Participation

The Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) held a public hearing on January 22, 2015 to solicit comments for the Community Development Block Grant Program. No one from the public attend the hearing.

Historically, attendance at formal public hearings held during the consolidated planning/CDBG application process has been low, and the same has been true for the 2015-2016 funding year. In order to obtain as much public input as possible, SEUALG staff attended many of the public meetings and hearings held by district entities. These meetings include local planning and zoning board meetings, housing authority and community housing development organization board meetings, tri-partite board meetings (Community Services Block Grant), interagency coordinating council meetings, homeless and continuum of care meetings, economic development councils, as well as special programs such as the Regional Transportation Coordinating Council, etc. SEUALG staff presented information about the Consolidated Plan, CDBG Program, HOME (and housing rehabilitation) program, etc., and solicited input about the issues, needs, goals and priorities to be identified in the Consolidated Plan. The SEUALG also coordinates with the Community Action Partnership of Utah (CAP-Utah) and provides regular input into their activities. CAP-Utah and the SEUALG staff also conducted two community forums to garner input from the public and help to conduct a public survey for the districts food banks.

Overall, the needs identified were:

1. Not enough full time jobs.
2. Quality paying jobs with benefits are need.
3. Lack of medical insurance.
4. Affordable housing is not available.
5. There is limit public transportation in the district.
6. Mental health and substance abuse services are scarce and unaffordable affecting drug issues in the community.
7. There is too much reliance on technology by public service agencies. Clients want/need more assistance from “real” people in order to access programs and services.

Needs Assessment

Demographics

Geography	2010 Census	2020 Projection	Household pop. 2010	Household pop. 2020	Per Capita Income 2010	Per Capita Income 2011	Per Capita Income 2012
Carbon County	21,403	21,602	20,865	21,041	31,675	33,084	33,375
Emery County	10,976	11,230	10,937	11,173	27,904	32,751	27,065
Grand County	9,225	10,300	9,082	10,144	32,503	36,211	37,701
San Juan	14,746	15,644	14,457	15,320	21,973	22,644	22,818

Geography	White alone	Black or African American alone	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian alone	Native Hawaiian and other	Two or more races	Hispanic or Latino	White alone, not Hispanic
Carbon County	95.1%	70.0%	1.4%	90.0%	20.0%	1.7%	12.9%	83.4%
Emery County	97.1%	0.4%	1.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.9%	6.3%	91.4%
Grand County	91.9%	0.7%	4.3%	1.0%	0.1%	2.0%	9.8%	83.5%
San Juan County	50.2%	0.4%	46.6%	0.4%	0.1%	2.2%	4.9%	46.9%

Non-Housing Needs Assessment

Throughout the year SEUALG has met and surveyed all the all 18 communities and counties. SEUALG met with local officials, public works staff, engineers, and other city staff. Many of the communities in the district are similar. As with most rural communities the needs list is long but the money to address the issues is short. Many communities would like to build new community buildings but make do with the facilities they have. Fire stations and emergency buildings are on the top of several communities wants list.

Communities in the district rely on water from runoff and underground springs. A lack of storage capacity and availability of springs leads to water shortage during times of high demand in the summer. Because of the drought conditions over the last several years' communities are already limiting outdoor

watering. High on communities' priority list is water development/storage. Communities in the district are at an economic development disadvantage because they can't supply enough water to potential large water users. Many communities are on septic systems which limit the types of business that are able to relocate to areas in the district. To mitigate these issues communities are trying to finding affordable ways to install sewer systems and provide more water. Based on the interviews from the communities in the district Water and Sewer are among the top priorities.

Another need identified is roads. Communities in the district face a major task are maintaining and improving thousands of miles of roads. Some roads remain dirt and gravel because the counties don't have the funding available to address the needs. Due to the propensity for flash floods in the district, roads are often times wiped out due to Mother Nature and the lack of proper drainage systems.

Program Beneficiaries

CDBG Benefit Recipients

From 2009-2014 SEUALG programs have benefited local governments along with individuals. The following is a list of communities and individual that have benefitted.

21 individuals were benefited by down payments assistance and 93 individuals benefited by rehab assistance that is operated by the SEUALG housing department. Of the 114 individuals that received assistance 113 of them were White and 1 was Native American.

Public Housing

Within SEUALG there are 3 public housing agencies. 1. Housing Authority of Carbon County 2. Emery County Housing Authority. 3. Housing Authority of Southeastern Utah. All three housing authorities responses to SEUALG request for information. Based on the information received there are 194 housing units, 409 vouchers and between 6 months to 1 ½ years waiting list on the units the housing authorities in the district operate.

SEUALG coordinates with the local housing authorities throughout the year by attending local housing task force meeting, board meetings, personal interviews to gather data, emails, and phone calls.

Market Analysis

Number of units

Types of properties

Property type	Number	Percent
1-unit detached structure	17,480	70.88%
1-unit, attached structure	404	1.64%
2 units	663	2.69%
3 or 4 units	927	3.76%
5 to 9 units	359	1.46%
10 to 19 more apartments	294	1.19%
20 or more units	217	0.88%
Mobile Home	4,219	17.11%
Boat, RV, van, etc.	98	0.40%
TOTAL	24,661	

Source: American Community Survey 2009-2013 Selected Housing Characteristics

Size of units

Unit Size by Tenure	Owners		Renters	
	Number	%	Number	%
No bedroom	268	1.39%	166	3.32%
1 bedroom	1,325	6.89%	808	16.23%
2 or 3 bedrooms	12,250	63.74%	3,421	68.71%
4 or more bedrooms	5,377	27.98%	584	11.74%
TOTAL	19,219			4,980

Assessment

The housing stock in the district varies. A lot of the more “affordable” homes in the district are old homes that need substantial rehabilitation. Many of the homes are old mining camp homes from the 1930’s to the 1950’s. The listing price of these homes makes them affordable but the amount of money that needs to be invested can be significant making them less desirable due to the amount of work that needs to be done to bring them up to energy efficient standards. Over the past several years the district population is stagnate. Those individuals for families moving into the district have a difficult time finding quality affordable housing.

Around the Moab region the issues that face the residents is finding land or rent that affordable. The tourism industry has created many housing issues because of the low paying jobs that are available and

the high price to rent or build. More housing that meets not only the 30% AMI but up to 100% of AMI levels is need desperately in Moab.

Cost of units

Cost of units

	2000	2010	% Change
Median Home Value	\$85,150	\$125,050	46.8%
Median Contract Rent	\$327	\$621	89.9%

Source: America Community Survey 2009-2013 and 2000 Census SF-3

Rent

Rent Paid	Number	Percent
Less than \$500	1,432	32.0%
\$500-999	2,521	56.34%
\$1,000-1,499	444	9.92%
\$1,500-1,999	77	1.72%
TOTAL	4,474	

Source: American Community Survey 2009-2013 Selected Housing Characteristics

Condition of Housing

Conditions include lacking appropriate kitchen facilities, lacking appropriate plumbing, having more than one inhabitant per room, and cost burden greater than 30%

Condition of Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
Household has 1 of 4 housing problems	3,235	22.29%	2,185	27.79%
Household has none of 4 Housing problem	11,210	77.23%	2,740	71.52%
Cost burden not available	75	0.52%	65	0.72%
Total of 1 of 4 housing problems	14,515		4,995	
Household has 1 of 4 severe housing problems	1,610	11.09%	1,350	27.03%
Household has none of 4 severe housing problems	12,825	88.36%	3,580	71.67%
Cost burden not available	75	0.52%	65	1.30%
Total	14,515		4,995	

SEUALG uses the definitions has defined by the HUD in the CHAS data query tool. The four housing problems are: incomplete kitchen facilities; incomplete plumbing facilities more than 1 person per room; and cost burden greater than 30%

The four severe housing problems are: incomplete kitchen facilities; incomplete plumbing facilities; more than 1 person per room; and cost burden greater than 50%

Year built

Year Unit Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
2010 or later	81	0.6%	13	0.3%
2000-2009	1,597	11.2%	472	9.5%
1980-1999	3,953	27.8%	1,259	25.3%
1960-1979	4,563	32.1%	1,541	30.9%
1940-1959	2,392	16.8%	820	16.5%
1939 or earlier	1,651	11.6%	876	17.6%
TOTAL	14,236		4,980	

Source: America Community Survey 2009-2013

Describe the need the for rehabilitation based on the condition of the jurisdictions housing

Non-Housing Community Assets

Business by sector

Business by Sector	Number of Workers	Share of Workers %
Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction	4,236	10.32%
Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations	8,243	20.09%
Construction	2,798	6.82%
Education and Health Care Services	8,406	20.64%
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	1,209	2.95%
Information	289	.70%
Manufacturing	714	1.74%
Other Services	1,617	3.94%
Professional, Scientific, Management Services	1,417	3.45%
Public Administration	4,184	10.20%
Retail Trade	4,724	11.51%
Transportation & Warehousing	1,663	4.05%
Wholesale Trade	1,467	3.58%
Grand Total	41,027	100.00%

Labor Force/ Unemployment

Total population in labor force	
Employed persons 16 yrs and over	25,033
Unemployment Rate	8.0%
Unemployment rate ages 16-24	2.67%
Unemployment rate ages 25-65	4.24%

2009-2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, S2301: EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Travel time

Travel Time	Number	Percentage
Less than 30 minutes	18,253	80.5%
30-59 minutes	3,077	13.5%
60 or more minutes	1,347	6.0%
Total	22,677	

Educational attainment (by age)

Educational attainment by employment status (population 16+)			
Educational attainment	In labor force		Not in labor force
	Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	1,195	246	1,322
High school graduate (or equivalency)	5,005	427	2,615
Some college of associates degree	8,729	567	2,839
Bachelors degree or higher	3,662	94	657

Source: America Community Survey B223006: Educational attainment

Median Earnings

Educational attainment	Median earnings in the past 12 months
Less than high school graduate	\$18,678
High school graduate (or equivalency)	\$27,919
Some college of associates degree	\$29,437
Bachelors degree or higher	\$38,148
Graduate or professional degree	\$52,152

Economic growth in southeastern Utah continues on a relatively flat trajectory. The last five years saw modest growth in tourism, some service sectors, and gas and oil extraction. However, this growth was offset by significant declines in the coal mining, construction, and power generation sectors.

The primary economic forces in Southeastern Utah haven't changed much in the last 20 years. Carbon and Emery Counties continue to be dependent on resource extraction (coal mining & oil/gas drilling) while the primary sectors in Grand and San Juan Counties continues to be tourism and travel related services, although, San Juan County is experiencing increased oil production, especially on Reservation lands.

From the publication "2013 Utah Counties in Review"

CASTLE COUNTRY (Carbon and Emery Counties) "The coal mining industry has been the casualty of progressively declining demand for that resource that supports electricity generation, steel manufacturing, and other industrial-production processes. The fact that the coal industry has been at the heart of the Castle Country economy for over a century underscores the influence the industry has on the region's overall wellbeing. During 2013, the year-over-year change in total nonfarm employment was down 1.5 percent—with mining as one of the major job-loss areas."

And for SOUTHEAST UTAH (Grand and San Juan Counties) "Aggregate nonfarm employment in Southeast Utah grew slightly in 2013. Much of this net job gain appeared in construction, manufacturing, and health and social services. On the other hand, mining employment fell in both Grand and San Juan counties."

Because the market price of natural gas has dropped, production in southeastern Utah has declined over the last five years. However, oil production and jobs in that sector continue to increase in San Juan County. Although, the decline in oil and natural gas production has resulted in fewer jobs in those sectors the decline appears to have bottomed out. The job loss in the coal mining sector continues on a severe downward trend.

There have also been declines in the number of jobs in the employment sectors that support mining and oil/gas extraction. However, because much of the oil produced in the Uintah Basin is trucked south to Carbon County for rail transport and storage, and because many of the companies that previously depended on coal mining have transitioned to the oil and gas industries, trucking and transport jobs haven't declined as much one would expect from the drop in coal production.

All four counties continue to experience very modest job growth in the hospitality and related service sectors. However, these jobs almost always pay significantly less than base resource extraction jobs, often only offer part-time work, and rarely provide benefits such as paid leave, medical insurance, and retirement plans. Most of the tourism and travel positions such as river or trail guides are also seasonal jobs and employees may experience several months of unemployment each year.

Goal Outcome Indicator	Quantity	Unit of Measurement
Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for low/moderate income housing benefit	250	Households Assisted
Homeowner housing rehabilitated	17	Household Housing Unit
Direct financial assistance to homebuyers	3	Households Assisted

Goals & Objectives

Five year goals for the number of households supported through:	
Rental assistance	110
The production of new units	50
Rehab of existing units	90
Acquisition of existing units	0
Total	250

Five year goals for the number of households to be supported :	
Homeless	15
Non-homeless	20
Special Needs	20
Total	55

Allocation priorities

The only HUD program the SEUALG has the responsibility to allocate is the CDBG program. Because there are no concentrations of poverty, deteriorated neighborhoods within the district, and all but 2 of the communities in this district can be identified as disadvantaged, the SEUALG has not developed a geographic distribution or allocation plan for the CDBG funding.

Rather, based on the needs identified by the annual updates to this Consolidated Plan and the capital improvements planning process SEUALG Rating and Ranking Committee has determined that CDBG funding will be targeted to projects according to the following priorities:

1ST PRIORITY - HOUSING:

- a. New permanent low income housing units
- b. Rehabilitation of existing permanent housing units
- c. New supportive and ADA adaptive units
- d. Transitional housing units
- e. Emergency shelter units

2ND PRIORITY – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:

- a. Projects that provide permanent jobs to low and very low income residents

3RD PRIORITY – COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

- a. Culinary water projects
- b. Sewer projects
- c. Storm drainage projects
- d. Public safety
- e. Facilities that provide services to income qualified clients
- f. ADA Access
- g. Multi-purpose community centers
- h. Transportation
- i. Recreation projects
- j. Public facilities (sidewalk/curb/gutter)
- k. General community, facility, or master planning.

When there is competition for funds within a particular category, the level of low-income benefit drives the decision of which project is funded.

Expected Resources

Annual Allocation	\$460,000
Program Income	\$0
Prior Years Resources	\$0
Total	\$460,000

The CDBG monies that SEUALG fluctuates depending on a vary of situations. Typically SEUALG receives between \$450,000 and \$500,000 each year. SEUALG leverage funds whenever possible. The biggest usage of leverage funds is the Community Impact Board monies. SEUALG works closely with projects throughout the district to identify other sources that maybe utilized to make the most out of the limited resources that are available.

Method of Distribution

The Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments determines funding criteria only for the CDBG program. The SEUALG Rating and Ranking committee uses the information provided by the Consolidated Planning and Annual Plan Update process to determine the region's rating and ranking policies. The actual rating and ranking policies are finalized in July/August of each year. Based on priorities identified in the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan and this update, projects will be awarded funding based on the amount of direct benefit to income qualified residents, how mature the project is, and the following priorities:

1. HOUSING AND HOMELESS PROJECTS

Housing and homeless projects that increase the number of units or rehabilitate the existing housing/units for income qualified households and homeless individuals and families.

2. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Projects that directly provide economic development or job creation benefit to income eligible residents.

3. COMMUNITY AND HUMAN SERVICES FACILITIES

Projects that increase or improve facilities that provides human services (food banks, daycare centers, senior centers, medical clinics, improved access (beyond basic ADA compliance) for people with disabilities, etc.). Applicants will be required to document how the project provides or improves access to a direct benefit or service for income qualified clients rather than primarily providing benefit to the agency or facility itself:

4. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Projects that provide general community development benefit to income qualified communities or neighborhoods will be rated and ranked under the following priorities:

A. Culinary water projects

B. Sewer projects

C. Waste water projects

D. General ADA compliance projects (curb cuts, ramping government buildings, parking lot striping, park restroom adaptations, etc.); multi-purpose community center projects (not including sports facilities)

E. Public safety projects (fire protection, emergency and ambulance service)

F. Recreation projects (parks & park improvements, playground equipment, sports centers/skate parks/ball courts, etc.

G. Basic public infrastructure such as sidewalk curb & gutter, etc.

H. General planning for communities such as water system master planning, community master planning, capital facilities master planning, etc.

The design and engineering services needed for CDBG eligible construction projects will be considered for funding under the actual construction or project category.

In the past, applications for the southeastern Utah housing rehabilitation programs funded with HOME and CDBG money have not been at a level that a wait list needed to be developed, or that the district's prioritization system (disabled, elderly, children under 6 yrs. of age, etc.) be implemented to determine who receives funding and when. Likewise, restrictions on how many housing rehabilitation applications can or will be accepted from any community have not been necessary. It is not anticipated that either wait listing or priority restrictions will become necessary during the period covered by this Consolidated Plan update.

SOUTHEASTERN UTAH ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
RATING AND RANKING POLICIES
PROGRAM YEAR 2015-2016

ALLOCATIONS POLICIES—the following set-asides are established for the 2015-2016 funding year:

- \$135,000 will be set-aside to fund the following district-wide housing rehabilitation programs operated by the Southeastern Utah Association of local Governments: 1. \$100,000 to provide repairs to the homes of residents throughout the District, either as a stand-alone project or in coordination with funds from the Olene Walker Loan Fund, Rural Development, or other sources. 2A: \$35,000 for the operation of the District's housing rehabilitation programs funded by CDBG, HOME, RCED, State Critical Housing Needs, Rural Development, Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund, etc., by providing loan underwriting services, development of scopes of work, contractor supervision, and housing rehabilitation-repair technical assistance directly to clients and to other entities or agencies providing services to low income persons. 2B: Operate the lead-based paint evaluation program for the district's housing rehabilitation activities, weatherization programs, and other agencies that serve low-income clients with housing and rehabilitation services
- \$50,000 will be set-aside to fund the district-wide planning and project development activities operated by the Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments: 1. Production of and/or update of (including compiling data) the District's required Consolidated Plan. 2. Coordinate Consolidated Planning activities and efforts with the district's economic development practitioners, chambers of commerce, travel councils, and the Southeastern Utah Economic Development District board and CEDS (Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy) Committee; 3. Coordinate Consolidated Planning activities and efforts with the district's homeless coordinating committees, agencies providing services to person with disabilities, district housing authorities, and other non-profit and special service agencies that serve low-income clients. 4. Coordinate Consolidated planning activities with the District's Rural Transportation Planning Organization for the development and implementation of a mobility management system to provide access and mobility services to senior citizens, persons with disabilities, and low-income workers. 5. Provide technical assistance to the district's CDBG grantees to ensure the successful completion of their projects. 6. Provide technical assistance to the district's homeless and affordable housing committees, and other agencies that serve low-income residents, for program development and funding opportunities.
- The remaining funds will be available for application on a district-wide basis for projects that address the needs/issues identified in the Consolidated Plan: [http://www/seualg.utah.gov](http://www.seualg.utah.gov)
- The state established minimum amount to be applied for per project is \$30,000
- Except for public service projects, there will be no maximum limit for any project or application. Public service projects will be limited to \$50,000 per applicant or sponsored agency. The total amount that will be awarded to all public service projects will not exceed 15% of the district's non set-aside funding.
- To comply with state policy, in order to be eligible to receive funding in this grant cycle, a grantee/sub-grantee must have drawn down at least fifty percent of their previous year's CDBG grant funds by the time of regional rating and ranking, which will occur within the first three months

of 2015.

- Applications for multi-year funding will not be accepted this year.

GENERAL POLICIES

1. All applications will be pre-rated by the Rating Advisory Committee. This committee will consist of:

- SEUALG Executive Director
- Community Development Program Manager
- District RFP Planner
- Two additional representatives from community entities/organizations that are not submitting an application.

The Rating and Ranking Committee (RRC)—consisting of the SEUALG Governing Board, will formally review the pre-rating and will rank the applications and award funding. The committee may revise the ratings assigned to an application by the Advisory Committee if it finds that points were not given according to the criteria, or if it is aware of facts about the project which were unknown at the time of pre-rating and which would change the rating given. Results of the pre-rating process will not be made public or released to any applicant until after the formal RRC review has been completed.

2. If the RRC is aware of facts about a project or application which were unknown at the time of application or pre-rating, and which make the project ineligible, the RRC may reject the assigned ratings and deny any ranking at all to the application.

3. Applications that indicate that additional non-CDBG monies will be used to fund the project will not be given points for the additional funding unless the applicant provides detailed documentation that the additional funding is committed and available in the amount needed. If (after rating and ranking) the additional funding becomes unavailable, the project must be re-ranked. The new ranking may place the project below another un-funded or partially funded project. In this case the CDBG grant award must be withdrawn and awarded to the next highest ranked applicant.

4. **Applications on behalf of sub-recipients (i.e., special service districts, nonprofit organization, etc.) are encouraged. However, the applicant city or county must understand that even if they name the sub-recipient as project manager the city/county is still responsible for the project's viability and program compliance. The applying entity must be willing to maintain an active oversight of both the project and the sub-recipient's contract performance. An inter-local agreement between the applicant entity and the sub-recipient must accompany the pre-application. The inter-local agreement must detail who will be the project manager and how the sponsoring entity and sub-recipient will coordinate work on the project. A letter from the governing board of the sub-recipient requesting the sponsorship of the project must accompany the pre-application. This letter must be signed by the board chairperson.**

Public service providers, which are usually non-profit organizations, are encouraged to apply for CDBG funds for capital improvements and major equipment purchases. Examples are delivery trucks, furnishings, fixtures, computer equipment, construction, remodeling, and facility expansion. State policy prohibits the use of CDBG funds for operating and maintenance expenses. This includes paying administrative costs, salaries, etc. No more than 15 percent of the state's yearly allocation of funds may be

expended for public service activities.

5. A copy of the sub-recipients By-Laws, Articles of Incorporation, and 501(c)3 certification, as appropriate, must accompany the pre-application. Sub-recipients that don't yet have the necessary documents are not eligible for sponsorship.

6. Applications for projects that are determined to provide direct benefit to LMI residents of a distressed community/area will receive an additional two points. The determination of "distress" will be based on the most current Consolidated Plan, but may include additional documentation provided by the applicant.

7. Documents proving ownership must accompany pre-applications for projects involving real property. If the property is mortgaged, documents detailing terms of the mortgage, balance due and maturity date of the loan must accompany the pre-application

8. Projects must be consistent with the district's Consolidated Plan. The project must be included on the prioritized capital improvements list that the entity submitted for inclusion in the Consolidated Plan. A copy of the current Consolidated Plan can be downloaded from: <http://seualg.utah.gov>

9. Economic/business development projects (where funds will be lent/granted to start or expand a business) are required to include with the pre-application: financial statements, business plans, pro-forma reports, financing strategies, etc. The project will be evaluated by the Revolving Loan Fund Manager and a feasibility report will be prepared for the Rating and Ranking Committee's use in considering the project for funding.

Entities considering such a project should contact the ALG before beginning the pre-application to obtain the necessary forms and technical assistance, and to determine if the district's Revolving Loan Fund Programs should be utilized prior to applying for CDBG funding.

10. All projects must demonstrate "maturity". A checklist will be provided by the ALG to any entity considering application. Items to be considered are:

1. Is the project feasible as presented?
2. Can the project be completed with the funding available?
3. Is there funding for ongoing operating costs?
4. Has the project been conceptually approved by local entities, i.e. planning & zoning?

For construction projects,

1. Are there title or ownership questions?
2. Will the project require property acquisition; exceptional engineering or design work?
3. Will the project require 'sole source' protection?

For planning projects-

1. Does the entity have a reasonable time-line for completing the project once the planning has been completed?

Applications that cannot document project maturity will not be rated and ranked. Applicants must

contact the ALG by the first business day in January to determine survey forms and requirements, survey tabulation forms and requirements and project maturity checklists.

11. Public service projects are limited to activities that provide a direct benefit to income qualified clients (i.e. purchase of senior program meals-on-wheels delivery vans, computers for literacy programs for children from income qualified households, etc.) State regulations do not allow funding for administration, operating or maintenance expenses. Costs such as personnel expenses, travel expenses, general operating or agency indirect expenses are not eligible for funding. Funding cannot be used for existing programs or services nor used to replace existing or current funding. CDBG funding can be used to significantly expand or provide completely new services/programs. Public service projects will be awarded funding for one year only. After a project is funded for one year, no applications for funding in subsequent years will be accepted. **100% of clients receiving the public services funded by the CDBG program must be income qualified.**

12. All eligible applications for physical projects (including required, project-specific engineering) will automatically receive the following points:

National Objective = Targeted Clientele (100%) Low Income	3 points
National Objective = Surveyed (51%+) Low Income	2 points
National Objective = Urgent Health, Welfare	1 point
National Objective = Elimination of Slum and Blight	0 points

13. All eligible applications will automatically receive one point for participation at any level in a Quality Growth Planning Program. Documentation must be provided by the applicant.

14. Applicants will be required to demonstrate how their project provides direct benefit to low-income residents and how that benefit will be documented. When applicants are choosing a project, they should consider which of the prioritized projects on their capital improvement lists best lends itself to this outcome based performance measurement requirement. These descriptions/explanations should be included in the project narrative section.

**SOUTHEASTERN UTAH ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
RATING AND RANKING WORKSHEET**

COUNTY:	TOTAL SCORE:	RANKING:	
APPLICANT NAME:			
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:			
CDBG FUNDS REQUESTED:			
OTHER FUNDS COMMITTED:			
LOW INCOME PERCENTAGE:		NUMBER OF PERSONS:	
VERY LOW INCOME PERCENTAGE:		NUMBER OF PERSONS:	
AUTOMATIC POINTS:	NO. ADMIN POINTS:	DISTRESSED AREA POINTS:	ADA HOUSING:

➤ **TOTAL NUMBER OF PEOPLE DIRECTLY BENEFITTING FROM THE PROJECT—7 POINTS**

- More than 50% of the sponsored agency = 7 points
- 25% to 50% of the sponsored agency = 5 points
- 10% to 24% of the sponsored agency = 3 points
- Less than 10% of the sponsored agency = 1 point

POINTS AWARDED _____

a. LOW INCOME DIRECT BENEFICIARIES—80% OR LESS OF MEDIAN INCOME—10 POINTS

- 100% = 10 points
- 80-99% = 7 points
- 65-79% = 5 points
- 51-64% = 3 points

POINTS AWARDED _____

➤ **VERY LOW INCOME DIRECT BENEFICIARIES—50% OR LESS OF MEDIAN INCOME—12 POINTS**

- 100% = 12 points
- 80-99% = 9 points

- 65-79% = 6 points
- 51-64% = 3 points
- 40-50% = 1 point
- < 40% = 0 points

POINTS AWARDED _____

b. EXTREMELY LOW INCOME DIRECT BENEFICIARIES—30% OR LESS OF MEDIAN INCOME—15 POINTS

- 100% = 15 points
- 80-99% = 12 points
- 65-79% = 9 points
- 51-64% = 6 points
- 40-50% = 3 points

- 30-39% = 1 point
- < 30% = 0 points

POINTS AWARDED _____

2. JOBS CREATED/RETAINED—22 POINTS

These jobs must be for people from low/moderate income households AND a job needs to have potential for advancement. Entity must provide documentation with the application of how/when the job creation will occur. No points are awarded for temporary or project construction jobs. Only permanent **full-time equivalent** positions will be awarded points.

- 1 – 3 permanent jobs= 6 points
- 4 – 7 permanent jobs = 10 points
- 9 – 10 permanent jobs = 14 points
- 10 – 15 permanent jobs= 18 points
- 15 + permanent jobs = 22 points

POINTS AWARDED _____

3. CREATION/IMPROVEMENT OF DISTRICT HOUSING STOCK

***See SEUALG RATING AND RANKING FOR HOUSING PROJECTS on page RR 9-11 (end of this document.)

POINTS AWARDED (from a-f) _____

4. PROJECTS THAT DIRECTLY ENHANCE THE AVAILABILITY OF ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES—32 POINTS Max.

Circle the best project match from the items below—only one item may be chosen!

The project must be **directly related to providing the indicated services**. Projects that are not directly related to providing the service, i.e. landscaping of public safety building or a new parking area for the staff of a daycare center will be awarded one point.

Public Service providers, traditionally non-profit organizations, are allowed to apply for CDBG funds for capital improvements and major equipment purchases. Examples are delivery trucks, furnishings,

fixtures, computer equipment, construction, and remodeling and facility expansion. **STATE POLICY PROHIBITS the use of CDBG funds for operating and maintenance expenses. This includes paying administrative costs, salaries, etc.**

Item 1—ADA Compliance/Access to/for public buildings & facilities, excepting curb cuts and restrooms in parks etc. Must be directly related to 504 compliance, i.e., ramps, push pads, etc. (Application must include a 504 assessment).
POINTS AWARDED 32

Item 2—Culinary water supply/quality (including engineering or design work necessary to complete the specific project).
POINTS AWARDED 28

Item 3—Sewage Treatment (including engineering or design work necessary to complete the specific project).
POINTS AWARDED 24

Item 4—ADA Compliance/Access to/for public buildings & facilities, excepting curb cuts and restrooms in parks etc. Must be directly related to 504 compliance, i.e., ramps, push pads, etc. (Application must include a 504 assessment)
POINTS AWARDED 20

Item 5—Human Services Facilities to include daycare centers, senior centers, children’s justice centers, disability service centers, food-banks, etc., the construction of these types of buildings for new or rehabilitation of existing buildings (including permanent fixtures and capital equipment; but, NOT including ADA only projects).
POINTS AWARDED 16

Item 6—Medical Services Facilities: construction of new or rehabilitation of existing buildings (including permanent fixtures and capital equipment; but, NOT including ADA only projects).
POINTS AWARDED 12

Item 7—Recreation Facilities (playgrounds, play equipment, pavilions, restrooms, sports courts, etc.)
POINTS AWARDED 8

Item 8—Public Facilities (sidewalks, curb/gutter, street signs) POINTS AWARDED 6

Item 9—General Planning (e.g. water, sewer or electrical system master planning, general entity master planning, feasibility studies, etc.)
POINTS AWARDED 2

5. PUBLIC SERVICE PROJECTS—10 POINTS

Fixtures and equipment such as meals on wheels vans, computers for client use and Assistive Technology Equipment, personal medical devices, personal mobility devices, etc.

POINTS AWARDED _____

6. OTHER FUDNING PROVIDED TO COMPLETE PROJECT—10 POINTS

Documentation of secured funding must accompany the application. Points will not be awarded unless other funding is already guaranteed. A letter from applicants’ financial institution stating applicant is secure for funds must accompany the application.

- 1-10% = 1 point
- 11-20% = 2 points
- 21-30% = 3 points
- 31-40% = 4 points
- 41-50% = 5 points
- 51-60% = 6 points
- 61-70% = 7 points
- 71-80% = 8 points
- 81-90% = 9 points
- >90% = 10 points

POINTS AWARDED _____

7. SALES TAX REVENUE—5 POINTS

SEUALG will fill in the information necessary for this rating based on the information contained in the most current audit, budget or other financial reports filed with the Utah State Auditor, or from financial information provided by the sub-recipient. The application from the entity with the lowest sales tax revenue will be awarded 5 points. Variable points will be awarded while other applications based on scaling from the highest rated project down.

POINTS AWARDED _____

8. ABILITY OF GRANTEE TO ADMINISTER GRANT—6 POINTS (*insight/information provided by state staff*)

- Project Manager with excellent history = 6 points
- First time applying entity as Project Manager = 5 points
- First time sub-recipient as Project Manager = 4 points
- Project Manager/entity with poor history = 3 points

POINTS AWARDED _____

9. AFFORDABLE HOUSING PLAN COMPLIANCE—2 POINTS

Current Utah State law requires all cities and counties to address the problems associated with the availability of affordable housing in their community’s plans. Applications received from

communities/counties who have complied with the various Utah State Laws requiring that cities/counties adopt and regularly update affordable housing plans, and who are applying for a project that is intended to address an element of that plan, will be given two additional points. Applicant is required to submit their latest plan along with documentation of on how the project addresses an issue identified in the plan.

Additional 2 points (if applicable) _____
POINTS AWARDED _____

Total Points Awarded _____
Name of Applicant _____

*****Continued from number**

3. CREATION/IMPROVEMENT OF DISTRICT HOUSING STOCK

SEUALG RATING AND RANKING FOR HOUSING PROJECTS

Projects eligible for points under the housing criteria are those that directly benefit the living quarters of households meeting the HUD income guidelines. Projects to acquire land and/or the provision of necessary infrastructure related directly to the development of new affordable and/or targeted clientele housing are eligible for housing criteria points. If a land acquisition is for single family housing, the entity applying will have a limit of \$100,000 and each lot acquired with CDBG grant will carry a deed restriction for resale of said property. Necessary infrastructure includes water and sewer systems, roads (including required sidewalk, curb/gutter), electrical service, etc. Infrastructure ineligible for the housing criteria points includes recreation areas, open space, landscaping, and community or common areas (e.g., laundry, meeting, and maintenance facilities), etc. Activities not eligible for the housing criteria points can be applied for under the general “essential Public Facilities” category. Only new multifamily, rental units are eligible to be built with CDBG funds. Land acquisition and infrastructure development are the only activities eligible for CDBG funding when developing new owner-occupied housing units.

PROJECTS APPLYING FOR CDBG FUNDING MUST DEMONSTRATE THAT THE BENEFIT OF THE FUNDING WILL BE TO REDUCE THE COST OF THE UNIT OCCUPIED BY THE INCOME QUALIFIED HOUSEHOLD, AND NOT TO PROTECT OR PAY THE DEVELOPER’S OR LEAD AGENCY’S PROFITS OR DEVELOPMENT FEES. THE PAYMENT OF IMPACT OR CONNECTION FEES IS NOT AN ELIGIBLE CDBG ACTIVITY.

Recognizing the importance of adequate, affordable, and safe housing, the Rating and Ranking Committee (RRC) has set-aside funding to operate an owner-occupied rehabilitation/replacement program, along with a down-payment/closing cost assistance program to serve income qualified residents throughout the District. Before an applicant or sub-recipient decides to apply for funding for similar activities, the applicant must contact the SEUALG to determine if the District programs can address the applicant’s specific needs and issues.

Projects to provide new accessible permanent housing units or accessibility adaptations to existing permanent housing units (rental/multi-family) for persons with physical disabilities will be awarded an additional 3 points.

Additional 3 points (if applicable) _____

a. PROJECT IN AN AREA IDENTIFIED AS HAVING AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROBLEMS—10 POINTS

The project located in an area with the most severe affordable and/or decent housing shortage (as identified in the districts Consolidated Plan) will be awarded 10 points. Variable points will be awarded to other applications based on scaling from the highest project. Because housing projects already outrank all other projects, if only one housing project application is received, no points will be awarded in this category.

POINTS AWARDED _____

b. NEW PERMANENT MULTI-FAMILY RENTAL HOUSING UNITS CONSTRUCTED—75-80 POINTS.

The project with the highest number of units will be awarded 80 points. Variable points will be awarded to other applications based on scaling from the highest project. Eligible activities include the acquisition and rehabilitation of existing residential properties to convert to affordable units, acquisition and rehabilitation of existing commercial properties, and participating in completely new construction by acquiring land, installing infrastructure, etc., when the actual units will be constructed within two years. Applications for infrastructure development will have to document how the development is directly related to and primarily benefits the increased number of affordable units. **An additional 5 points will be awarded to projects where at least 30% of the new units are designed utilizing Universal Design principals.**

Additional 5 points (if applicable) _____

POINTS AWARDED _____

c. PERMANENT UNITS SUBSTANTIALLY REHABILITATED—65-70 POINTS

Eligible activities are those that provide rehabilitation services to multi-family rental properties and owner-occupied properties that are otherwise not eligible for the district-wide programs operated by SEUALG, and that provide permanent housing to income qualified residents. The project with the highest number of units will be awarded 70 points. Variable points will be awarded to other applications based on scaling from the highest project. Applications from PHA’s CHDO’s or other organizations, that are for activities that could reasonably be considered “standard maintenance” (i.e., tenant damage and normal wear and tear) are discouraged. Such applications will receive the minimum points available in this category.

POINTS AWARDED _____

d. PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING—55-60 POINTS

Development of permanent supportive rental housing for persons with mental/physical disabilities and senior citizens:

Funds can be used for acquisition, rehabilitation, site preparation, etc. The project providing housing to the highest number of persons will be awarded 60 points. Variable points will be awarded to other applications based on scaling from the highest project. Applicants must demonstrate that funding for operating expenses and the supportive services associated with the housing, including sufficient staff, has been secured. Applications for activities that could reasonably be considered “standard maintenance” –tenant damage and normal wear and tear—are discouraged. Such applications will receive the minimum points available in this category. An additional 5 points will be awarded for universal Design principals.

Additional 5 points (if applicable) _____

POINTS AWARDED _____

e. TRANSITIONAL HOUSING PROJECTS—35-40 POINTS

The development of new or the rehabilitation of existing transitional housing units:

The project providing housing to the highest number of persons will be awarded 50 points. Variable points will be awarded to other applications based on scaling from the highest project. Applicants must demonstrate that funding for operating expenses and to provide the services required for transitional housing programs, including staff, has be secured.

POINTS AWARDED _____

f. EMERGENCY SHELTER PROJECTS—25-30 POINTS

The development of new or the rehabilitation of exiting emergency homeless and spouse abuse shelter facilities/units:

The project providing housing to the highest number of persons will be awarded 40 points. Variable points will be awarded to other applications based on scaling from the highest project. Applicants must demonstrate that funding for operating expenses and to provide the services required for emergency/transient shelter programs, including staff, has be secured.

POINTS AWARDED _____

--Add up points and place on line Points Awarded for number 3 on page RR 6--

Barriers to Affordable Housing

Southeastern Utah district is so sparsely populated, 3.23 people per square mile; that extraordinary land use, zoning, and construction requirements sometimes prohibit the development of affordable housing. Communities in southeastern Utah have historically used a “pay as you go” system of financing infrastructure expansion (sewer, water, electric lines, natural gas lines, streets, and sidewalks/curb/gutter). In order to mitigate the costs of infrastructure development, new housing and commercial development is usually kept close to existing cities and towns. Because there is limited public transportation available, it’s vital that affordable housing (especially that designed for the low-wage worker) be developed close to jobs, services, and schools. The result is that affordable housing projects must compete against well financed, private development for the same scarce land and public infrastructure access. These two basic “realities” have the effect of increasing costs for development in general and affordable housing in particular.

Because of growth/development pressures associated with the tourism industry, some communities in southeastern Utah have infrastructure impact fees as high as \$10,000 per unit, including each apartment in a multi-family development. This is a significant cost for a low-income housing project to absorb. And because the scarce availability of land in the areas where growth is/has occurred (again, mostly the counties with a significant tourism industry), land costs also often present a barrier to affordable housing. Several communities in southeastern Utah are trying to address some of these barriers by adopting zoning ordinances that encourage the development of affordable housing, i.e., allowing for accessory dwellings, offering high-density bonuses for affordable housing, and relaxing some development requirements (sidewalk parkways, open areas, and landscaping regulations, for instance)

Generally, the primary barrier to the availability of affordable housing in southeastern Utah is the lower wages and incomes within the district. Recent budget cuts do not allow for programs to be offered in these smaller districts. Because tourism is a primary component of the district's economy, and wages in this industry are significantly below the state average, lower income workers often find it difficult to obtain decent, affordable housing.

Because of stagnant population growth, only 3.4% growth from 2000 to 2013, developers have not found it profitable to invest in the district. Except for multi-family type housing units developed as second homes or as investment properties which are rented for tourist room sales and vacation housing, almost all of the housing built in the last ten years has been single family units, constructed one unit at a time by the owner/occupant. A significant portion of those single family units were manufactured homes which do not retain their value, are difficult to finance in the current market and usually have higher maintenance and energy costs.

Finally, because much of the single family housing in the district, including units available for rent, is well over 40 years old, poor housing condition is a major barrier to affordable housing. Housing authorities in southeastern Utah report that often voucher clients end up turning their vouchers in because they cannot find a housing unit that meets the minimum habitability standards at the fair market rate.

Protected Classes

Race Ethnicity and National Origin

45,813 or 81.54% people identify as white

The biggest racial minority is American Indian with a total of 7,804 or 13.89% of the total population.

4,943 or 8.80% of the total population identify as Hispanic

1,601 or 2.85% people born outside of the United States

Familial status

2,752 or 4.89% number of single parent households

5,849 or 10.41% number of households with children under the age of 18 years old.

2,491 or 12.97% of households with 4+ children

Age

7,301 or 12.99% of people that are over 65

13,489 or 24.00% number of youth

20,709 (youth & elderly) 35,396 (population between 15-64) 58% is the dependency ratio for the SEUALG.

Sex

50.07% male, 49.93% female

The percentage follows the normal distribution of sexes.

Disability

8,849 total number of disabled individuals, 15.22% as percentage of total population

Homeless

The regional homeless coordinating and continuum of care committees continue to coordinate their strategies and implementation plans with the Utah Balance of State Homeless Coordinating Committee. While resources for implementation of projects that address the homeless needs in the district are scarce, continued coordination of services and information continues to be the goal of the district's homeless providers.

Goal: Reduce the number of homeless individuals and families and improve services

1. Provide resource and referral for Services by maintaining lines of communication between service agencies.
2. Coordinate services by training staff to be familiar with services offered by other agencies.
3. Increase the supply of housing by identifying needs and gaps, assisting housing developers and supportive service providers to partner in new projects, assist developers to include very low income units in their projects.
4. Provide short and long term resources to homeless persons by providing supplemental food, utility and rent payments (CSBG, rental assistance, etc.)
5. Increase participation in mainstream support programs by providing assistance to clients to access food stamp programs, disability support programs, and health (mental and physical) programs.

In general the overall priorities to address homelessness and special housing needs in southeastern Utah continue to be:

1. Develop additional permanent, supportive and ADA adaptive housing units for the very low income household
2. Continue to rehabilitate existing housing units including ADA adaptations
3. Develop transitional housing units
4. Develop additional units for senior citizens and people with disabilities.
5. Develop emergency (including winter shelter) shelters in at least two counties.

Recognizing the importance for safe, decent, affordable housing plays in both healthy communities and healthy economies, the Southeastern Utah Association of Governments Board has taken an active role in housing development, rehabilitation, and planning and technical assistance programs on a region-wide basis. For over 20 years the Rating and Ranking Committee has dedicated a significant portion of the region's CDBG allocation to affordable housing activities and projects. Further, the SEUALG Board has 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.

There are three domestic violence shelters operating in the district, but stays at these shelters are usually limited to 30 days. There are no transitional housing programs or units geared toward families, so often shelter clients have to choose between continuing to live with their abusers and becoming homeless. Options for emergency shelter for single men and families that are not the victims of domestic violent are generally limited to short-term (2 to 30 days) motel or rent payments. The

emergency assistance provided by the Community Services Block Grant funding (available in Carbon, Emery & Grand Counties), United Way, Salvation Army, and through the Department of Workforce Services is limited by funding availability. All of these programs have sustained significant funding cuts over the last several years and have had to reduce elements of the services they provide.

Appendix I Communities Served

Eligible communities
Carbon County
Helper City
Price City
Wellington Town
Emery County
Castle Dale City
Clawson Town
Cleveland Town
Elmo Town
Emery Town
Ferron City
Green River City
Huntington City
Orangeville City
Grand County
Castle Valley Town
Moab City
San Juan County
Blanding City
Monticello City

Appendix II Previously Approved Projects

Project name	Grantee	Funds Expended	Year awarded	Year completed
V.Apt Rehab	Moab/Grand	\$160,468.00	2009	2010
City Hall ADA	Monticello/SanJuan	\$59,588.00	2009	2010
Food Bank	Castle Dale/Emery	\$400,000.00	2010	2011
Cinema Court	Moab/Grand	\$250,000.00	2011	2012
4 Corners	Moab/Grand	\$240,000.00	2012	2014
ECHA Rehab	Emery County	\$150,000.00	2012	2013
CCHA Rehab	Price/Carbon	\$302,050.00	2013	2013
Sewer Rehab	Blanding/SanJuan	\$60,000.00	2013	2014