

Consolidated Plan

July 1 2020 - June 30 2025

DRAFT

SEUALG
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments



SEUEDD
Southeastern Utah Economic Development District

2020-2025 Consolidated Plan Prepared by: Jade Powell

Address: 375 South Carbon Ave
P.O. Box 1106
Price, UT 84501

Phone: 435-613-0022

Email: jpowell@seualg.utah.gov

DRAFT

Contents

Executive Summary	3
Outreach	5
Consultation	5
Citizen Participation	6
Needs Assessment	12
Demographics	12
Non-Housing Needs Assessment	13
Market Analysis	15
Housing Assessment and Supporting Tables	15
Non-Housing Assessment and Supporting Tables	23
Goals & Objectives	28
Allocation priorities	29
Expected Resources	30
Method of Distribution	31
Barriers to Affordable Housing	40
Protected Classes	42
Appendix A - Consultation Forms	45

Executive Summary

Environment:

The Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) consists of the four counties in the southeastern corner of Utah; Carbon, Emery, Grand and San Juan Counties. A portion of the Ute Tribal Lands in Grand County (uninhabited) and the Utah Navajo Strip region of the Navajo Reservation. The Navajo Reservation area also includes isolated Ute Tribal Lands.

The SEUALG is geographically rural. SEUALG is a large region, covering 17,432 square miles with a population of 55,659. The majority of the population is living in small cities and towns that dot the primary highways in each county.

Wholly contained within the Colorado Plateau Province, Southeastern Utah is outlined by Tavaputs Plateau (north), the eastern slope of the Wasatch Mountain Range (west), the western slope of the Rocky Mountains (east), the northern end of the Grand Canyon Plateau (south). The entire region is bisected by the Green River, Colorado River and the San Juan River.

The average altitude of the District is slightly above 5,000 ft. The area is largely comprised of high desert landscape with scattered forests and mountain regions, with some altitudes as high as 12,731 ft. Southeast Utah is a semi-arid region with average rainfall of only 12” per year. The unique geology offers many natural resources.

Population & Employment:

Carbon County’s population is 20,512. Growth is negative and labor force is estimated at 8,372. Unemployment rate is 4.4% and median household income is \$60,024. Poverty rate is 15.2%.

Emery County’s population is 10,410. Growth is negative and labor force is estimated at 4,255. Unemployment rate is 4.5% and median household income is \$65,094. Poverty rate is 12.4%.

Grand County’s population is 9,544. Growth is positive and the labor force is estimated at 5,971. Unemployment rate is 4.3% and median household income is \$58,945. Poverty rate is 12.7%.

San Juan County’s population is 15,193. Growth is positive and the labor force is estimated at 5,820. Unemployment rate is 6.2% and median household income is \$50,721. Poverty rate is 31%.

Outreach & Goal Setting:

Outreach throughout the SEUALG region will always be ongoing. SEUALG staff consults with the four counties as well as the cities/towns within the counties on a regular basis. The consultation visits are frequent and informal; however, once a year, an Infrastructure/Services Current Need Survey is conducted to all cities/towns and counties. The results are as follows:

Score	Sewer System	Culinary Water Storage	Culinary Water Source	Culinary Water Distribution System	Health Care	Roads and Road Maintenance	Recreation Facilities	Fire Dept Facilities and Equip	Public Safety Facilities	Services to Assist Homeless	Housing for LMI	Housing for Area Workforce
1	6	3	2	5	5	0	2	2	4	3	3	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	3
3	5	5	7	5	3	4	6	6	4	4	2	6
4	2	4	1	2	4	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
5	2	3	5	3	3	8	3	3	2	3	5	4
Avg. Score	2.5	3.1	3.3	2.8	2.9	4	3	3	2.7	2.9	3.2	3.4

The results from the survey are used to determine the needs and priorities for the following year’s Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program year as well as set goals for the coming years.

Priorities for the Next Five Years:

- 1st Priority – Affordable and Workforce Housing
- 2nd Priority – Infrastructure Development
- 3rd Priority – Community Development

Outreach

Consultation

The SEUALG consulted with the cities/towns and counties in the region, nineteen (19) cities/towns and four (4) counties. The SEUALG is a resource for the entities located within the region for community and economic planning, aging services, and community services.

The SEUALG collaborates with all local governments in the southeastern Utah region. The participation varies from county to county with the most emphasis being on community and economic development planning. In addition to community and economic development planning, the SEUALG participates on many human services and aging boards/committees/councils. By participating at the local level on issues the cities/towns and counties are facing, the SEUALG has the opportunity to convey resources such as State and federal funding as well as collaborate on ideas.

Throughout the past year, the SEUALG has consulted with the following entities and have worked to find solutions to their respective issues the entity is/was facing:

Area Agency on Aging (SEUALG and San Juan County)

Housing Authority of Carbon County

Regional Planning Office (SEUALG)

Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC)

Emery County Housing Authority

Housing Authority of SE Utah

Active Re-Entry

Seekhaven Family Crisis Center

Four Corners Community Behavioral Health

San Juan County Behavioral Health

Community Services Programs (SEUALG)

FutureINDesign (FIND)

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

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

San Juan County Homeless Coordinating Committee

Balance of State Homeless Coordinating Committee

Southeastern Utah Economic Development District (SEUEDD)

Tripartite (CSBG) Advisory Board

Carbon, Emery, Grand and San Juan Counties School Districts

Public safety agencies in all four (4) counties

Local offices of the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation Office

Local offices of the Department of Workforce Services

Citizen Participation

Annually, the SEUALG holds public hearings for Community Development Block Grant funding and public input on the SEUALG Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan. Typically, these hearings are held between December and January of each year.

Below is an example of the notice posted on the Utah Public Notice Website:

SOUTHEASTERN UTAH ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments will hold a Public Hearing on February 27, 2020, 1:00 pm in the Grand County Council Chambers located at 125 East Center Street, Moab, UT 84532, to take comments on the 2020-2025 Consolidated Plan which can be reviewed at <http://seualg.utah.gov/index.php/administration/reports-forms/>. Written public comments will also be accepted from January 27, 2020 - February 27, 2020. To comment, please contact Jade Powell: PO Box 1106, Price, UT 84501 or by email at jpowell@seualg.utah.gov.

In compliance with the Disability Act, individuals wishing to attend this meeting and who require special accommodations should contact Jade Powell at 435 613-0022 least five (5) working days prior to the meeting.

Historically, attendance at formal public hearings held during the Consolidated Planning/Community Development Block Grant application process has been low. In order to obtain as much public input as possible, SEUALG staff attended many of the public meetings and hearings held by entities within the southeastern Utah region. These meetings included local planning and zoning board meetings, special service district board meetings, housing authority and community housing development organizations board meetings, tripartite board meetings, interagency coordinating council meetings, homeless and continuum of care meeting, 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 and housing rehabilitation programs, etc., and solicited input about the issues, needs, goals and priorities to be identified in the Consolidated Plan. The SEUALG recently conducted a [Community 3-Year Needs Assessment](#) through the Community Services Program. Below are the findings of the Community Needs Assessment in southeastern Utah:

Prioritized Issues:

- 1- Employment/Intergenerational Poverty
- 2- Mental Health/Addiction
- 3- Transportation
- 4- Housing
- 5- Homelessness
- 6- Food Insecurity

Gaps in Services:

- 1- Lack of Primary Jobs
- 2- Lack of Access to Mental Health and Addiction Services
- 3- Lack of Accessible and Affordable Transportation in Southeastern Utah
- 4- Lack of Affordable and Accessible Housing
- 5- Lack of Shelters for Homeless

In addition to the Community 3-Year Needs Assessment, the SEUALG conducts an annual survey of current infrastructure and issues facing communities in the SEUALG region. The questions are as follows:

Infrastructure/Services Current Need Survey

The following questions are to discover what the needs of your community are currently. Please select a number 1 - 5 with 1 being a low priority for the county/community (i.e. good condition) and 5 being a high priority for the county/community (i.e. needs repair/replacement).

Sewer System

Mark only one oval.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

Culinary Water Storage

Mark only one oval.

0	0	0	0	0
1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

Culinary Water Source

Mark only one oval.

0	0	0	0	0
1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

Culinary Water Distribution System

Mark only one oval.

0	0	0	0	0
1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

Health Care

Mark only one oval.

0	0	0	0	0
1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

Roads and Road Maintenance

Mark only one oval.

0	0	0	0	0
1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

Recreation Facilities

Mark only one oval.

0	0	0	0	0
1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

Fire Department Facilities and Equipment

Mark only one oval.

0	0	0	0	0
1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

Public Safety Facilities (i.e. police, sheriff, EMS)

Mark only one oval.

0	0	0	0	0
1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

Services to Assist Homeless Individuals

Mark only one oval.

0	0	0	0	0
1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

Housing for Low to Moderate Income (persons below 80% area median income)

Mark only one oval.

0	0	0	0	0
1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

What are the barriers for AFFORDABLE HOUSING in your community?

(short answer)

Housing for Area Workforce (persons above 80% area median income)

Mark only one oval.

0	0	0	0	0
1	2	3	4	5
Low				High

What are the barriers for WORKFORCE HOUSING in your community?

(short answer)

Infrastructure/Services Current Need Survey RESULTS

Score	Sewer System	Culinary Water Storage	Culinary Water Source	Culinary Water Distribution System	Health Care	Roads and Road Maintenance	Recreation Facilities	Fire Dept Facilities and Equip	Public Safety Facilities	Services to Assist Homeless	Housing for LMI	Housing for Area Workforce
1	6	3	2	5	5	0	2	2	4	3	3	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	3
3	5	5	7	5	3	4	6	6	4	4	2	6
4	2	4	1	2	4	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
5	2	3	5	3	3	8	3	3	2	3	5	4
Avg. Score	2.5	3.1	3.3	2.8	2.9	4	3	3	2.7	2.9	3.2	3.4

What are the barriers for AFFORDABLE HOUSING in your community?

- Cost of Development (i.e. land, utilities, building costs) for Developers
- High priced real estate and low seasonal, non-benefited jobs due to tourism economy
- Limited supply and no current programs for cities/developers
- Available housing being used for AirBnB units
- Development resources and funding incentives
- Actual available stable housing stock
- Low inventory

What are the barriers for WORKFORCE HOUSING in your community?

- Low housing stock
- Most smaller homes are short-term rentals or rentals
- Homes to purchase are not available or dilapidated. New homes need to be built
- Actual available stock of housing that is workforce affordable
- Limited supply due to labor forces and AirBnB
- Developers are hesitant to invest
- Lack of new development

Needs Assessment

Demographics

Population*

Geography	2017 ACS Population Estimate	Median Household Income	Proportion of Median Income				
			0-30% Extremely Low Income	30-50% Very Low Income	50-80% Low Income	80-100% Moderate Income	100+% High Income
Carbon County	20,512	\$60,024	13.75%	13.88%	18.66%	10.85%	42.93%
Emery County	10,410	\$65,094	9.96%	11.38%	20.63%	15.22%	42.67%
Grand County	9,544	\$58,945	15.05%	12.70%	20.16%	12.43%	39.53%
San Juan County	15,193	\$50,721	23.54%	12.15%	18.73%	10%	35.70%

Race and Ethnicity*

Geography	Hispanic or Latino	Not Hispanic or Latino	White Alone	Black or African American Alone	American Indian and Alaskan Native	Asian Alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Two or more races
Carbon County	13.2%	86.8%	83.3%	0.7%	0.8%	0.4%	0.2%	1.5%
Emery County	6.2%	93.8%	91.4%	0.1%	0.7%	0.6%	0.0%	0.9%
Grand County	10.0%	90.0%	88.1%	0.2%	1.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%
San Juan County	5.3%	94.7%	44.0%	0.2%	47.8%	0.5%	0.5%	1.7%

Household Demographics*

Geography	Number of Disabled Individuals	Median Age	Percentage of Individuals 65+	Family Households	Nonfamily Households	Total Households
Carbon County	1,659	36.4	15.7%	5,096	2,745	7,841
Emery County	831	35	15.2%	2,764	800	3,564
Grand County	592	39.8	16.5%	2,625	1,248	3,873
San Juan County	1,355	31.6	12.8%	3,036	983	4,019

*All data gathered from the 2017 ACS 5-year Estimates and 2016 HUD CHAS

Non-Housing Needs Assessment

Annually, the SEUALG conducts a survey to determine the need for public facilities, services and infrastructure. The survey is given to all counties and municipalities in the SEUALG region. The survey is first passed along to elected officials and county/city staff-when appropriate-to be completed. It is heavily advised for elected officials to take the survey and forward the survey to the appropriate person(s) in charge of such facilities/infrastructure. The results of the survey set the priorities for regional funding such as the Community Development Block Grant Rating and Ranking criterion.

Results of Community Assessment for 2020-2025 Consolidated Plan

Score	Sewer System	Culinary Water Storage	Culinary Water Source	Culinary Water Distribution System	Health Care	Roads and Road Maintenance	Recreation Facilities	Fire Dept Facilities and Equip	Public Safety Facilities	Services to Assist Homeless	Housing for LMI	Housing for Area Workforce
1	6	3	2	5	5	0	2	2	4	3	3	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	4	4	3
3	5	5	7	5	3	4	6	6	4	4	2	6
4	2	4	1	2	4	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
5	2	3	5	3	3	8	3	3	2	3	5	4
Avg. Score	2.5	3.1	3.3	2.8	2.9	4	3	3	2.7	2.9	3.2	3.4

Based on the survey results, the highest need is Housing for Area Workforce followed by Culinary Water Source. The region has seen a drop in new development for area workforce housing over the past few years. This is an issue in Carbon and Emery as industry starts to diversify and attach new workers from out of the area. In Grand County, the issue of a lack of workforce housing is because of the tourism economy causing real estate in the County to become too expensive-and more appealing for hotel/resort properties to be built-for those that work in the tourism industry (tour guides, restaurant workers, hospitality workers and managers, etc.) to afford housing within the county. San Juan County also sees an issue with workforce housing because of the tourism economy as well as the rural area and lack of builders/developers.

Being in a cold desert in southeastern Utah, culinary water has been-and will continue to be-an issue for the region. The counties and municipalities rely on springs and runoff water from winter for their water needs. Most cities receive their water from reservoirs that collect the runoff water. This is good if the previous year yields large amounts of snow. Being in the desert, cities and counties are continually seeking water sources.

In addition to the survey conducted by the SEUALG Community Development Department, the SEUALG Community Services Department conducted a 3-year needs assessment named the [SEUALG Community Action Plan](#). Below are listed services and issues that are impeding the southeastern Utah region:

- 1- Employment/Intergenerational Poverty
- 2- Mental Health/Addiction
- 3- Transportation*
- 4- Housing*
- 5- Homelessness*
- 6- Food Insecurity*

Gaps in Services:

- 1- Lack of Primary Jobs
- 2- Lack of Access to Mental Health and Addiction Services
- 3- Lack of Accessible and Affordable Transportation in Southeastern Utah*
- 4- Lack of Affordable and Accessible Housing*
- 5- Lack of Shelters for Homeless*

*Areas the Community Development Block Grant could potentially assist with the needs in the SEUALG region.

The SEUALG Community Action Plan collected data by holding town hall type meetings and surveys through direct email, paper surveys at various related meetings in the region, and via the web utilizing the Google Forms system.

Market Analysis

Housing Assessment

The housing stock in the region is sparse. A lot of the more “affordable” homes in the region are old homes that need substantial rehabilitation. Many of the homes are old mining camp homes from the 1930s to the 1950s. The listing price of these homes makes them affordable but the amount of money that needs to be invested (i.e. suitable living conditions and energy efficient) can be significant making them less desirable. Over the past several years the region’s population has stagnated. Those individuals for families moving into the district have a difficult time finding quality affordable housing.

Another difficulty within the region is the amount of developers and contractors willing to build affordable housing units. Most developers and contractors are focused on building luxury homes for high-income persons.

Around the Moab area, the issues that face the residents are finding land or rent that is 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 needed desperately in the Moab area.

Types of Properties:

Carbon County

Property Type	Number	Percentage
1-unit detached structure	7,261	74.3%
1-unit, attached structure	89	0.9%
2-4 units	717	7.3%
5-19 units	379	3.9%
20 or more units	158	1.6%
Mobile home, boat, RV, van, etc.	1,166	11.9%
Total	9,770	100%
Data collected from the 2017 ACS		

Emery County

Property Type	Number	Percentage
1-unit detached structure	3,468	75.7%
1-unit, attached structure	57	1.2%
2-4 units	254	5.5%
5-19 units	39	0.9%
20 or more units	0	0.0%
Mobile home, boat, RV, van, etc.	766	16.7%
Total	4,584	100%
Data collected from the 2017 ACS		

Grand County

Property Type	Number	Percentage
1-unit detached structure	3,079	58.9%
1-unit, attached structure	121	2.3%
2-4 units	484	9.3%
5-19 units	263	5.0%
20 or more units	48	0.9%
Mobile home, boat, RV, van, etc.	1,229	23.5%
Total	5,224	100%
Data collected from the 2017 ACS		

San Juan County

Property Type	Number	Percentage
1-unit detached structure	4,361	73.5%
1-unit, attached structure	52	0.9%
2-4 units	134	2.3%
5-19 units	159	2.7%
20 or more units	20	0.3%
Mobile home, boat, RV, van, etc.	1,210	20.4%
Total	5,936	100%
Data collected from the 2017 ACS		

Year Built:

Carbon County

Year Built	Number	Percentage
2000 or Later	891	9%
1980-1999	2,026	21%
1950-1979	2,583	26%
Before 1950	4,270	44%
Total	9,770	100%

Data collected from the 2017 ACS

Emery County

Year Built	Number	Percentage
2000 or Later	533	12%
1980-1999	1,141	25%
1950-1979	1,859	41%
Before 1950	1,051	23%
Total	4,584	100%

Data collected from the 2017 ACS

Grand County

Year Built	Number	Percentage
2000 or Later	1,089	21%
1980-1999	1,568	30%
1950-1979	2,212	42%
Before 1950	355	7%
Total	5,224	100%

Data collected from the 2017 ACS

San Juan County

Year Built	Number	Percentage
2000 or Later	1,209	20%
1980-1999	2,260	38%
1950-1979	1,989	34%
Before 1950	478	8%
Total	5,936	100%

Data collected from the 2017 ACS

Size of Units:

Carbon County

Unit Size	Number	Percentage
No Bedroom	141	1.4%
1 Bedroom	668	6.8%
2 Bedrooms	2,458	25.2%
3 or more Bedrooms	6,503	66.6%
Total	9,770	100%
Data collected from the 2017 ACS		

Emery County

Unit Size	Number	Percentage
No Bedroom	9	0.2%
1 Bedroom	208	4.5%
2 Bedrooms	912	19.9%
3 or more Bedrooms	3,455	75.4%
Total	4,584	100%
Data collected from the 2017 ACS		

Grand County

Unit Size	Number	Percentage
No Bedroom	118	2.3%
1 Bedroom	304	5.8%
2 Bedrooms	1,738	33.3%
3 or more Bedrooms	3,064	58.7%
Total	5,224	100%
Data collected from the 2017 ACS		

San Juan County

Unit Size	Number	Percentage
No Bedroom	421	7.1%
1 Bedroom	446	7.5%
2 Bedrooms	1,659	27.9%
3 or more Bedrooms	3,410	57.4%
Total	5,936	100%
Data collected from the 2017 ACS		

Cost of Units:

Carbon County

Unit Size	2010	2015	% of Change
Median Home Value	\$109,200	\$123,900	13.5%
Median Contract Rent	\$542	\$619	14.2%

Data collected from the American FactFinder

Emery County

Unit Size	2010	2015	% of Change
Median Home Value	\$105,500	\$132,700	25.8%
Median Contract Rent	\$594	\$593	-0.2%

Data collected from the American FactFinder

Grand County

Unit Size	2010	2015	% of Change
Median Home Value	\$194,100	\$224,800	15.8%
Median Contract Rent	\$729	\$758	4.0%

Data collected from the American FactFinder

San Juan County

Unit Size	2010	2015	% of Change
Median Home Value	\$108,000	\$139,400	29.1%
Median Contract Rent	\$568	\$607	6.9%

Data collected from the American FactFinder

Rent:

Carbon County

Rent Paid	Number	Percentage
Less than \$500	202	6.4%
\$500-999	1,434	45.1%
\$1,000-1,499	1,025	32.2%
\$1,500-1,999	337	10.6%
\$2,000 or more	181	5.7%
Total	3,179	100%

Data collected from the 2017 ACS

Emery County

Rent Paid	Number	Percentage
Less than \$500	46	3.1%
\$500-999	651	43.7%
\$1,000-1,499	576	38.7%
\$1,500-1,999	176	11.8%
\$2,000 or more	41	2.8%
Total	1,490	100%

Data collected from the 2017 ACS

Grand County

Rent Paid	Number	Percentage
Less than \$500	80	5.6%
\$500-999	375	26.3%
\$1,000-1,499	620	43.5%
\$1,500-1,999	241	16.9%
\$2,000 or more	109	7.6%
Total	1,425	100%

Data collected from the 2017 ACS

San Juan County

Rent Paid	Number	Percentage
Less than \$500	17	1.7%
\$500-999	289	28.6%
\$1,000-1,499	411	40.7%
\$1,500-1,999	223	22.1%
\$2,000 or more	69	6.8%
Total	1,009	100%

Data collected from the 2017 ACS

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%.

Carbon County

Condition	Owner		Renter	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Household has at least 1 of 4 housing problems	1,150	21%	775	36%
Household has none of 4 housing problems	4,430	79%	1,335	62%
Cost burden not available, no other problems	20	0%	35	2%
Total	5,600	100%	2,145	100%

HAMFI: Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income

Data collected from 2016 HUD CHAS

Emery County

Condition	Owner		Renter	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Household has at least 1 of 4 housing problems	440	15%	190	30%
Household has none of 4 housing problems	2,435	84%	435	70%
Cost burden not available, no other problems	20	1%	0	0%
Total	2,895	100%	625	100%

HAMFI: Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income

Data collected from 2016 HUD CHAS

Grand County

Condition	Owner		Renter	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Household has at least 1 of 4 housing problems	620	23%	595	51%
Household has none of 4 housing problems	2,035	77%	565	49%
Cost burden not available, no other problems	4	0%	0	0%
Total	2,659	100%	1,160	100%
HAMFI: Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income				
Data collected from 2016 HUD CHAS				

San Juan County

Condition	Owner		Renter	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Household has at least 1 of 4 housing problems	925	29%	155	20%
Household has none of 4 housing problems	2,170	69%	620	80%
Cost burden not available, no other problems	70	2%	4	1%
Total	3,165	100%	779	100%
HAMFI: Housing Urban Development Area Median Family Income				
Data collected from 2016 HUD CHAS				

Non-Housing Community Assessment

Maintaining a ready workforce has become increasingly challenging. Issues pertaining to the workforce are consistently identified as a weakness and vulnerability in the region. The region lags behind the national averages in 24-month average unemployment and labor force participation. Opioid addiction is a threat in the region.

Utah State University Eastern has campuses in Price, Moab and Blanding. Emery County does not have a campus. Access to higher education and increased efforts with career training and certifications are a primary opportunity for the region. K-12 education has strong efforts with new opportunities with robotics, STEM and certifications. STEM courses include College Algebra, Math Research, Applied Molecular Biology, Bimolecular Separation and Analysis and Medical Terminology.

The Rural Online Initiative assists with connecting rural communities with remote work. The initiative assists with training to gain employment through remote work. The final initiative is to reach 25K Jobs in Rural Utah. This initiative is a movement to increase urban-rural collaboration, cultivate empowerment of rural leaders, invest in rural human and physical capital to strengthen the regional economy by creating jobs.

Business by Sector:

SEUALG Region

Business by Sector	Number of Workers	Percentage of Workers
Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction	1,675	7%
Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations	3,139	14%
Construction	2,131	9%
Education and Health Care Services	5,311	23%
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	663	3%
Information	382	2%
Manufacturing	1,009	4%
Other Services	1,202	5%
Professional, Scientific, Management Services	1,376	6%
Public Administration	1,424	6%
Transportation and Warehousing	1,602	7%
Wholesale Trade	736	3%
Retail Trade	2,392	10%
Total	23,042	100%
Data collected from the 2017 ACS		

The major employment sectors within the SEUALG region are public administration, transportation and warehousing, and arts, entertainment, accommodations.

Labor Force/ Unemployment:

Carbon County

Total Population in Labor Force	Number
Employed Persons 16 yrs and Over	9,412
Unemployment Rate	4.4%
Unemployment Rate Ages 16-24	10.8%
Unemployment Rate Ages 25-65	3.5%

Data collected from jobs.utah.gov

Emery County

Total Population in Labor Force	Number
Employed Persons 16 yrs and Over	4,215
Unemployment Rate	4.5%
Unemployment Rate Ages 16-24	11.1%
Unemployment Rate Ages 25-65	2.5%

Data collected from jobs.utah.gov

Grand County

Total Population in Labor Force	Number
Employed Persons 16 yrs and Over	5,193
Unemployment Rate	4.3%
Unemployment Rate Ages 16-24	23.4%
Unemployment Rate Ages 25-65	3.8%

Data collected from jobs.utah.gov

San Juan County

Total Population in Labor Force	Number
Employed Persons 16 yrs and Over	5,727
Unemployment Rate	6.2%
Unemployment Rate Ages 16-24	18.5%
Unemployment Rate Ages 25-65	5.6%

Data collected from jobs.utah.gov

Commuting Patterns:

Carbon County

Total Population in Labor Force	Number
Inflow of Workers to Carbon County	3,218
Outflow of Workers from Carbon County	4,340
Reside and Work in Carbon County	4,303
Mean Travel Time to Work (in minutes)	17.7

Emery County

Total Population in Labor Force	Number
Inflow of Workers to Emery County	2,016
Outflow of Workers from Emery County	2,182
Reside and Work in Emery County	1,439
Mean Travel Time to Work	19.8

Grand County

Total Population in Labor Force	Number
Inflow of Workers to Grand County	1,225
Outflow of Workers from Grand County	1,232
Reside and Work in Grand County	3,143
Mean Travel Time to Work	15.6

San Juan County

Total Population in Labor Force	Number
Inflow of Workers to San Juan County	1,906
Outflow of Workers from San Juan County	1,761
Reside and Work in San Juan County	2,208
Mean Travel Time to Work	20.6

Data collected from jobs.utah.gov

Educational attainment (by age, 25-64):

Carbon County

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	452	50	332
High school graduate (or equivalency)	1,811	116	767
Some college of associates degree	3,287	149	1,286
Bachelor's degree or higher	1,333	23	274
Data collected from the 2017 ACS			

Emery County

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	166	2	114
High school graduate (or equivalency)	927	72	496
Some college of associates degree	1,528	30	684
Bachelor's degree or higher	642	15	98
Data collected from the 2017 ACS			

Grand County

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	363	10	45
High school graduate (or equivalency)	1,175	30	327
Some college of associates degree	1,273	133	398
Bachelor's degree or higher	1,101	19	110
Data collected from the 2017 ACS			

San Juan County

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	244	32	499
High school graduate (or equivalency)	1,165	135	1,043
Some college of associates degree	1,743	124	750
Bachelor's degree or higher	1,009	7	124
Data collected from the 2017 ACS			

Median Earnings:

Carbon County

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings (Past 12 Months)
Less than high school graduate	\$23,571
High school graduate (or equivalency)	\$27,431
Some college of associates degree	\$30,116
Bachelor's degree or higher	\$41,129
Graduate or professional degree	\$57,050
Data collected from jobs.utah.gov	

Emery County

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings (Past 12 Months)
Less than high school graduate	\$27,656
High school graduate (or equivalency)	\$31,607
Some college of associates degree	\$32,183
Bachelor's degree or higher	\$51,875
Graduate or professional degree	\$53,000
Data collected from jobs.utah.gov	

Grand County

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings (Past 12 Months)
Less than high school graduate	\$15,513
High school graduate (or equivalency)	\$31,473
Some college of associates degree	\$38,525
Bachelor's degree or higher	\$35,625
Graduate or professional degree	\$38,042
Data collected from jobs.utah.gov	

San Juan County

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings (Past 12 Months)
Less than high school graduate	\$20,375
High school graduate (or equivalency)	\$23,026
Some college of associates degree	\$29,023
Bachelor's degree or higher	\$41,776
Graduate or professional degree	\$61,250
Data collected from jobs.utah.gov	

Goals & Objectives for SEUALG Region

1 & 5-Year Goals and Objectives

Goal Outcome Indicator	Quantity (1-Year)	Quantity (5-Year)	Unit of Measurement
Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	10	50	Households Assisted
Homeowner Housing Rehabilitation*	30	150	Households Housing Unit
Homeowner Housing Added*	4	20	Households Housing Unit
Homeless Person Overnight Shelter**	23	115	Persons Assisted
Homelessness Prevention**	28	140	Persons Assisted

*CDBG funds leveraged with USDA and Olene Walker funding

**Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Funding

Allocation Priorities

The HUD programs the SEUALG has the responsibility to allocate is the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) program.

Speaking on behalf of CDBG, there are no concentrations of poverty, deteriorated neighborhoods within the district, and all but two 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 – Affordable and Workforce Housing:

- a. New permanent low- to moderate-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 – Infrastructure Development:

- a. Culinary water projects
- b. Sewer projects
- c. Storm drainage projects

3rd Priority – Community Development:

- a. Public Safety
- b. Facilities that provide services to income qualified clients
- c. ADA Access
- d. Multi-purpose community centers
- e. Transportation
- f. Recreation projects
- g. Public facilities (sidewalk/curb/gutter)
- h. 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 for SEUALG Region

Resources	Annual	5-Year
CDBG Allocation	\$708,228	\$3,541,140
Program Income	\$0	\$0
Prior Years Resources	\$0	\$0
Total	\$708,228	\$3,541,140

The CDBG funding that SEUALG receives fluctuates depending on a variety of situations. Typically SEUALG receives between \$700,000 and \$710,000 annually. SEUALG leverage funds whenever possible. The biggest usage of leverage funds is the Community Impact Board (CIB), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development, and Olene Walker funding. SEUALG works closely with projects throughout the district to identify other sources that could be 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 2020-2025 Consolidated Plan and the 2020 Annual Action Plan 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 provide 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. Wastewater 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 (i.e. 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 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.



CDBG RATING AND RANKING POLICIES PROGRAM YEAR 2020

ALLOCATIONS POLICIES—the following set-asides are established for the 2020 funding year:

1. \$174,000 will be set-aside to fund the following Region-wide single-family housing rehabilitation programs operated by the Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments: 1) \$134,000 to provide repairs to the homes of residents throughout the Region, either as a stand-alone project or in coordination with funds from the Olene Walker Loan Fund, Rural Development, or other sources. 2) \$40,000 for the operation of the Region's housing rehabilitation programs funded by CDBG, 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. 3) Operate the lead-based paint evaluation program for the Region's housing rehabilitation activities, and other agencies that serve low-income clients with housing and rehabilitation services
2. \$50,000 will be set-aside to fund the Region-wide CDBG administration and consolidated planning activities operated by the Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments: 1) Update of the Region's required Consolidated Plan. 2) Coordinate Consolidated Planning activities and efforts with the Region's economic development practitioners, chambers of commerce, travel councils, and the Southeastern Utah Economic Development Region Board and CEDS (Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy) Committee; 3) Coordinate Consolidated Planning activities and efforts with the Region's homeless coordinating committees, agencies providing services to person with disabilities, region housing authorities, and other non-profit and special service agencies that serve low-income clients. 4) Coordinate Consolidated Planning activities with the Region'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 Region's CDBG applicants to ensure the successful completion of their applications. 6) Provide technical assistance to the Region's homeless and affordable housing committees, and other agencies that serve low-income residents, for program development and funding opportunities.
3. In compliance with the policies of the State of Utah CDBG Program, and to be eligible for funding, all applicants must have drawn down 50% of any prior year's CDBG funding prior to the Regional Review Committee's (RRC) rating and ranking meeting in March.
4. State of Utah has established the minimum amount of funding of \$30,000 per project and the maximum amount is limited by the annual allocation amount.
5. Applicants must provide written documentation of the availability and status of all other proposed funding at the time the application is submitted, including all sources of funding which are considered local contributions toward the project and its administration.
6. The Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (SEUALG) will aid with the completion of the application. All applications for CDBG funds will be made and processed in accordance with the State of Utah and Federal regulations.

7. Official representatives of potential applicants **MUST ATTEND ONE** of the “How to Apply Workshops.” Applicants that do not attend will not be considered for funding. Official representatives can be elected officials of the applicant entity or management level employees of the entity such as city/county managers or administrators, city/county recorders or clerks, or management staff from the entities’ planning or community development department. Third party representation (engineers, architects, lower level entity staff, etc.) will be accepted only if written designation from the entity is provided at the start of the “How to Apply Workshop”.
8. All applications will be scored by the Rating and Ranking Committee (RRC) based on the rating and ranking criteria approved by the SEUALG Governing Board. SEUALG staff will make recommendations to the RRC on each application and then present the applications to the SEUALG Governing Board for final approval.
9. The SEUALG Governing Board has the final approval for projects. The SEUALG Board consists of one county commissioner/councilperson and one municipal elected official from each county. Membership on the SEUALG Board is determined by county level councils of governments at meetings held shortly after new elected officials take office.
10. The Rating and Ranking Committee will be composed of two recommended individuals from each county to represent the county and municipalities and will be on the Committee for two-year terms. These recommendations will be from the SEUALG Governing Board. The Rating and Ranking Committee creates the Rating and Ranking Policies and Criteria to be approved by the SEUALG Governing Board.
11. Projects must be consistent with the Region’s Consolidated Plan.
12. 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, construction, remodeling, and facility expansion. State of Utah policy prohibits the use of CDBG funds for operating and maintenance expenses. This includes paying administrative costs, salaries, etc. No more than 15% of the state’s yearly allocation of funds may be expended for public service activities.
13. Applications on behalf of sub recipients (i.e. special service districts, non-profit organizations, etc.) are allowed. The applicant city or county must understand that even if they name the sub recipient as project manager the city or county is still responsible for the project’s viability and program compliance. A subcontractor’s agreement between the applicant entity and the sub recipient must accompany the application. A letter from the governing board of the sub recipient requesting the sponsorship of the project must accompany the application. The letter must be signed by the board person. To utilize CDBG funds for a public service, the service must be either a new service or a quantifiable increase in the level of existing services which has been provided by the applicant in the previous 12 months.
14. To qualify for ADA points a project must be an adaptation to an existing facility or structure. New construction must be ADA compliant by law, so while these projects may meet a National Objective and qualify for CDBG funding, they will be rated and ranked as community development projects.
15. Project Maturity: Funding should be prioritized to those projects which are the most “mature”. Maturity is defined as those situations where: 1) the applicant has assigned a qualified project manager; 2) has selected an engineer and/or architect; 3) proposed solution to problem is identified in the Scope of Work and ready to proceed immediately; 4) has completed architectural/engineering design (blueprints); and 5) identifies all funding sources and funding maturity status. Projects that are determined to not be sufficiently mature to be ready to proceed in a timely manner, may not be rated and ranked.
16. When an applicant submits more than one application, only the highest ranked application will be considered for funding unless all other applicants’ projects have been funded.

17. Emergency projects may be considered by the RRC at any time during the year. Projects that are considered for emergency CDBG funding must still meet a national objective and regional goals set by the RRC. Projects may be considered an emergency if the following apply:

- ❖ Funding through a normal CDBG funding cycle would create an unreasonable health and or safety risk to people or property.

If an applicant deems it necessary to apply for emergency funding, they must contact the Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments promptly to discuss the details of the project and the state required application procedure and the RRC criteria. Emergency funds are limited on a statewide basis and will need approval from the State CDBG Policy Board. The amount of emergency funds awarded will be subtracted from the top of Region's next yearly allocation.

18. In the event of a tie the following policies will be followed in order from 1 to 5:

1. The project that has the highest percentage of LMI persons benefiting.
2. The project with the most local leveraged funds.
3. The project with the most other leveraged funds.
4. The largest geographical area benefitted.
5. The project with the largest number of LMI beneficiaries.

19. In the event there is not enough money to fully fund the final ranked project the money will be awarded as follows:

1. The final ranked applicant will be given the opportunity to amend their project description to reflect the reduced funding. The project must still be viable, complete and earn the required points.
2. If the final ranked project cannot be awarded partial funding, the highest ranked project will be given the opportunity to expand its project. This process will be followed until all the funded projects have received the opportunity to expand their projects and all the available CDBG funding has been awarded.
3. If none of the applied-for projects can be awarded additional funding, the un-awarded funding will be allocated to the Region-wide single-family rehabilitation program.

20. To ensure all requirements and time constraints for the CDBG application deadline of January 31 are met, applicants must have a project consultation meeting with SEUALG CDBG staff prior to December 15. Those applicants that do not consult with SEUALG CDBG staff prior to December 15 will not be eligible to apply for CDBG funding.

Definitions by Criteria Number:

1. Capacity to Carry Out Grant (5 points possible): Grantee’s history in administering CDBG grants. In the case that this is a grantee’s first CDBG grant, 2.5 points will be given. The State of Utah CDBG Staff determines this score by the following:
 - a. Applicant’s capacity to administer grant: project manager consistency (1 point)
 - b. Documentation/communication (1 point)
 - c. Project completed in contract period (1 point)
 - d. Compliance with regulations/laws (2 points)
2. Project Maturity (12 points possible): A qualified project manager has been selected, meaning the project manager is an employee or elected official that will be with the applicant or sub-recipient entity to oversee the grant until closeout; an architect or engineer has been selected and is working with applicant; applicant has a well-defined scope of work illustrating the problem and solution of the project including demographics, data, address of project, work to be performed, etc.; completed architectural/engineering design (blueprints) are completed and submitted; funding in place meaning all other forms of funding is secured/committed and supporting documents are attached with the application.
3. A. Public Facility Development/Improvements (7 points possible): Development and improvements of water/sewer or other community infrastructure such as ADA improvements, fire stations/medical service facilities and equipment, parks, community centers, streets and sidewalks, storm water drainage, etc. All activities must be eligible HUD matrix codes.

-OR-

- B. Improvement of LMI Housing (5 points possible): Improvement of existing housing stock with rehabilitation. This includes but is not limited to; energy-efficiency improvements, infrastructure, ADA accessibility, rehabilitating an existing building to become LMI housing.

-OR-

- C. Development of LMI Housing (7 points possible): Development of new housing that is to benefit low- to moderate-income families and individuals. This includes but is not limited to; infrastructure, property acquisition for housing project, construction.
4. Affordable Housing Plan (2 points possible): City or county has adopted an affordable housing plan and the project implements items addressed in the plan. Those projects that do not implement items in plan will receive 0 points.
5. Extent of Poverty (5 points possible): Extent of extremely low- to very low- income (0-50% AMI) households or beneficiaries in a project area divided by total households or population of a project area.
6. CDBG Funds Requested per Capita (5 points possible): Total CDBG funding divided by total project beneficiaries.
7. LMI Project Beneficiaries (4 points possible): Percentage of project beneficiaries that are low- to moderate-income (LMI).
8. Project Overall Impact (10 points possible): The area in which the beneficiaries are located. Those projects impacting the community/county as a whole will receive more points than those projects that are site specific or targeting a population.
9. Percentage of Non-CDBG Funds Invested in Total Project Cost (5 points possible): Total non-CDBG funds

divided by the total project cost. Points will then be given in relation to the jurisdiction's population size (9 a-d).

10. Applicant Last Funded (5 points possible): Points are given to those applicants based on when they last received CDBG funding.
11. Jurisdiction Property Tax Rate (5 points possible): The communities/counties that maintain an already high tax burden, as compared to the tax ceiling set by set law (municipalities .007 per dollar [Utah Code 10.6.133]; counties .0032 or .0036 per dollar [Utah Code 59.2.908]), will be given higher points in this category.
12. Capital Improvement Plan (1 point possible): To promote proactive planning, points will be given to those applicants that have the project listed on a local capital improvement plan with an associated budget. A copy of the capital improvement plan must be submitted with the application in order to receive the points.
13. Civil Rights Compliance (2 points possible): Applicant is in compliance with federal laws and regulations related to civil rights. One point will be awarded if the applicant has completed the "ADA Checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal" form. One point will be awarded is the applicant has adopted all the following policies: Grievance Procedure under the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 and ADA Effective Communication Policy, Language Access Plan, and Section 504 and ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy (Forms available from SEUALG).

2020 CDBG Application Scoring Criteria										Score
1	Capacity to Carry Out Grant	Excellent 5 points	Very Good 4 points	Good 3 points	Average 2 points	Below Average 1 point				
						Completed Architectural or Engineering Design 4 points	Funding in Place 3 points	Recreation Facilities or Planning 2 points		
2	Project Maturity	Project Manager 1 point	Architect or Engineer 1 point	Scope of Work 3 points	Completed Architectural or Engineering Design 4 points	Other Public Facilities 4 points	Streets & Sidewalks 3 points	Recreation Facilities or Planning 2 points		
3 a	Public Facility Development/Improvements	Water & Sewer 7 points	ADA Compliance 6 points	Fire, Medical Service Facilities and/or Equipment 5 points	Other Public Facilities 4 points	Streets & Sidewalks 3 points	Recreation Facilities or Planning 2 points			
3 b	Improvement of LMI Housing	>15 units 5 points	10-14 units 4 points	\$-9 units 3 points	Other Public Facilities 4 points	Streets & Sidewalks 3 points	Recreation Facilities or Planning 2 points			
3 c	Development of LMI Housing	>15 units 7 points	10-14 units 6 points	\$-9 units 5 points	Other Public Facilities 4 points	Streets & Sidewalks 3 points	Recreation Facilities or Planning 2 points			
4	Affordable Housing Plan	Yes 2 points	No 0 points							
5	Extent of Poverty in Project Area	≥20% 5 points	15%-19% 4 points	10%-14% 3 points						
6	CDBG Funds Requested per Capita	\$1-100 5 points	\$101-200 4 points	\$201-400 3 points	\$401-\$800 2 points	≥ \$801 1 point				
7	LMI Project Beneficiaries	>75% 4 points	66%-75% 3 points	56%-65% 2 points	51%-55% 1 point					
8	Project's Overall Impact	County/Community Wide 10 points	Site Specific or Targeted Population 5 points							

9	Percentage of Non-CDBG Funds Invested in Total Project Cost										
9a	Jurisdictions with a population of less than 500	>10% 5 points	7.1-10% 4 points	4.1-7% 3 points	1-4% 2 points	<1% 1 point					
9b	Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000	>20% 5 points	15.1-20% 4 points	10.1-15% 3 points	5.1-10% 2 points	1-5% 1 point					
9c	Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000	>30% 5 points	25.1-30% 4 points	20.1-25% 3 points	15.1-20% 2 points	1-15% 1 point					
9d	Jurisdictions with a population of greater than 5,000	>40% 5 points	35.1-40% 4 points	30.1-35% 3 points	25.1-30% 2 points	1-25% 1 point					
10	Applicant Last Funded	Last Funded FY2014 or earlier 5 points	Last Funded PY2016 4 points	Last Funded PY2017 3 points	Last Funded PY2018 2 points	Last Funded PY2019 0 points					
11	Jurisdiction Property Tax Rate	>50% 5 points	40-49% 4 points	30-39% 3 points	20-29% 2 points	10-19% 1 point	<10% 0 points				
12	Capital Improvement Plan	Yes 1 point	No 0 points								
13	Civil Rights Compliance	Fully Compliant 1 point	Completed ADA Checklist 1 point								
Total Points											
											/66

Barriers to Affordable Housing

The southeastern Utah region is sparsely populated (3.53 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, etc.).

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.

Also, investors (both locally and out-of-the-area) purchase affordable housing stock and remodeled/renovated the home. These homes are then used for short-term rentals found in tourism economies. Another issue with investors purchasing the affordable housing stock

and remodeling/renovating is the cost of the home is then higher making the home not affordable for low-income individuals and families.

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 & National Origin (SEUALG Region)

	Number	Percentage
Identify as White	41,694	74.9%
Biggest Racial Minority (American Indian)	7,604	13.7%
Identify as Hispanic	5,113	9.2%
Born Outside of United States	1,470	2.6%

Data collected from the 2017 ACS

Familial Status (SEUALG Region)

	Number	Percentage
Single Parent Households	3,060	15.8%
Households with Children <18	6,596	34.1%
Two Parent Household	10,461	54.1%
Total Households in Region	19,349	

Data collected from the 2017 ACS

Age (SEUALG Region)

	Number	Percentage
Elderly (over 65)	8,288	14.9%
Youth (under 15)	13,062	23.5%
Population between 15-64	34,309	61.6%
Dependency Ratio (youth + elderly / population 15-64)		62.2%

Data collected from the 2017 ACS

Sex (SEUALG Region)

	Number	Percentage
Male	27,769	49.9%
Female	27,890	50.1%
Total	55,659	100.0%

Data collected from the 2017 ACS

Disability (SEUALG Region)

	Number	Percentage
Disabled Individuals	8,467	15.2%

Data collected from the 2017 ACS

Homeless:

The regional Local Homeless Coordinating Councils 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 SEUALG

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 Executive Board has taken an active role in housing development, rehabilitation, and planning and technical assistance programs on a region-wide basis. For over 25 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 Executive Board has directed that the CDBG funds be coordinated with other HUD funding, USDA Rural Development programs, Olene Walker Funding 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 violence 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 A
Community Assessment Form

Consultation Form

1. AOG: Southeastern ALG Employee: Jade Powell

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Carbon County Date of Consultation: Ongoing

3. Agency/Group/Organization Type (**Check all that apply**)

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PHA | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Elderly Persons | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Employment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with Disabilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Victims of Domestic Violence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Fair Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Welfare Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Civil Leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Publicly funded institution/System of Care* | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Federal | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-State |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other government-County | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Local | <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee Department |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Planning organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Business leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector | <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhood Organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Institution | <input type="checkbox"/> Banking/Financing | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Major Employer | <input type="checkbox"/> Foundation | |

*Organizations which may discharge persons into homelessness, such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions.

4. What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? (**Check all that apply**)

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Needs Assessment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Housing Needs Homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Market Analysis Homelessness |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Chronically homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Needs-Families with Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Needs-Veterans |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special Needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Needs-Unaccompanied Youth | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Development | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy | | |

5. Briefly describe how the Agency/Group/Organization was consulted?

Throughout FY2020, SEUALG consulted with Carbon County on various occasions. Many of the consulting meetings were informal or in a meeting setting.

6. What are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation of areas for improved coordination?

Carbon County is partnering with SEUALG to provide support and authorizations of SEUALG programs to be implemented in the County, namely CDBG Single-Family Housing Rehabilitation. Other consulting meetings were to discuss possible CDBG projects located within the County.

In addition to consulting with Carbon County, the cities located within Carbon County were consulted. These consulting visits are very similar to the County's visits in regards to programs SEUALG offers and discussing possible CDBG projects.

Consultation Form

1. AOG: Southeastern ALG Employee: Jade Powell

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Emery County Date of Consultation: Ongoing

3. Agency/Group/Organization Type (**Check all that apply**)

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PHA | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Elderly Persons | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Employment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with Disabilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Victims of Domestic Violence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Fair Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Welfare Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Civil Leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Publicly funded institution/System of Care* | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Federal | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-State |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other government-County | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Local | <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee Department |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Planning organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Business leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector | <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhood Organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Institution | <input type="checkbox"/> Banking/Financing | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Major Employer | <input type="checkbox"/> Foundation | |

*Organizations which may discharge persons into homelessness, such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions.

4. What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? (**Check all that apply**)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Needs Assessment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Housing Needs | <input type="checkbox"/> Market Analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Chronically homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Families with Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Needs-Veterans |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special Needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Needs-Unaccompanied Youth | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Development | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy | | |

5. Briefly describe how the Agency/Group/Organization was consulted?

Throughout FY2020, SEUALG consulted with Emery County and the cities and towns located within the county on various occasions. Many of the consulting meetings were informal or in a meeting setting.

6. What are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation of areas for improved coordination?

Emery County is partnering with SEUALG to provide support and authorizations of SEUALG programs to be implemented in the County, namely CDBG Single-Family Housing Rehabilitation. Other consulting meetings were to discuss possible CDBG projects located within the County.

In addition to consulting with Emery County, the cities located within Emery County were consulted. These consulting visits are very similar to the County's visits in regards to programs SEUALG offers and discussing possible CDBG projects.

Consultation Form

1. AOG: Southeastern ALG Employee: Jade Powell

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Grand County Date of Consultation: Ongoing

3. Agency/Group/Organization Type **(Check all that apply)**

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PHA | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Elderly Persons | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Employment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with Disabilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Victims of Domestic Violence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Fair Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Welfare Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Civil Leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Publicly funded institution/System of Care* | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Federal | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-State |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other government-County | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Local | <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee Department |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Planning organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Business leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector | <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhood Organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Institution | <input type="checkbox"/> Banking/Financing | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Major Employer | <input type="checkbox"/> Foundation | |

*Organizations which may discharge persons into homelessness, such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions.

4. What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? **(Check all that apply)**

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Needs Assessment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Housing Needs | <input type="checkbox"/> Market Analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Chronically homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Families with Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Needs-Veterans |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special Needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Needs-Unaccompanied Youth | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy | | |

5. Briefly describe how the Agency/Group/Organization was consulted?

Throughout FY2020, SEUALG consulted with Grand County and the cities and towns located within the county on various occasions. Many of the consulting meetings were informal or in a meeting setting.

6. What are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation of areas for improved coordination?

Grand County is partnering with SEUALG to provide support and authorizations of SEUALG programs to be implemented in the County, namely CDBG Single-Family Housing Rehabilitation. Other consulting meetings were to discuss possible CDBG projects located within the County.

In addition to consulting with Grand County, the cities located within Grand County were consulted. These consulting visits are very similar to the County's visits in regard to programs SEUALG offers and discussing possible CDBG projects.

Consultation Form

1. AOG: Southeastern ALG Employee: Jade Powell

2. Name of Agency Consulted: San Juan County Date of Consultation: Ongoing

3. Agency/Group/Organization Type (**Check all that apply**)

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PHA | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Elderly Persons | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Employment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with Disabilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Victims of Domestic Violence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Fair Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Welfare Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Civil Leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Publicly funded institution/System of Care* | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Federal | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-State |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other government-County | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Local | <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee Department |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Planning organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Business leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector | <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhood Organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Institution | <input type="checkbox"/> Banking/Financing | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Major Employer | <input type="checkbox"/> Foundation | |

*Organizations which may discharge persons into homelessness, such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions.

4. What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? (**Check all that apply**)

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Needs Assessment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Housing Needs | <input type="checkbox"/> Market Analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Chronically homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Families with Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Needs-Veterans |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special Needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Needs-Unaccompanied Youth | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Development | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy | | |

5. Briefly describe how the Agency/Group/Organization was consulted?

Throughout FY2020, SEUALG consulted with San Juan County and the cities and towns located within the county on various occasions. Many of the consulting meetings were informal or in a meeting setting. Most meetings were held via telephone because of travel constraints.

6. What are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation of areas for improved coordination?

San Juan County is partnering with SEUALG to provide support and authorizations of SEUALG programs to be implemented in the County, namely CDBG Single-Family Housing Rehabilitation. Other consulting meetings were to discuss possible CDBG projects located within the County.

In addition to consulting with San Juan County, the cities located within San Juan County were consulted. These consulting visits are very similar to the County's visits regarding programs SEUALG offers and discussing possible CDBG projects.