

Six County Association of Governments

Consolidated Plan

2014 Annual Action Plan

For July 1 2014 - June 30 2015



Prepared: April 28, 2014

Prepared By: Six County Association of Governments

250 North Main
P.O. Box 820
Richfield, Utah 84701

Russ Cowley, Executive Director
(435) 893-0712 or rcowley@sixcounty.com

Emery Polelonema, Regional Planner
(435) 893-0713 or epolelon@sixcounty.com

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Evaluation of Current Needs.....	3
Community Assessments.....	3
Affordable Housing.....	3
Economic Development.....	3
Community Assistance.....	3
Funding Priorities and Decision Making Process.....	4
Citizen Participation and Consultation.....	4
Outreach.....	5
Consultation.....	5
SCAOG Department of Community Assistance.....	5
SCAOG Department of Housing Services.....	6
SCAOG Department of Aging and Volunteer Services.....	6
SCAOG Department of Economic and Community Development.....	6
<i>Planning Component.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>2014 Six County Community Needs Assessment.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Economic Development Component.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Executive Office</i>	<i>9</i>
SCAOG Administrative Services.....	9
Public Participation.....	10
Communities and Towns.....	10
Business Community.....	10
Interfaith Council.....	10
SCAOG Tri-partite Board.....	10
SCAOG/SCEDD Board.....	10
General Public.....	11
Goals and Objectives.....	12
Allocation Priorities.....	13
SCAOG Administration.....	13
SCAOG Housing Rehab.....	13
Nephi City.....	13
Hinckley Town.....	13
Fayette Town.....	14
Marysville Town.....	14
Expected Resources.....	15
SCAOG	15
SCAOG Community Assistance.....	15
SCAOG Housing Services.....	15
SCAOG Planning.....	15

State CDBG Allocation to the Six County Region.....	15
---	----

Table of Contents

Method of Distribution.....	16
Policies.....	16
Regional Review Committee (RRC).....	18
SCAOG Rating and Ranking Criteria Sheet	18
Access.....	20
Outreach.....	20
Process	20
Affordable Housing.....	21
Action Planned	21
Multi-family Housing.....	21
Public Housing.....	21
Single Family Housing.....	22
HUD Income Guidelines.....	23
Lead Based Paint.....	24
Coordination	24
Barriers to Affordable Housing.....	25
Barriers to affordable housing identified.....	25
Affordable Housing Barriers and Strategies.....	26
Other.....	26
Attachments and References.....	27
Consolidated Plan Consultation Tracking Form.....	28
Citizen Participation Outreach Tracking Form.....	29

Executive Summary

Evaluation of Current Needs - The Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) has evaluated the data obtained through program administration, personal interviews with county and community officials, business leaders, state and federal agencies, along with other service providers. From this evaluation, the current needs of the Region were determined as follows:

Community Assessments – From the Region’s annual assessments capital improvements and equipment needs still surface as priorities for communities. This category includes water, sewer, recreational facilities, fire stations, streets and roads, equipment, affordable housing, town hall/community centers.

Affordable Housing – There is a need for affordable housing in the Six County region. From the evaluation, the low median family of the area is a contributing factor to affordable housing. Wages are not keeping with increasing land and building costs. This also applies to the increasing needs for home rehabilitation. Resources through the Self- Help and Credit to Own (C.R.O.W.N.) programs are being utilized. The regional Weatherization and Single Family Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Program (S.F.R.R.P) provide assistance to families in need of housing rehabilitation and energy efficiency. Available resources are not keeping up with demand. Additional resources are also needed to augment the current programs administered by the SCAOG. These programs enhance the standard of living for the low and moderate income families.

Economic Development – An evaluation of current needs identified the median family income, \$53,125. The median family income is 81% of the State \$65,646 and of the 83% of nation, \$64,293, according to the 2007-2011 American Community. The Region goal is to cooperate and coordinate with the economic development professionals in the six counties. By supporting the economic development professionals, local officials are able to evaluate business opportunities for their respective counties.

Community Assistance – This category covers crisis management, the poverty stricken, special needs, homeless, and etc. Resources available through the community assistance programs and administered by the SCAOG greatly reduce the need in this area. Additional resources are always needed to meet the increasing demands for community assistance services. One area of concern is the need for additional transitional, special needs, and other public housing. An objective to address this concern is acquiring Section 8 Vouchers (when available) and the development of affordable multi-family housing. To qualify for these and other programs the Region has established a regional housing authority. From a regional perspective a top priority for the upcoming year is to identify and obtain addition funding to augment current resources.

Funding Priority and Decision Making Process – Funding priorities for the upcoming year include **Nephi City** located in Juab County for housing rehabilitation. **Hinckley Town** located in Millard County for a sewer improvement project. **Fayette Town** located in Sanpete County for water system upgrade, meters and monitors. **Marysvale Town** located in Piute County for installation of water meters. **SCAOG Housing Services** serving the entire Six County region for housing rehabilitation. **SCAOG Planning** serving the entire Six County region for CDBG administration. The Executive Board of the SCAOG comprising six appointed commissioners and six appointed mayors, one from each of the six counties, serve as the Region's Rating and Ranking Committee. SCAOG has set up a sub-committee to be responsible for the annual review of the Rating and Ranking. SCAOG rating and ranking can be found in section VI.

Citizen Participation and Consultation – Citizens are encouraged to participate in the CDBG and Consolidated Plan process. A public comment commenced on Friday, February 28, 2014 and ended on Friday, March 28, 2014. Additionally each county and community in the region was interviewed and a needs assessment taken. In addition, contact was made with agencies serving the elderly, special needs, domestic violence, substance abuse, homeless, workforce, public health, mental health, and others. For further information please contact those listed on the front cover of this plan.

OUTREACH

Consultation - The SCAOG comprises departments overseeing community assistance, housing services, aging and volunteer services, economic development, planning, and administrative services. In 2014, through program outreach, these departments will consult with counties, communities, church organizations, senior boards, law enforcement agencies, emergency services, food banks, shelters, public health, mental health, state and other organizations. To better track the consultation efforts of the SCAOG for purposes of the Consolidated Plan, departments will be asked to complete the “Citizen Participation Outreach Tracking Form” and/or the “Consolidated Plan Consultation Tracking Form”. Copies of these forms can be found in the Attachments and References section page 28.

During the past period the departments within the SCAOG consulted with all six counties, and 49 communities, churches, Central Utah Food Bank, One Way Ministry, New Horizon’s Crisis Center, sheriff and police departments, Central Utah Mental Health, Central Utah Public Health, and other organizations within the Six County region. Additionally state agencies and federal agencies were intricately involved in making sure program resources were utilized. Below is a summarization of those organizations that were consulted and used in developing the 2014 Consolidated Plan. This summary is by no means inclusive but represents the effort made by the SCAOG in providing outreach to the various organizations throughout the region.

SCAOG Department of Community Assistance – Consultation with county and community officials, churches, police and sheriff departments, emergency services, Central Utah Food Bank, New Horizon’s Crisis Center, One Way Ministry, Adult protective Services, Central Utah Public Health, Central Utah Food Bank, and the Family Support Center along with others have taken place. The department has also advertized and provided contact information for their various programs.

As a result and through the various programs administered by the Department, over 2,600 families meeting low income guidelines have received direct services. Indirect services with funding provided to Central Utah Public Health, Central Utah Food Bank, and the Family Support Center provides much needed services that are not means based.

Discussion: There are a growing number of those in need of the programs administered by the SCAOG Community Assistance department. Another observation is the fact that many now seeking support and service are those middle class citizens who have lost jobs, are up-side-down in their mortgage, health issues, or experiencing other crisis. Creating more jobs that provide a sustainable wage is the greatest need identified by the department after consulting with these various organizations.

SCAOG Department of Housing Services – During the past period the department has consulted with county and community officials. They have also conducted a marketing campaign to identify individuals who qualify for their various programs. As a result affordable housing was provided to over one hundred households through various programs of the Department. These programs include Weatherization, Self Help, CROWN, HOME rehab, and CDBG housing rehab. All clients participating must meet low income guidelines. Currently there is a two year waiting list the for HOME rehab services. CDBG rehab provided services for eight households during last year’s period.

Discussion: There continues to be a need for affordable housing in the six county area. However through a community assessment process affordable housing is not a high priority for local officials. Another concern is the limited opportunities for more rural communities. The population base or demographics in some counties and communities do not support or it is not feasible for many affordable housing programs such as USDA’s Mutual Self Help, the CROWN program, or low income housing projects. Another concern is that many applicants do not qualify for affordable housing programs because they make too much income; yet, they do not qualify for a commercial mortgage because they make too little. Added to the frustration is the continued cut to federal and state programs for affordable housing programs. The current trend results in less opportunity and longer waiting time for current available services. Lower wages experienced in the Six County area add to the affordable housing needs of the region.

SCAOG Department of Aging and Volunteer Services – Every senior citizen center and board along with county and community leaders have been consulted. Additionally volunteer efforts have been tracked. The Department each year inputs data into the National Aging Program Information System (NAPIS). This report outlines the general characteristics of the elderly population of the region.

Discussion - As federal law prohibits required means testing to receive congregate or delivered meals, the information does allow for declaration of “income below poverty”, ethnicity, age, and etc. The NAPIS report for 2013 shows that out of a total of 935 client respondents, 105 reported income below poverty. However, 528 did not declare income. A large percentage also did not declare their ethnicity. Even the NAPIS report does not accurately identify the low and moderate income; it does give general conditions and trends. Other program administered through the aging department does require qualification for Medicaid to utilize programs. Currently the SCAOG’s Department of Aging and Volunteer Services does not identify or track housing concerns or needs.

SCAOG Department of Economic and Community Development – This department encompasses the SCAOG executive office, economic development district (SCEDD), and planning programs. During the past period consultation with all county commissioners, community mayors and local officials, has taken place. A compilation of the results of these assessments entitled “2014 Six County Needs Assessment” follows. The information on this chart is from the sole opinion(s) of those providing the information and from notes taken. Its intent is to serve as a general observation as to needs and current conditions and does not represent the official position of the respective county or community.

Planning Component – The eight seven columns provides information about the general condition of the community. It asks about the respective community’s assessment of fire and police services, recreational opportunities, sewer, culinary water supply, conditions of streets and roads, health care services, and affordable housing needs. These were rated one to ten with “1” being very inadequate with much need and “10” being properly addressed without current need. In the sewer infrastructure column a “0” represented a septic system. A “0” elsewhere indicates a no response from the respective entity. The other seven columns include an assessment of services for cellular and broadband, outreach required by Title VI and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) guidelines, economic development activities, mobility management, and general overall SCAOG programs. The rating on the services portion of the assessment is ranked one, two or three for cell service, broadband, and economic development. The numeral “1” indicates bad service for cell and broadband coverage; or, in economic development the community wishes to remain a bedroom community with little business or industrial activity. The rating of “2” in cell and broadband suggests there is only one provider and service could be improved with more options; whereas, a “2” in economic development shows a community is interested but does is currently not pursuing any business or industrial development activities. A “3” rating indicates that service is good with no real need for cellular and broadband; and, the community is actively working on economic development activities.

From the assessment survey regional planners can better understand a county or a community’s needs. It also helps them identify available resources from various state and federal programs. From the perspective of the consolidated plan, the county and community assessments helps the planner in preparing grant applications and obtaining political support. On the services side, in looking at the assessment chart, communities and areas with poor services for cellular and broadband service stand out. All were aware of dead spots or no service in their respective county or area. From the chart it is also obvious that none of the communities were aware of the Title VI/LEP requirements but all are willing to support and help in developing a universal plan that could be utilized by all communities. Mobility management and the need for mass transit were met with mixed reviews. It seems that most surveyed felt that transportation needs of their particular community is being met. It was also clear that there was skepticism in believing that a mass transit or alternative transportation would be successful. Another key accomplishment of meeting with the counties and communities is developing county infrastructure lists for the Community Impact Board (CIB). Millions of dollars are expended yearly on infrastructure projects in the Six County region by the CIB. A current list of projects can be reviewed at the SCAOG planning website - sixcountyplanning.com.

Discussion – From this endeavor and from a general overview most communities and counties are doing well with infrastructure. A good number of towns and cities are still served by septic systems. Roads and streets seem to be a concern and in need of repair. In general even though health care appears low on the regional total, many surveyed had no major concern with health care options but due to their not having a healthcare facility in their community did not rank. This was the case with fire and police services as well. Many towns are served in this area by the county and did not rank. It was interesting that recreational facilities and opportunities were lacking in many communities. One important factor is that the need for water and/or water

improvement needs are less this year. Communities have been working on water acquisition infrastructure improvements over the past years.

2014 Six County Community Needs Assessment (** Last Year's Survey; "0" other than septic indicates no response by communities)	Fire Department - (1) Bad - (10) Excellent	Police Department - (1) Bad - (10) Excellent	Recreational Facilities (1) Bad - (10) Excellent	Sewer (0) Septic (1) Bad - (10) Excellent	Culinary Water (1) Bad - (10) Excellent	Streets & Roads (1) Bad - (10) Excellent	Health Care (1) Bad - (10) Excellent	Affordable Housing 2013 Survey	Cell Service (3=Good; 2=Provider; 1=Bad)	Broadband (3=Good; 2=Provider; 1=Bad)	Title VI/LEP (2) no plan/will help (1) yes plan	Econ. Dev. (1=Bedroom; 2=Interest; 3=Active)	Mobility (2) Mass-transit Need (1) No need	SCAOG Program Concerns (1) YES (2) NO	Average
	Juab County														
Eureka City	10	9	7	5	5	3	0	1	-1	3	2	3	1	2	3.6
Levan	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	1	3	2	2	1	2	2	1.5
Mona City	8	8	7	7	9	7	0	8	1	3	2	2	2	2	4.7
Nephi city	5	5	2	4	4	3	7	9	1	2	2	3	2	2	3.6
Rocky Ridge town	5	9	3	0	5	3	0	5	3	2	2	3	2	2	3.1
Totals	5.6	6.2	3.8	3.2	5.6	4	1.4	4.8	1.4	2.4	2	2.4	1.8	2	4.3
Millard County															
Delta City	9	0	9	8	9	7	9	9	1	2	2	3	1	2	5.1
Fillmore City	5	0	2	6	6	8	10	7	3	1	2	3	1	2	4.0
Hinckley town	5	9	7	1	3	2	8	7	1	2	2	2	2	2	3.8
Holden town	9	9	5	0	8	2	8	7	3	3	2	2	1	2	4.4
Kanosh town	9	9	7	0	5	8	0	5	3	1	2	1	1	2	3.8
Leamington town	9	5	3	0	2	3	0	5	3	1	2	1	1	2	2.6
**Lynndyl town	8	0	7	0	7	5	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.1
Meadow town (Not Available)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Oak City (Not Available)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Scipio town	1	10	5		4	2	8	7	3	1	2	3	1	2	3.8
Totals	5.4	3.2	4.0	1.5	4.0	3.5	4.5	4.6	1.4	1.6	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.7
Piute County															
Circleville town	7	10	4	0	4	5	4	7	1	3	2	2	1	2	3.7
Junction town	8	7	5	0	2	6	2	7	1	2	2	2	1	2	3.4
Kingston town	4	9	3	0	9	2	2	7	3	3	2	1	1	2	3.4
Marysville town	2	8	3	0	5	2	0	6	3	2	2	2	1	2	2.7
Totals	5.3	8.5	3.8	0.0	5.0	3.8	2.0	6.8	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	4.0
Sanpete County															
Centerfield town	10	10	8	8	10	6	0	8	3	2	2	1	2	2	5.1
Ephraim city	6	1	4	6	1	1	5	5	3	3	2	3	2	2	3.1
Fairview city	6	5	5	8	3	6	8	8	1	3	2	3	2	2	4.4
Fayette town	3	5	7	0	8	2	0	3	1	3	2	1	2	2	2.8
Fountain Green city	8	10	2	10	10	6	0	8	3	3	2	2	0	2	4.7
Gunnison city	9	5	4	7	2	3	0	0	1	3	2	3	1	2	4.3
Manti city	6	8	1	6	3	6	6	6	3	2	2	3	2	2	4.0
Mayfield city	9	0	10	0	10	5	10	5	1	3	2	2	1	2	4.3
Moroni city	3	10	7	4	2	3	8	0	3	3	2	3	2	2	5.3
Mount Pleasant City	10	9	9	5	10	1	10	4	3	3	2	3	2	2	5.2
Spring City	8	6	7	7.5	9	7	9	7	3	3	2	1	0	2	5.1
Sterling town	8	1	4	4	5	3	0	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2.9
Wales town	5	1	3	1	5	1	0	5	3	3	2	1	2	2	2.4
Totals	7.0	5.5	5.5	5.1	6.0	3.8	4.3	4.8	2.4	2.8	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	5.3
Sevier County															
Annabella town	0	0	8	0	5	4	0	7	3	2	2	1	1	2	2.5
Aurora city	10	5	7	9	9	6	0	0	3	3	2	2	2	2	4.3
Central Valley	0	0	8	0	10	5	0	0	3	3	2	1	2	1	2.5
Elsinore town	7	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	1.6
Glenwood town	5	0	1	1	7	3	8	0	3	3	2	1	1	2	2.6
Joseph town (Not Available)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Koosharem town	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	5	1	1	2	2	1	2	0.7
Monroe city	9	0	2	0	5	1	9	9	3	3	2	2	2	2	3.5
Redmond town	7	6	8	8	7	9	8	5	3	3	2	1	2	2	5.1
Richfield city	7	6	5	8	9	4	8	4	3	3	2	3	2	2	4.7
Salina city	8	5	1	5	2	9	10	3	3	1	2	3	0	0	4.3
Sigurd town	1	0	0	0	9	2	0	9	3	3	2	2	1	2	1.7
Totals	4.7	1.8	3.3	2.6	5.6	3.8	3.6	3.8	2.8	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.6
Wayne County															
Bicknell town	5	0	2	0	5	1	8	5	3	3	2	2	1	2	2.8
** Hanksville	9	0	0	0	7	5	0	4	1	2	2	2	1	2	3.0
Loa town	6	0	6	0	6	6	0	7	3	2	2	2	2	2	3.1
Lyman town	7	7	5	0	4	4	8	0	3	3	2	2	1	2	3.4
Torrey town	10	4	6	0	8	7	9	0	3	3	2	2	1	2	4.1
Totals	7.4	2.2	3.8	0	6	4.6	5	3.2	2.6	2.6	2	2	1.2	2	4.1
Six County Totals	5.9	4.6	4.0	2.1	5.4	3.9	3.5	4.6	2.1	2.3	2.0	2.1	1.8	2.0	4.2

Discussion – The need for more jobs with a sustaining wage is the top concern. Statistical data shows the Six County area to be forty percent less than the national average in per-capita income. This compares to twenty percent below the per-capita income of the State. This statistic supports the observation made by the SCAOG Community Assistance Department and Housing Department. The District is working on goals and objectives that will enhance employment opportunities. The current Six County CEDS can be found on the SCAOG Website – sixcounty.com.

Executive Office – The Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) comprises commissioners and mayors of Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, and Wayne Counties. They were organized in November of 1969. Consultations during the past period, in addition to those mentioned by other departments, include congressional members, state legislators, and federal and state agency representatives. The results of the assessment done about SCAOG Programs are certainly commendable and can be found on the 2014 Six County Community Needs Assessment.

Discussion – In addition to other discussion points brought out in the Consolidated Plan, the SCAOG continues to have concerns related to the vast amount of public lands within the Six County area. Public land policy makes economic development, recreational opportunities, and acquisition of other natural resources most difficult. The public lands debate will continue to present very difficult challenges for local officials.

SCAOG Administrative Services – The SCAOG by contract provides the fiscal services for Central Utah Mental Health. Through this service and ongoing consultation the SCAOG is able to understand trends in spending for mental health programs.

Discussion – There was less Medicaid dollars expended in the Six County region during the past period than in earlier periods.

Public Participation

The following entities and organizations will be utilized to involve the public in creating the Annual Action Plan. (Please list your plan to involve the public in your jurisdiction in the creation of the Annual Action Plan)

Communities and Towns - There are 49 incorporated cities and towns in the Six County region. SCAOG staff will meet individually with each and conduct an assessment of community needs. Assessments are conducted with mayors and city council members who represent the general public.

Business Community – Each county in the Region has an economic development director. These professionals represent the economic development interest of their respective county. They are also members of the Six County Economic Development District Board’s (SCEDD) Technical Committee. Through this committee, whom meets monthly the economic development needs of the Region are identified, discussed, and mitigating strategies developed. The expertise of these individuals along with members of the SCEDD provides input for the development of the Region’s Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDDS). The CEDDS is a five year economic development plan for the Six County region. The SCEDD Steering Committee comprises 51% business and industry representation. The SCEDD meets bi-monthly and are responsible to oversee the implementation of the CEDDS throughout the five year period.

Interfaith Council – Staff have been asked to serve on a regional Interfaith Council. This group represents the various religious organizations of the area. They meet monthly to coordinate and discuss ways that church resources can be more effectively utilized to mitigate the needs of area residents – especially those with low and moderate income, the homeless, jobless, handicapped, elderly, and with other critical needs.

SCAOG Tri-partite Board – This Board comprises representation of public entities dealing with the low and very-low income of the Six County region. They meet bi-monthly to provide direction to the SCAOG Community Assistance Department as to the effective and efficient use of program funding.

SCAOG/SCEDD Board – These Boards comprise all eighteen commissioners and six appointed mayors of the Six County region. The Executive Board comprises six appointed commissioners and six appointed mayors. They provide direction and oversight of all SCAOG programs and services. The Executive Board also serves as the rating and ranking committee for the CDBG program.

General Public – A public notice was posted in all local newspapers within the Six County region notifying the public of a 30 day comment period for the 2014 Consolidated Plan. This period commenced on Friday, February 28, 2014 and ended on Friday, March 28, 2014. Through this notification the general public was encouraged to review and make comments concerning the Six County Consolidated Plan.

Discussion – As consultation with each of these entities has taken place, the question as to how available resources can be better utilized for the area’s needs is discussed. Developing better coordination and gaining a greater understanding of partnership resources needs to take place. The Six County Consolidated Plan for 2014 encourages more involvement of public entities. SCAOG Department staff has been asked to completing the “Consolidated Plan Consultation Tracking Form” and “Citizen Participation Outreach Tracking Form” each time consultation

takes place either in a group or in person. Information gleaned from this undertaking will provide greater focus for the Consolidated Plan.

Goals & Objectives

During this period the SCAOG has a goal to assist 86 households with affordable housing. This includes all projects including Self Help, CROWN, State Home Rehabilitation, CDBG Rehabilitation, etc. Of these about 40% or 34 would be for extremely low-income; 30% or 26 would be low-income; and 30% or 26 would be for moderate-income families. Note, of the 86 households receiving affordable housing assistance, 12 would be available through the CDBG Home Rehabilitation funding.

Through programs administered by the SCAOG, a goal for the next year is to assist 120 people or 40 families with rental assistance. It is anticipated that there will be 6 new housing units developed and a total of 80 housing units rehabbed. There is no acquisition of existing units expected during the next year.

Allocation priorities

The specific geographic areas and jurisdictions which are being targeted in the upcoming year are:

SCAOG Administration serving the entire Six County region for CDBG administration.

SCAOG Housing Rehab serving the entire Six County region for housing rehabilitation.

Nephi City located in Juab County for housing rehabilitation.

Hinckley Town located in Millard County for a sewer improvement project.

Fayette Town located in Sanpete County for water system upgrade, meters and monitors.

Marysvale Town located in Piute County for installation of water meters.

A more detailed definition of these projects along with the needs that are being addressed follows. The reason why these projects were chosen and prioritized is also discussed.

SCAOG Administration – The SCAOG Planning Department receives a set-aside for administration of the CDBG program in the Six County region. These funds are prioritized because of administrative requirements necessary to obtain CDBG funding. These include but are not limited to: 1) Developing and publishing the Six County Consolidated Plan; 2) Providing technical assistance to counties, communities, and other project applicants in qualifying for CDBG funding through application preparation, submission, and other support.

SCAOG Housing Rehab - For the upcoming year funding for housing rehabilitation within the Six County region surfaces as the top priority. This is largely due to the large waiting list of low income applicants seeking housing rehabilitation through the SCAOG's Weatherization Program. Recent funding cuts have increased the need for supplemental funding to help meet this demand. As a result a set-aside for CDBG funds was approved by the Six County Rating and Ranking Board. This project is being prioritized because of its provision for providing adequate affordable housing to the Region's low income population.

Nephi City – Nephi City has identified a need within their community for housing rehabilitation. They realized that many of these units needing rehabilitation belong to those who are categorized as low and moderate income or extremely low income. Knowing they cannot provide assistance to everyone at one time, they have chosen to provide assistance to a few each year. They have attended the CDBG How to Apply Workshop and qualified themselves in all ways to obtain resources through the CDBG program. Through their effort they are meeting their goal and objective to enhance the lives of those in Nephi City and Juab County by providing affordable and adequate housing for their citizens. This project is being prioritized because of its focus on affordable housing.

Hinckley Town – This project is being targeted because of the problematic and insufficient capacity of the Town's current sewer system. This improvement will benefit the town comprising well over 51% low income individuals. They have attended the CDGB How to Apply Workshop, completed an income survey, and qualified themselves in all aspects of eligibility for CDBG funding. This project is being prioritized because of health and safety concerns brought about by an insufficient sewer system.

Fayette Town – The focus of this project is upgrading the town's water system, installing meters and Monitors. Along with providing more reliable culinary water delivery, this project will provide the Town with greater accuracy and efficiency in monitoring and invoicing for culinary water services. They have attended the CDGB How to Apply Workshop, completed an income survey, and qualified themselves in all aspects of eligibility for CDBG funding. This project is will benefit the Town's over 51% low income residents by providing a more accurate delivery and cost for culinary water. The project is being prioritized because of the savings, efficiency, and accuracy the water system upgrade will provide to the citizens of Fayette Town.

Marysvale Town - This project will provide the Town with a greater efficiency and effectiveness in monitoring and providing culinary water service. The project includes installing new culinary water Meters. The existing old meters are antiquated, outdated, and costly to maintain. The new system will be less expensive to maintain and provide a cost savings to the community. They have attended the CDGB How to Apply Workshop, completed an income

survey, and qualified themselves in all aspects of eligibility for CDBG funding. The reason for targeting and prioritizing this project is to acquire a more accurate and cheaper method of calculating water use among residents which is over 51% low income.

Discussion - According to the 2012 Census Annual Estimates of the Resident Population, approximately 75,861 people live in the Region. From 2010 to 2011 Sanpete, .9%; Juab, .7%; Millard .6%; Sevier, .3% had a slight increase in population. Piute, -.8% and Wayne, -1.6% saw a decrease in population. The unemployment of the Region is higher 7%, then the State 5.4% and slightly less the nation average of 7.9% as of January 2013. A low median family income is a major concern in the Six County area. The average median income for the Region is \$52,242 as compared to the State at \$65,646 and U.S. at \$64,293. This equates to 84% of the State and only 72% of the U.S.

From the community assessment it is evident that communities in the Six County region are in need of assistance for a variety of infrastructure and services. Unfortunately, resources are scarce and insufficient to support all needs. It is therefore imperative that available resources be utilized as effectively and efficiently as possible. In order for this to take place communities and counties must do those things required for eligibility for CDBG and other funding resources. It is surprising how many entities do not attend the CDBG How to Apply Workshop.

Expected Resources

SCAOG - Annual allocation of resources to support programs administered by the SCAOG total over four million dollars. These include federal, state, and local dollars. These funds are utilized to enhance the quality of life among the citizens of the Six County region. However, for purposes related to the Consolidated Plan, approximately \$1.7 million is directly associated with support services for the low income. Funding from state and federal sources is very specific in purpose. As it relates to the goals and objectives of the CDBG program, the following provide services that benefit the low and moderate income as it relates to affordable housing, community development and other viable services. These include programs for HEAT assistance, rental assistance, home weatherization and rehabilitation, and CDBG.

SCAOG Community Assistance – Received just over \$500,000 last year for critical needs, rental assistance, heat assistance, home repairs, and like programs.

SCAOG Housing Services – Received over \$1,000,000 for weatherization, CROWN home program, Self Help Program, HOME and CDBG rehabilitation. Note – HOME and CDBG provided close to \$150,000 for home rehabilitation.

SCAOG Planning - Received \$50,000 for CDBG administration.

State CDBG Allocation to the Six County Region – \$517,809 was allocated to the Six County region for CDBG projects. \$50,000 was utilized for administration. \$100,000 was set-a-side for housing rehabilitation by the SCAOG Housing Services department. This leaves \$367,809 for other projects. For purpose of the CDBG Program, the following applies:

Marysvale Town will receive \$77,800 from CDBG with a 4,000 match from the town. Fayette Town will receive a \$146,850 from CDBG and \$18,000 from the town. Hinckley Town will receive \$98,000 from CDBG but will provide no match. Nephi City will receive \$45,159 from CDBG and provide 10,000 from the city. This equates to \$367,809 allocated from CDBG with a match of \$32,000 provided by the cities and towns.

Additionally the SCAOG Housing Services program will provide an in-kind match providing pre qualified applicants, staff knowledge and skills, equipment, oversight, etc. It is difficult to put a dollar figure to this soft injection but at least \$10,000 would be a fair amount.

Discussion – Nearly all of the SCAOG programs help support the low and moderate income. However, the aging department, economic development, and much of planning do not require recipients to be low and moderate in nature. Through a regional collaborative process coordination with nearly every faction of citizen makeup is accomplished. This is possible because of the variety of funding allocations received from the local, state, and federal government.

Method of Distribution

- A. **Policies** - The following policies have been established by the SCAOG Executive Board - who also serves as the CDBG Rating and Ranking Committee - to govern the CDBG application award process. All eligible applications will be accepted for rating and ranking.
1. The Six County Association of Governments approved no less than \$50,000 and not to exceed 15% of the total allocation for administration of the Six County CDBG program, to be subtracted from the Six County total. The remaining amount is allocated on a competitive basis. Based on submitted application. To encourage multiple projects and local match, no project will receive more than 50% of the net allocation. Depending on funding the Six County RRC reserves the right to eliminate the 50% rule by a vote of the board.
 2. In compliance with the policies of the State of Utah CDBG program, and to be eligible for funding consideration, all grantees or sub-grantees must have drawn down 50% of any prior

year's CDBG funding prior to the Regional Review Committee's (RRC) rating and ranking session.

3. 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. A project is not mature if funding cannot be committed by the time of the application.
4. State policy has established the minimum amount of funding of \$30,000 per project and the maximum amount is limited only by the annual allocation amount, and the Six County CDBG policies out line in paragraph 1 (one).
5. Projects must be consistent with the Region's Consolidated Plan. The project applied for must be included in the prioritized capital improvements list that the entity submitted for inclusion in the Consolidated Plan. Sponsored projects on behalf of an eligible sub-recipient may not necessarily be listed in the jurisdictions capital investment plan, but the sub-recipient's project must meet goals identified in the Region's Consolidated Plan.
6. Attendance at one of the annual How to Apply workshops is mandatory of all applicants and sub-grantees. The project manager and an elected official from the applicant's jurisdiction should be in attendance. Newly elected officials and project managers are especially encouraged to attend since the administrative requirements and commitments of a CDBG project are considerable.
7. Public service providers, traditionally non-profit organizations, are allowed to apply for CDBG funds for capital improvement 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 % of the state's yearly allocation of funds may be expended for public service activities.
8. Emergency projects may be considered by the RRC at any time. Projects applying for emergency funding must still meet a national objective and regional goals and policies. Projects may be considered as an emergency application if:
 - Funding through the normal application timeframe will create an unreasonable risk to health or property.
 - An appropriate third party agency has documented a specific risk (or risks) that, in their opinion, need immediate remediation.
 - Cost overruns from a previously funded project may be funded only if the RRC deems it an appropriate emergency.

The amount of any emergency funds distributed during the year will be subtracted from the top of the regional allocation during the next funding cycle. Additional information on the emergency fund program is available in the Application Policies and Procedures manual developed annually by the state in Chapter II, Funding Processes.

9. 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/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 (after funds have been committed to the project).
 10. Multi-year projects will be considered. Proposals must contain specific cost estimates and work elements by year so that annual allocations by the RRC can be determined at the outset.
 11. Project maturity will be considered in determining the awarding of funds for the funding cycle, i.e., project can be completed within eighteen months, leveraged funds are in place, detailed scope of work is developed, engineer's cost estimates in place, etc.
 12. The application must be submitted by 5:00 PM Friday, February 1, 2013. Any applications received after this date and time will not be considered for funding.
 13. Applicants with a population of 2,500 or less will receive double the points in the Local funds category.
 14. In the event of a tie the following policies will be followed
 - The project has been listed as a Distressed Community
 - The project that has the Highest percentage of LMI
 - The project with the most Local funds leveraged
 - The project with the most Other leverage funds
 - The Project with the most points in the Overall Impact category
 - If the tie remains unbroken after the above mentioned tie breakers the Members of the RRC will vote and the project that receives the majority vote will be Ranked Higher.
 15. The Six County RRC board has establish a RRC sub-committee; the SCAOG State CDBG representative being the Chair of the RRC sub-committee. The RRC sub-committee along with SCAOG CDBG manager will be responsible for the annual review of the Rating and Ranking criteria and make recommendation to the SCAOG Executive Board.
- B. **Regional Review Committee (RRC)** – The RRC is made up one commissioner and one mayor from each county. To accommodate travel, the RRC is the same local officials as the SCAOG Executive Board. The SCAOG Executive Board Chair also serves as the RRC chair. The following table identifies members of the SCAOG Regional RRC.

Commissioner Chad Winn (Chair)	Juab County
Mayor Russell Mangelson	Juab County, Levan
Commissioner Alan Roper	Millard County
Mayor Gayle Bunker	Millard County, Delta
Commissioner Rick Blackwell*	Piute County
Mayor Rick Dalton	Piute County, Junction
Commissioner Claudia Jarrett	Sanpete County
Mayor John Christensen	Sanpete County, Mayfield
Commissioner Gordon Topham	Sevier County
Mayor David Ogden	Sevier County, Richfield
Commissioner Robert Williams	Wayne County
Mayor Adus Dorsey*	Wayne County, Torrey



RRC sub-committee member

- C. **SCAOG Rating and Ranking Criteria Sheet** – On the following page is the rating and ranking criteria sheet used in prioritizing and awarding CDBG funds allocated to the Six County region. Criteria are reviewed annually and changes made by the RRC as required or are necessary. There are no expected changes in the upcoming year’s rating and ranking criteria.

Applicant:	Score Requested	CDBG \$'s	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	
1 Capacity to Carry Out The Grant: Applicant's capacity to administer grant; project manager completed in contract period (1 point); compliance with regulations/laws (2 points); (First time grantee: default is 2.5 points) Possible 5 points	Excellent 5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	0 points		
2 Job Creation: Estimated number of permanent new jobs project will create or number of jobs retained that would be lost without this project	>25 jobs 8 points	15-24 Jobs 6 points	10-14 Jobs 4 points	1-9 Jobs 2 points			
3 LMI Housing Stock: Number of units constructed, rehabilitated, or made accessible to LMI residents	>10 units 10 points	5-10 Units 9 points	1-5 Units 8 points				
4 Affordable Housing Plan: Has jurisdiction addressed moderate income housing in its general plan as required by HB295/SB60?	Yes 2 points	No 0 points					
4a Does this project implement moderate income housing elements identified in the affordable housing plan? (applicant is required to submit their latest plan along with documentation of how project addresses an issue identified in the plan)	Yes 2 points	No 0 points					
5 Extent of Poverty: Percent of persons considered LMI benefiting from project. (According to the Census/Surey)	>80% 4 points	71%-80% 3 points	61%-70% 2 points	56%-60% 1 point	51%-59% 0 points		
6 Local Funds: Percentage of the total project that the city/county is contributing?	>50% 5 points	31%-49% 4 points	21%-30% 3 points	11%-20% 2 points	1%-10% 1 point		
7 Leveraged Funds: Percentage of "other" non-CDBG funds invested in total project.	>50% 5 points	31%-49% 4 points	21%-30% 3 points	11%-20% 2 points	1%-10% 1 point		
8 Project Maturity: Detailed engineer's cost estimate; confirmed/designated, project manager, specific/detailed scope of work; secured funding (possible 5 points)	Architect/Engineer selected 1 point	Designated Project Manager 1 point	Well-defined Scope 1 point	Funding Applied Not Committed 1 point	Funding in Place 2 points		CD Fur 2 p
9 Overall project impact for the region? Projects will be rated on their realive impact in the community both in terms of numbers and relative need.	Project benefits a single neighborhood or a targeted population 2 points	Project benefits are community wide 4 points	Project benefits are county-wide 6 points	Project benefits are region-wide 8 points			
10 Applicant has not had any project funded in previous years	Received a grant in the last funding cycle 0 points	1 prior funding cycle 2 point	2 prior funding cycles 4 points	3 prior funding cycles 6 points	4 or more funding cycles 8 points		
11 Jurisdictions Project Priority: Project listed as distressed community in Regional Consolidated Plan. (Capital Investment Plan, Once-Year Action Plan)	Yes 5 points	No 0 points					
12 Quality Growth Principles: Has jurisdiction demonstrated their desire to improve planning using quality growth principles?	Yes 1 point	No 0 points					
13 Infrastructure Development/Improvement: i.e. expansion of basic infrastructure (water sewer) or other physical infrastructure (libraries, fire stations, parks, community center, LMI Housing etc.) to create suitable living environments for the persons in a community.	Water 6 points	Sewer/Storm Drainage 5 points	Public Health Safety 4 points	Other Public Facilities 3 points	Street Sidewalks 2 points	Re Fac Pla 1 p	
14 Jurisdictions Property Tax Rate: Communities that maintain an already high tax burden will be given higher points for this category (applicants tax rate +ceiling=percent ceiling)	>40% 5 points	31%-40% 4 points	21%-30% 3 points	11%-20% 2 points	>10% 1 point		

* Targeted population includes LMI populations and HUD-specified presumed LMI populations.

- D. **Access** - Potential applicants may access the application manuals or other materials describing the application criteria by visiting the Six County Association of Governments offices located at 250 North Main, Richfield, Utah, Suite B-08. They may also go to the SCAOG web site: www.sixcountyplanning.com. From this site there are links to State of Utah CDBG website and web-grant. There is also a “low-moderate-income” (LMI) calculator applicants can use to help determine project survey requirements. For general information about the CDBG Program and application criteria contact SCAOG staff at (435) 893-0711.
- E. **Outreach** – A formal letter outlining the CDBG process is sent to each county commission and each mayor. Additionally, collaboration between SCAOG departments takes place which encourages outreach to various groups and organizations that may utilize CDBG resources. This letter also explains CDBG eligibility criteria and encourages participation in the How to Apply Workshops. Outreach is also provided by word of mouth from partnership associates working with local communities such as SBDC, Snow College, USU Extension, Technical Committee, and others.
- F. **Process** – The process that an applicant must go through to be successful in receiving CDBG funding is explained in detail at the How to Apply Workshop. This is a mandated training with two sessions offered at different times. If there are scheduling conflicts potential applicants may attend this workshop in another region. In addition SCAOG staff is available to discuss in detail the CDBG program, criteria, and application requirements.

In summary, through an outreach effort communities are notified of CDBG funding availability. Potential applicants are required to attend a How to Apply Workshop. They must then select a qualified project (explained in the workshop), make sure project benefits 51% low and moderate income (requires a survey in most cases), complete application, have a public hearing, and submit application utilizing web-grants. The project is then rated and ranked by the RRC. Projects are then prioritized for funding and awarded based on available resources. Both successful and non-successful applicants are notified as to the results. Successful applicants then work with a State CDBG representative to work through project logistics and funding.

Affordable Housing

- A. **Actions planned to address needs of public housing in the Six County region** – To determine the need for affordable housing in the Six County area the Consolidated Plan addresses housing needs as they relate to multi-family, public, and single-family.

Multi-family Housing – Even though local officials have not identified the need for multi-family housing as a priority, the data contained in the chart titled “Multi-family Rental Housing” clearly identifies a need for more apartments and rental units. As the “Multi-family Rental Housing” chart reveals, there is a shortage of multi-family housing. There are 54 currently waiting for an apartment in the Six County region. Adding to the issue of shortage is the fact that many apartment and housing rentals are poorly maintained and substandard. There is also a need for subsidized housing. To put this into perspective, in the area the average monthly fair market rent for a two-bedroom apartment is \$620. In order for a family to afford this rent and utilities, without paying more than 30 percent of income on housing, a family would require an annual income of \$24,800 which translates to \$11.93 per hour. The current area average hourly wage is only \$7.25 per hour. The charts below visually compare the federal housing expense guidelines with the average expenses for housing in the Six County area.

In conclusion, there is a need for additional multi-family housing in the area. This need includes providing subsidies to those with average incomes which would enable them to find an affordable, decent, and safe place to live.

Action - The Region has been and continues to look for feasible and effective multi-family housing projects that could be successful in the Six County region. Most communities do not have the infrastructure to support this type of project. The Region will work with larger cities to establish multi-family projects as opportunities arise.

Public Housing – The need for transitional housing and shelters was not assessed as a critical need. After consulting with New Horizon Crisis Center in Richfield, there were 127 individuals cycled through the shelter in 2007. All of these required some sort of transitional housing. Only four transitional housing units are currently available in the area. As a result, the Region has assessed a need for additional transitional housing units. New Horizon Crisis Center has proposed the development of more units but needs the assistance and partnership of the SCAOG. To accomplish this partnership a regional housing authority is necessary.

Action - A housing authority has been established and there is an effort to assist with the development of more transitional housing. This is a crucial need and objective for the upcoming year. Through the SCAOG’s Community Assistance Program individuals are worked with through incentives to acquire, maintain.

Single Family Housing – The long term need for affordable housing is to increase the median family and per capita income of the area. The average median family income over the entire Central Utah region is \$3,260 per month. Following Federal guidelines for affordable housing a person should only spend thirty percent of their income towards housing. This equates to \$978 per month. The average mortgage payment in the Six County area is approximately \$1,594 with utilities, insurance, and taxes. This equates to roughly forty nine percent of wages being spent for housing in the Six County area. From this evaluation the greatest need for single family housing in the region is affordable housing for individuals with wages between LMI and sufficient incomes for home purchase through traditional financing; and, those meeting LMI standards but have poor credit, high debt to income ratios, and felony history. The Region's income levels are listed on the following page.

Action - Programs such as CROWN, Self Help and Down Payment Assistance currently have funds to help meet demands for this type of housing. Resources for HOME and CDBG Rehab are in place to help meet demands throughout the next year. The weatherization program has a continual waiting list of approximately 100 homes with one and a half to two years waiting period. Work with agencies to adjust income guidelines so more could qualify for programs such as CROWN and Self Help. Through the economic development component of the region, local officials continue to foster business and industrial growth that provide a sustainable wage.

- B. **Lead based paint** – This program provides resources to train and certify technicians in identifying and eliminating the hazards of lead based paint utilizing high tech equipment which is also provided. Currently the SCAOG does not provide fee for service in this area but does test each home serviced through weatherization and home rehab.

Staff of the SCAOG will test client homes for Lead that was constructed prior to 1978. If Lead Based Paint is found in a home or on a surface that will be disturbed, then lead safe work practices must be used by anyone certified to do the work. A pamphlet titled Protect Your Family From Lead in Your Home is handed out to any pre- 1978 home no matter if Lead is found or not. The certified staff from the SCAOG does not make these services available to the public due to time constraints in doing complete inspections.

Action – Until more resources are made available along with addressing liability issues of those providing the service, the opportunity for the Region to actively participate is limited. The Region will work with other AOG's and the State to better address this issue in the upcoming year.

- C. **Coordination** – The SCAOG will continue to work with religious organization by attending the Monthly Interfaith Council to ascertain housing needs. The SCAOG Community Assistance Department will likewise work with public and private entities to coordinate critical needs of citizens within the Six County area. The SCAOG Housing Services Department will coordinate and outreach to the public and provide affordable housing opportunities to qualified individuals. The SCAOG Planning Department will discuss housing needs with communities during their annual visit and assessment.

Barriers to Affordable Housing

Barriers to affordable housing identified - When conducting assessments with communities and counties the topic of affordable housing does not receive a high priority. Common excuses are: “all who want a house in the area has one” or, “there is no lots available in the community”, and the biggest question “what can we do about it anyway”?

Through these assessments and through collaboration of the SCAOG Programs and services the above issues are real. However, the biggest barrier to affordable housing in the Six County area is the lack of higher paying jobs that provide a sustainable living wage. Throughout the Consolidated Plan this concern is mentioned numerous times. However, other issues also limit affordable opportunities. The following chart identifies these barriers and describes strategies that can help remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing.

Discussion – As the Region collaboratively works with counties and communities they are able to rectify affordable housing issues. A good example is the project in Hanksville that helped provide single family housing to their seasonal workers. Larger communities that serve as geographical service centers are much more apt to face these challenges. Most of these are amenable to developing affordable housing but face the difficult task of securing sufficient funding.



Affordable Housing Barriers and Strategies	
Barriers	Strategies
Low Median Income	Develop business and industry that provides family sustaining employment. Support county economic development offices and professional staff.
Affordable Land	Use CDBG money to assist with the purchase of land that can be used for single family housing projects. Partner with local communities asking for flexibility on impact fees for low income housing.
Building Material Prices	Partner with a Home Center to receive discounts for low income families based upon the volume of business that low income families along with our other housing programs will bring to their business.
Income Guidelines	Work with State agencies to demonstrate the income guidelines are too low. People with income slightly above the income guidelines still cannot afford housing and need assistance.
Insufficient Subsidized Housing	Partner with another agency in building a Multi-family Housing unit in our more densely populated areas that will provide subsidized housing units.
Land availability	Local governments should plan ahead and budget for growth and diminishing resources. Local governments could seek low-interest loans and/or grants to reduce development costs.
Training/Knowledge	Provide Home Buyer education course to assist and teach potential home owners how to budget and prepare them to financially survive home ownership.

Other – The Region will continue to work with programs that foster life style education and promote long term sustainability of housing development. Six County will work with local officials, State and Federal agencies to further recognize barriers to affordable housing, and identify strategies that will be applied to the barriers in the Region. Six County staff will make resources available to cities and towns in the Region to update affordable housing plans that will assist the communities in identifying impediments and barriers to affordable housing.

Attachments and References

