

**Bear River Association  
of Governments  
2019 CDBG Annual  
Action Plan**



---

**For July 1 2019 - June 30 2020**

**Prepared by: Brian Carver, Community & Economic Development  
Director**

**Organization Name: Bear River Association of Governments**

**Address: 170 North Main, Logan, Utah 84321**

**Phone: (435) 752-7242**

**Fax: (435) 752-6962**

**Email: [brianc@brag.utah.gov](mailto:brianc@brag.utah.gov)**

**Contents**

Executive Summary (AP-05)..... 3

- Community Development..... 3
- Natural Resource Management..... 4
- Economic Development..... 5

Outreach ..... 6

- Consultation ..... 6
- Citizen Participation ..... 7

Expected Resources (AP-15) ..... 7

- CDBG ..... 8
- HUD Section 8 ..... 8
- Single Family Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Program..... 9
- Olene Walker Housing Loan..... 9
- Pamela Atkinson Homeless Housing Fund..... 10
- First-Time Home Buyer Voucher..... 10
- HUD Continuum of Care Program..... 11
- Federal Program Assistance..... 11
- HUD Program Assistance ..... 12

Goals & Objectives (AP-20) ..... 13

Affordable Housing (AP-55) ..... 13

Allocation priorities (AP-25)..... 14

- Geographic Distribution..... 15
- Method of Distribution ..... 15

Public Housing (AP-60)..... 16

Barriers to Affordable Housing (AP-75) ..... 16

Other Actions (AP-85) ..... 19

- Lead Based Paint ..... 19

## **Executive Summary (AP-05)**

BRAG, which also staffs both the Logan City Housing Authority and the Bear River Regional Housing Authority, is constantly evaluating local housing needs. The current economic conditions in the region have greatly increased needs for moderate income housing, as market value and demand for housing of any kind is beginning to increase. BRAG works closely with local governments to provide current estimates of housing affordable to Moderate Income Households (earning less than 80% of the County Median Income), Low Income Households (earning less than 50% of the County Median Income), and Very Low Income Households (earning less than 30% of the County Median Income) and develop objectives for each community to address any identified needs in housing affordability and availability.

There is also persistent demand for transitional housing for persons with mental health disabilities in Box Elder County and victims of domestic abuse throughout the region. In 2016, BRAG, Neighborhood Nonprofit Housing Corporation, and Bear River Mental Health negotiated the transfer of ownership for the Bear River Commons apartment complex to BRAG. This complex provides housing to low-income individuals, primarily those receiving mental health services. Box Elder and Cache Counties have also identified a moderate need for transitional housing for persons recently discharged from local correctional facilities. While efforts to implement a project to address this need are ongoing, challenges organizing the staff and addressing liability concerns remain. Similarly, public sentiment is growing for the provision of a local full-time homeless shelter. While funds are available to create such a facility, the persistent low numbers of chronic homeless make it difficult to justify the investment of State and Federal agencies to provide staffing and counselling services.

BRAG is engaging Logan City and other regional stakeholders to develop a new plan to address Homelessness issues, including chronic homelessness, transitional homelessness, and incidents related to correctional discharge. This plan will be complete in late 2019.

## **Community Development**

BRAG staff routinely assesses local community infrastructure needs through routine visits with member communities, surveys and the Regional Capital Improvements Projects List. These needs are felt most acutely in remote rural regions and small communities where funding for community-wide projects is limited.

Common needs include access to critical community infrastructure such as Emergency Response and Public Safety and adequate water and wastewater facilities. To reflect these needs, the regional Community Investment Council has attempted to prioritize basic public infrastructure and emergency service projects in the CDBG Rating & Ranking process. The 2018 award cycle was able to fund real property acquisition for an affordable housing project, infrastructure to serve an affordable housing project, improvements to an emergency abuse

prevention shelter and educational center - an activity that the regional investment council views to be related to emergency services and public safety, and equipment for a community health center. The 2019 award cycle is focused again on rural community infrastructure including water and storm water systems.

There is also a lack of capacity to provide long-term community land use and facilities planning. Without full- or even part-time staff to address long-range planning, most communities in the region are reactive to growth and provide only minimal required services to landowners and developers. Technical planning for infrastructure and specialized needs such as moderate income housing is often deferred or performed only when outside funds are accessed to hire consultants. Through 2018, BRAG has provided planning and development technical assistance including planning for access to moderate income housing for local communities utilizing State of Utah Permanent Community Impact Fund Board (CIB) funds, and provides other specialized planning technical assistance through sources such as the U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration (EDA); U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Administration; and State of Utah, Governor's Office of Economic Development.

Planning to address infrastructure and programs to provide transportation services to special needs populations such as Persons with Disabilities, the Elderly, and Low-Income Households has become a regional focus. BRAG currently provides "Mobility Management" planning and coordination services in cooperation with the State of Utah Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration. Mobility Management has the potential to significantly impact the sustainability and livability of disabled, elderly, and frail elderly in the region. By providing extra transportation options, particularly for high-priority medical care, clients are able to reside in their own homes longer and more comfortably, reducing stress on the health care system and increasing quality of life.

### **Natural Resource Management**

Pre-Disaster Hazard Mitigation planning to identify capital infrastructure projects communities can implement to lessen damage in the event of a natural disaster has been conducted for the Region with an anticipated completion date of early 2020. Communities in the region are now being contacted to evaluate potential natural hazard risks and to develop mitigation methods that would be eligible to receive federal hazard mitigation funds. Funding for this plan is provided by the Utah State Department of Homeland Security and the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

High-speed Internet, or Broadband Internet service is rapidly becoming a necessity in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century for education, public safety, economic development, and communication. BRAG completed a Regional Broadband Access Strategy to evaluate gaps in telecommunication

infrastructure and identify opportunities to expand services and take advantage of existing capacity. Equal access to education, health care, and economic opportunity through access to the information and services available via the Internet are critical components to improving the quality of life in low-income and rural communities.

An Interoperable Emergency Communications Plan was completed in late 2010 for the Region as an effort to coordinate communications efforts between jurisdictions, agencies, and volunteer groups in the event of an emergency. This plan was completed using funding from the U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security.

### **Economic Development**

Economic development assistance in form of loans and micro-loans has been reduced over recent years, but BRAG has increased access to technical assistance and training throughout the region. Prior to 2009, BRAG received regular CDBG assistance to provide loans to local businesses. These funds were then awarded to the Bear River Community Services Foundation, a non-profit program to provide select services to communities and individuals in the Bear River Region of northern Utah. In 2009, approximately \$14,000 of funds programed for micro-loan assistance to entrepreneurs and small businesses was awarded to the Utah Micro-Enterprise Loan Fund, a non-profit economic development fund in Salt Lake City, with the understanding that the funds would be managed to provide economic opportunities for businesses in the Bear River Region.

BRAG also partners with the EDA to provide regional economic development strategic planning and coordination, focusing particularly on growth in non-urban areas. A new regional 5-year strategy was adopted in June of 2018. This plan includes workforce and language training for immigrant and refugee populations, coordinated planning and development of infrastructure for the steady growth the region is experiencing including transportation, and coordinated services to emerging and existing businesses to help decrease local business failures and increase sustainability and prosperity. In 2011, BRAG assisted in establishing a business outreach program – the Business Expansion And Retention (BEAR) program – in Box Elder and Cache Counties to better coordinate the distribution of public economic development and entrepreneurship assistance to the private sector. The BEAR program frequently refers rural business owners and prospective entrepreneurs to economic development assistance available through the regional Business Resource Center, Small Business Development Center at Utah State University, and the State of Utah Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget

## Outreach

### Consultation

As part of this Consolidated Planning process BRAG has sought to collect information from as many outside sources as possible. This public input process is an attempt to synthesize public opinion about the adequacy of support and funding of BRAG's services and products within the Bear River District. In this effort, BRAG holds multiple public meetings each year. Information was collected from individuals and representatives of all three counties of the Region.

BRAG holds regular consultations with staff at Logan City to exchange demographic data and coordinate on projects occurring within either jurisdiction that may potentially benefit residents of both the Entitlement Area and the balance of the Bear River Region. Transitional housing has been identified in Logan City's 5-year Consolidated Plan as a significant need in Logan City's Entitlement Area and the region.

In Calendar Year 2018, BRAG has worked regularly with the English Language Learning Center in Logan and the Northern Utah Hispanic Health Coalition to promote BRAG services including access to CDBG, Weatherization, LIHEAP assistance, and Aging Services to populations where English is not the primary language spoken at home. Additionally, BRAG was involved in the establishment of the Cache Refugee and Immigration Connection, a support organization designed to promote the economic self-sufficiency and integration of immigrants and refugees through improved access to services and education. Through 2018, additional outreach and public comment will be gathered from Latino and other non-English-speaking communities in the Region, particularly Southeast Asian refugees relocating to Cache County.

Participants in the regular BRAG Human Services Board meeting expressed concern over regional housing quality. It was recommended that incentives should be prioritized to assist in rehabilitation of rental properties, especially single-family homes.

In late January of 2019, the Bear River Homeless Coordinating Council conducted its annual point-in-time homeless count. Total counts from that activity will be available by the time this document is finalized in March of 2019. In 2018, total of 13 homeless individuals were officially identified, however a significant number of individuals refused to be counted. 32 families were sheltered using local Continuum of Care funds.

Throughout 2018, BRAG collected feedback from local governments regarding economic development issues as part of the regional Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy produced in partnership with the U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Economic Development Administration. Housing affordable to the region's workforce is a critical need consistently identified by many participants.

### Citizen Participation

BRAG, as the Regional Housing Authority, conducts annual public input meetings with their Resident Advisory Committees. These meetings were held February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017 in Logan, Utah. Feedback on existing program priorities was collected, as well as comments on a new proposal to provide homeownership mortgage payment assistance to Housing Choice Voucher clients. The issue of prioritization of full-time university and technical school students in the Housing Choice Voucher Program was discussed. The majority of those in attendance favored that prioritization method. Additionally, the issue of transference of credits from the Bear River Regional Housing Authority to another housing authority in the U.S. was criticized. Local residents felt that priority should be given to existing residents with long-term commitment to stay in the area and contribute to the local communities over residents looking to earn the Housing Choice Voucher and then relocate to a different part of the country. Finally, a brief survey of issues regarding Fair Housing was conducted. Of those in attendance, the anecdotal instances of housing discrimination were directed at persons of limited English proficiency and single parents with children. The Committee members were directed to contact the Housing Authority if they felt discriminated against or knew of instances of discrimination.

BRAG will conduct a public hearing on March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2019 to solicit comments on the Community Development Block Grant program.

A second public hearing will be held March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2019 to collect public input regarding Community Development Block Grant projects identified for funding.

A public comment period on the draft 2019 Annual Action Plan Update to the 2015 Consolidated Plan was held from February 1<sup>st</sup> through March 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2019 and a public hearing was held on March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2019. No public comments were received. Notice of the public comment period will be included in Appendix A. The public comment period was noticed on the Utah Public Notice website and copies of the draft Consolidated Plan Annual Action Plan Update was made available on the BRAG website.

### Expected Resources (AP-15)

Annual Allocation	\$680,000
Program Income	\$0
Prior Years Resources	\$0
Total	\$680,000

## **Program by program Summary for all HUD Programs**

**CDBG:** Each year BRAG staff, Investment Strategy Council (Rating and Ranking Committee), and Governing Board review BRAG's rating and ranking criteria to assure consistency with BRAG Consolidated Plan, State and HUD requirements. The ranking system for 2019 CDBG Program year provides the highest number of points for those projects that benefit the highest numbers of moderate, low, and very low income persons; that implement quality growth principles; that provide decent, safe and affordable housing, create suitable living environments, or create economic opportunities; that result in the greatest regional impact; that have been well planned; that demonstrate project maturity and collaboration, and that leverage the most funds.

**HUD Section 8:** The Bear River Housing Authority has adopted the following system for determining an applicant's place on the waiting list for subsidized rent.

Priority Level 1: Applicants who are in an emergency crisis situation for which affordable housing is an important component will be offered assistance on a first come first serve basis. Emergency crisis is defined to be an emotionally significant event or a radical change of status in a person's life which causes a danger to the health or safety of the family, causing one's attention and energy to be focused on this crisis alone. Financial stress does not qualify as an emergency crisis situation.

Priority Level 2: Applicants who are either achievement directed (FAST) or daily challenged (DC) for which affordable housing is an important component will be offered assistance on a first come first serve basis only after assistance has been offered to all priority level 1 families. An achievement directed family is one that demonstrates a minimum level of self-directed activity. A daily challenged family is one whose daily problems are using all of their time and energy and are therefore unable to focus on anything else. Their ability to become success or achievement oriented is delayed until resolution of that challenge has been made. Applicants who are disabled and or elderly will qualify as daily challenged.

Priority Level 3: Applicants who are neither in a crisis situation, achievement directed, or daily challenged will be offered assistance on a first come first serve basis only after assistance has been offered to all priority level 1 and priority level 2 families.

Priority Level 4: Applicants who are a single family member and are not handicap, disabled or elderly, regardless of whether they are in an emergency crisis situation or achievement directed, will be offered assistance on a first come first serve basis only after assistance has been offered to all priority level 1, priority level 2, and priority level 3 families.

## Single Family Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Program

The Single Family Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Program supports a partnership between the Utah Division of Housing and Community Development and local entities to provide low-interest loans for home repairs to low-income households for existing owner occupied single-family units. The priorities of this program are to:

- Keep the existing housing stock viable for approximately 30 years.
- Encourage neighborhood improvement through successful rehabilitation projects
- Address the high proportion of housing that is deteriorated and needs rehabilitation
- Stabilize the housing stock and to address “street presence” of the neighborhood
- Provide assistance to low-income families, elderly and disabled homeowners in order to achieve safe, decent affordable housing and accessible environment.

This program is also funded by Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund (OWHLF) which receives funding from HUD and the State legislature. This program is administered by the OWHLF Board who approves projects and policies for administration that meet HUD’s priorities and is targeted to rural areas that are underserved.

## Olene Walker Housing Loan

Fund [http://community.utah.gov/housing\\_and\\_community\\_development/OWHLF/programs.html](http://community.utah.gov/housing_and_community_development/OWHLF/programs.html)

*Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund* was established to support quality affordable housing options that meet the needs of Utah's individuals and families, while maximizing all resources. Utahns served by the fund include those with low-incomes, first-time home buyers, residents with special needs such as the elderly, developmentally disabled, physically disabled, victims of abuse, and Native Americans. Money from the fund is generally loaned to first time homebuyers, builders, and developers. This is a revolving loan fund. Payments made on these loans are returned to the fund allowing it to be used again for future projects. The fund is also supported by a leveraging ratio of \$11 from federal and other sources for each dollar contributed by the state and supports the following programs:

**Multi-Family Program** - The Multi-family program provides financial assistance for the acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of affordable rental housing of five or more units.

**Single-Family Programs** - The Single-family programs offers financial assistance to low-income residents or families in need of rehabilitation, replacement, or weatherization of an existing owner-occupied home. Although the program targets rural communities, projects for rural areas can be submitted to the OWHLF Board for consideration using the application.

**Home Ownership Self-Help Development** - The Owner-Occupied Development program, also known as the Self Help Program, provides financial assistance to developments of single-family

subdivisions and infill projects designed to provide housing to low-income individuals and families.

Home Choice - The Home Choice program is designed to provide financial assistance and mortgage assistance for low-income persons with disabilities.

Down Payment Assistance/American Dream - The American Dream Down Payment Assistance program helps low-income, first time home buyers (as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development) purchase homes by providing down payment or closing-cost assistance in the form of interest-free loans.

Pre-Development Program - The Pre-Development program provides non-recourse loans for project development preceding permanent/construction financing of affordable rental and homeownership projects.

- \* Pre-Development Application
- \* Pre-Development Instructions for Application
- \* Allocation Plan
- \* Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA)

### **Pamela Atkinson Homeless Housing Fund**

The Pamela Atkinson Homeless Trust Fund (PAHTF), formerly known as the Homeless Trust Fund, has been administered by the Department of Community and Culture since 1983. Funded by the Utah State Legislature and by contributions made by individuals on their Utah Individual Income Tax Form TC-40, this money goes to fund various agencies statewide in moving people from homelessness to self-sufficiency. Funding from the PAHTF is a critical component in [Utah's Ten-Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness] ([link](#)).

Eligible activities for funding under the PAHTF include: emergency shelter operations, meals, transitional housing, case management services, homeless outreach and day centers. Agencies providing these services are encouraged to apply for funding. The application period for funding runs during the months of January and February. Awards are made by the [State Homeless Coordinating Committee] ([link](#)) in May with funding available during the State Fiscal Year (July – June). Typical awards amounts range from \$10,000 - \$30,000.

### **First-Time Home Buyer Voucher**

BRAG now provides two grants each year to first-time home buyers. As in the loan program, these grants may be used towards the closing costs and down payment associated with purchasing a home, but do not require repayment of the assistance once the house is sold.

Participants in the First-Time Home Buyer program also are eligible to receive extra funds upon completion of a Home Ownership and Financial Planning class offered at the Utah State University Family Life Center in Logan, Utah.

### **HUD Continuum of Care Program**

This program requires a match (which has been matched with the Pamela Atkinson fund) to provide transitional housing assistance to victims of domestic violence. Acquired funds are only enough to serve 20 families per year. Where approximately 60 families are in need (based on agency input) the method of distribution allows for funds to be spent only on those victims that have third party documentation of physical abuse and are referred by CAPSA, a local abuse prevention and counselling service provider.

The HUD Continuum of Care Program is also used to pay for bus tickets to Ogden for those persons whom are considered chronic homeless or street homeless (being homeless 30 consecutive days or more than 3 times per year). This is because there are so few people (less than six per year) requiring this service in Box Elder, Cache, and Rich counties, that it is more cost-effective to help these people access existing near-by services, rather than to create new programs and facilities in our area. This creates difficulties with families or individuals that do now wish to leave education, employment or family situations in the region.

### *Private Program Assistance*

Private funding for needs identified in the Consolidated Plan includes the Bear River Human Services Foundation, a non-profit organization established to provide an additional mechanism for raising funds to assist in regional aging, housing, and business development services. Additional private partners include Zions Bank and Cache Valley Bank, funding partners for the Revolving loan fund for job creation and retention.

### *State and Local Program Assistance*

Public resources originate from both State and Federal sources. The State of Utah provides assistance through the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund of \$14,000 for short-term housing assistance while the Pamela Atkinson Homeless Prevention Fund provides \$30,000 for emergency shelter and other homeless services.

### **Federal Program Assistance**

Several federal agencies work with BRAG to provide assistance and resources. The U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development Office provides small business development grant assistance and capital funding assistance for rural community development projects.

The Economic Development Agency of the U.S. Department of Commerce provides \$66,000 annually to BRAG for the Bear River Economic Development District. These funds are used to develop the regional Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy as well as regional

economic development planning and technical assistance to small businesses. This program currently does not leverage any private money.

The U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, through the Community Services Block Grant program, provided \$250,000 for emergency food and shelter assistance.

#### **HUD Program Assistance**

BRAG receives assistance from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development through several programs. The Community Development Block Grant program provides approximately \$600,000 annually for community development projects that serve low- to moderate-income households in the region. This program frequently leverages high percentages of project money from local governments and private non-profit foundations that provide services to pre-determined low-income populations such as elderly, disabled adults, homeless, and victims of domestic violence. There are no matching requirements for this program.

BRAG has received funding through the HOME program in the past, but has replaced those program funds with assistance from the State of Utah.

The Continuum of Care program received \$48,000 to address homelessness issues and update the BRAG Homelessness Plan. This program requires a 50% match that is covered with the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund and Pamela Atkinson Homeless Fund through the State of Utah.

## Goals & Objectives (AP-20)

(Include narrative, and **do not change the goal indicators or units of measurement**) Also if including **outputs which are the result of other programs and activities then include two tables. One showing overall goals and one showing only the goals/outputs which result from CDBG funded activities.**

Goal Outcome Indicator	Quantity	Unit of Measurement
Public Facility or Infrastructure Activity other than low/moderate income housing benefit	3,500	Persons Assisted
Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for low/moderate income housing benefit	2	Households Assisted
Public service activities other than low/moderate income housing benefit	2,200	Persons Assisted
Public service activities for low/moderate income housing benefit	0	Households Assisted
Facade treatment/Business building rehabilitation	0	Businesses Assisted
Rental units constructed	0	Housing Unit
Rental units rehabilitated	5	Housing Unit
Homeowner housing added	0	Housing Unit
Homeowner housing rehabilitated	20	Housing Unit
Direct financial assistance to homebuyers	40	Households Assisted
Homelessness prevention (emergency rental assistance)	0	Persons Assisted
Businesses assisted (AOG's only)	0	Businesses Assisted
Other	0	Other

One year goals for the number of households supported through:	
Rental assistance	750
The production of new units	0
Rehab of existing units	25
Acquisition of existing units	0
Total	775

## Affordable Housing (AP-55)

BRAG staff will work with each of the 23 communities in the region required by the State of Utah to perform Moderate Income Housing Needs Assessments and create plans. The intent will be to educate local elected officials and appointed planning commission officials on the importance of housing choice and affordability to each community. Assistance will be provided to identify regulatory barriers to housing affordability and develop policies that encourage communities to allow the development market to meet affordability demands.

## **Allocation priorities (AP-25)**

Focus communities are identified using Census Bureau median area income estimates, senior population estimates, and self-assessed infrastructure needs.

The identified focus communities are located in northwestern Cache County, western Box Elder County, and Rich County. This is consistent with the fact that these communities are geographically isolated from major transportation, commercial airports, suppliers, etc. The geographical isolation of these rural areas, in conjunction with lack of infrastructure and services necessary for consistent, year-round employment creates unique needs.

Specific areas of concern are Rich County and its communities of Randolph, Garden City, Laketown, and Woodruff, and western Box Elder County communities of Snowville, Park Valley, Lynn, Yost, Grouse Creek, and Lucin.

BRAG will continue to focus HUD CDBG and other federal and state funding programs towards critical community infrastructure needs such as water, wastewater, and transportation infrastructure and safe, decent, and affordable housing. While current funding is inadequate, increased coordination and programmatic planning can help relieve the highest priority needs.

BRAG is continually working to identify Affordable Housing Need for each County and community within the region. These assessments will provide further detailed information for use in determining focus areas for appropriate resources. The most acute area of concern is currently the Bear Lake Valley portion of Rich County. Rapidly growing resort development is stressing local communities' abilities to provide adequate workforce housing for the accompanying construction and service industries. In Box Elder County, housing affordable to the manufacturing workforce is limited. As the market works to catch up with demand for median-income level housing, the low- and very low-income populations struggle to find new housing opportunities.

Aging services and housing needs are acutely felt in Box Elder and Rich Counties. With few local care center options, many seniors opt to stay in sub-standard private living quarters. BRAG will work with local senior center staff to identify potential candidates for home repair and weatherization services along with affordable alternatives to costly assisted living services. The immediate future faces significant challenges in reduced State support for home-delivered meals and nursing services.

Local infrastructure needs are regularly assessed by BRAG through individual capital improvement plans. BRAG staff will continue to work with local elected officials to identify critical infrastructure needs and match them with available funding. Staff will also engage in

direct capital facility planning to ensure that more projects are matched with funding before service delivery reaches a crisis level.

In 2019, BRAG will continue to deliver Homeless Aid throughout the region utilizing Pamela Atkinson Funds and Community Service Block Grant Funds. This aid will focus on emergency shelter grants and referrals to transitional housing opportunities.

BRAG will also focus housing rehabilitation funds on non-urban communities. Service will be provided on a case-by-case, income-qualified basis.

BRAG will assist local communities in Rich County to determine eligibility for projects that will improve critical community infrastructure and access to emergency services.

The 2019 CDBG Rating & Ranking process continues to place rural community infrastructure needs as the highest priority, though other projects are eligible and may be funded if scoring in other criteria is high enough. Other programs are funded based on income eligibility of clients on a first-come first-served basis.

### **Geographic Distribution**

Currently, BRAG has no geographically-based distribution priority for funds or services. Remote communities in southern Rich County and western Box Elder County have been identified as “distressed” in previous Consolidated Planning efforts. Funding and services are available to these communities, however extra effort must be made to include residents and leaders of these areas in outreach and service awareness. BRAG must work to provide additional support and education to encourage residents to participate in available programs and services.

### **Method of Distribution**

Application criteria, materials and assistance are available online through the BRAG website and at offices in Logan and Perry.

Potential applicants for the CDBG program are notified through direct mailing sent to local governments and non-profit service providers. Additionally, CDBG application details are discussed at regular meetings with the Northern Utah Hispanic Health Coalition, the BRAG Human Services Board, and BRAG Governing Board.

The CDBG program award process involves grantee completion of the regional Rating & Ranking materials in tandem to the State program application forms. This regional Rating & Ranking process is developed using input from the BRAG Community Investment Council, an ad-hoc committee of local government officials and representatives from non-profit service provider groups involved in housing and community service programs. Regional priorities and selection criteria are evaluated and amended annually.

Once projects have been rated and ranked, the highest-scoring projects are recommended to the State of Utah Department of Workforce Services, Division of Housing and Community Development for funding.

The 2019 Regional CDBG Rating & Ranking methodology and Thresholds & Policies are attached in Appendix D. The Bear River Region limits CDBG awards up to \$200,000 in order to encourage local investment leverage and ensure successful projects while assisting the highest possible number of communities and beneficiaries each year.

The intended outcomes of these investments are to improve suitable living environment of LMI communities and populations through critical public infrastructure investments, increased access to non-profit service providers, and expanded housing opportunity.

### **Public Housing (AP-60)**

In 2015, BRAG sold eight CROWN homes into private ownership through the Utah Housing Corporation. After having provided the single-family detached units for rent to low and moderate income households, the homes will be sold on the open market to income-qualified families.

The HUD Section 8 program provides approximately \$2.5 million for rental assistance through the Bear River and Logan Housing Authorities, both administered by BRAG. There are no matching requirements for this program.

Additionally, the Bear River Housing Authority will offer mortgage payment assistance to five qualified clients each year.

### **Barriers to Affordable Housing (AP-75)**

(Describe actions to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment)

Compared to many other housing markets in parts of state of Utah and inter-mountain west, the BRAG region's housing costs are very reasonable and mostly stable. The prevailing attitudes towards government regulation naturally limit the potential for taxation, fees, and other rules and policies that restrict building. One of the most direct ways to influence housing prices is to reduce the amount of land necessary to build. Multi-family housing and small-lot single-family housing are often controversial in rural communities, but offer the best chance to combat rising housing costs while providing safe and decent housing options.

BRAG works regularly with local governments to address planning and zoning requirements that may limit housing choice. BRAG provides technical assistance throughout the planning process as requested and has distributed an educational pamphlet to each community in the region highlighting the benefits of planning for housing choice and addressing many of the concerns related to multi-family and smaller-lot housing.

The rate of increase in incomes has not kept pace with the rate of increase in housing costs. Even during the economic recession from 2007 to 2010, as housing costs dropped or stagnated, they continued to climb faster than wages. The result of this disparity is twofold; first, renters and homeowners are paying an increasing portion of their household income toward housing related costs, and second, more families are being priced out of home-ownership.

Families with housing costs in excess of 30% of their gross income are at risk of financial "meltdown" when faced with unexpected medical or other household expenses. Many households are literally one paycheck away from foreclosure, bankruptcy or homelessness. Since 2000, the number of households spending greater than 30% of their gross income on rent, mortgages, and other selected household expenses such as utilities has increased in each of the Region's three counties. This increase of 6% is similar to statewide changes.

Selected Monthly Owner/Renter Costs as a Percentage of Household Income		
	2000	2015
Box Elder County	21%	24%
Cache County	26%	32%
Rich County	15%	20%
State of Utah	27%	33%
Bear River Region	23%	29%

Source: 2000 Census and 2015 American Community Survey

Most communities in the region have recognized the need to provide housing for moderate income families and individuals. Regulatory barriers for affordable housing such as accessory apartments, manufactured housing, and high-density multi-unit development are rare and are not significantly limiting availability of housing. However, appreciating land values and infrastructure costs, particularly for waste water treatment, in remote rural areas are making it difficult for developers to provide affordable units at current market prices. BRAG continues to encourage communities to adequately plan ahead for growth to reduce infrastructure costs, thereby passing fewer costs on to developers and property owners. BRAG also serves as a regional clearinghouse for housing providers and local agencies to collaborate and partner on housing needs and projects.

Other problems of Low Income Housing in the three counties of the Bear River Region include: lacking complete kitchen or plumbing facilities (substandard), having more than 1 person per room (overcrowded), and paying more than 30% of gross income towards housing costs (cost burdened). We assume that lacking complete kitchen or plumbing facilities is the most severe housing problem, followed by overcrowding, followed by cost burden. If a household has more than one of these problems they are counted with the most severe problem. These data is collected from Table 3 of HUD's 2009 CHAS data.

## **Other Actions (AP-85)**

### **Lead Based Paint**

BRAG's Housing Specialist performs lead based paint tests on all HUD funded housing rehabilitation projects that cost more than \$5,000 for. Projects that are less than \$5,000, but are likely to disturb painted surfaces are also tested. (Emergency Home Repair, Minor and Major Home Repair, CDBG) All Section 8 Units receive a visual inspection. For units that appear to have deteriorating paint, lead based paint testing is required. If lead is found, the landlord must take corrective action.

**Public Comment Period and  
Public Hearing  
Proof of Notice and Response  
to Comments**

# Entity: Bear River Association of Governments

## Body: Bear River District Consolidated Plan

<b>Subject:</b>	Hearings
<b>Notice Title:</b>	Bear River District 2019 Annual Action Plan for Regional Consolidated Plan Public Hearing
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	170 N Main Logan 84321
<b>Event Date &amp; Time:</b>	March 15, 2019 March 15, 2019 03:00 PM - March 15, 2019 04:00 AM
<b>Description/Agenda:</b>	<p style="text-align: right;">Bear River District 2019 Annual Action Plan for Regional Consolidated Plan Public Hearing</p> <p>Bear River Association of Governments has updated the regional 2019 Consolidated Plan Annual Action Plan for Box Elder, Cache &amp; Rich Counties Utah as required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and State of Utah Permanent Community Impact Fund Board (CIB). The Consolidated Plan examines needs and proposes priorities for public expenditures related to providing safe and affordable housing, providing for suitable living environments and promoting economic development opportunities. A public hearing will be held to collect comments on the 2019 Annual Action Plan and regional housing priorities. The hearing will be at approximately 3:05 p.m. on Friday, March 15th, 2019, in the Main Floor Conference Room at the Bear River Association of Governments Cache County Office at 170 North Main, Logan, Utah 84321</p> <p>Further information can be obtained by contacting Brian Carver at 435.752.7242. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during these hearings should notify Karen at the BRAG Office, 435.752.7242, at least three days prior to the hearing.</p>
<b>Notice of Special Accommodations:</b>	<p>Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities by calling Dolores Berkley at the BRAG office, (435) 752-7242 or (877) 772-7242 at least three working days prior to the meeting. Individuals with speech and/or hearing impairments may call Relay Utah by dialing 7-1-1 to use Hamilton Relay or call toll free TTY# 1 (800) 346-4128. Spanish Relay Utah: 1-888-346-3162</p>

**Notice of Electronic or telephone participation:**

Please direct any questions or comments to: Bear River Association of Governments, 170 North main Street, Logan, UTah 84321, 435-752-7242 or 877-772-7242 (toll free).

---

**Other information:**

---

**Contact Information:**

Brian Carver  
4357527242  
brianc@brag.utah.gov

---

**Posted on:**

March 11, 2019 04:51 PM

---

**Last edited on:**

March 11, 2019 04:51 PM

---

Printed from Utah's Public Notice Website (<http://pmn.utah.gov/>)

# Entity: Bear River Association of Governments

## Body: Bear River District Consolidated Plan

<b>Subject:</b>	Business
<b>Notice Title:</b>	Bear River District Consolidated Plan 2019 Annual Action Plan
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	170 N Main Logan
<b>Event Date &amp; Time:</b>	February 1, 2019 February 1, 2019 01:00 AM
<b>Description/Agenda:</b>	<p style="text-align: right;">Bear River District Consolidated Plan 2019 Annual Action Plan</p> <p>Bear River Association of Governments has updated the regional Consolidated Plan 2019 Annual Action Plan for Box Elder, Cache &amp; Rich Counties Utah as required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and State of Utah Permanent Community Impact Fund Board (CIB). The Consolidated Plan examines needs and proposes priorities for public expenditures related to providing safe and affordable housing, providing for suitable living environments and promoting economic development opportunities. A draft copy of the plan is available for public review and comment at BRAG, 170 N. Main, Logan, Utah, or on the Internet at <a href="http://www.brag.utah.gov">www.brag.utah.gov</a>. Comments will be accepted February 1st, 2019 through March 4th, 2019. Contact Brian Carver at 435-752-7242 or <a href="mailto:brianc@brag.utah.gov">brianc@brag.utah.gov</a></p>
<b>Notice of Special Accommodations:</b>	Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities by calling Dolores Berkley at the BRAG office, (435) 752-7242 or (877) 772-7242 at least three working days prior to the meeting. Individuals with speech and/or hearing impairments may call Relay Utah by dialing 7-1-1 to use Hamilton Relay or call toll free TTY# 1 (800) 346-4128. Spanish Relay Utah: 1-888-346-3162
<b>Notice of Electronic or telephone participation:</b>	Please direct any questions or comments to: Bear River Association of Governments, 170 North main Street, Logan, UTah 84321, 435-752-7242 or 877-772-7242 (toll free).
<b>Other information:</b>	
<b>Contact Information:</b>	Brian Carver 4357527242

brianc@brag.utah.gov

---

**Posted on:** February 01, 2019 03:49 PM

---

**Last edited on:** February 01, 2019 03:49 PM

---

Printed from Utah's Public Notice Website (<http://pmn.utah.gov/>)

# **2019 Bear River Regional Capital Improvements List**

### Bear River Regional 2019 Consolidated Capital Improvements List Supplemental

Applicant Priority*	Project Description	Total Project Cost	CDBG Amount	CIB Amount	Other Funds	CIB Submission Date
<b>Box Elder County</b>						
<b>Cache County</b>						
	County Roads Department Building	\$2,000,000		\$2,000,000		June 2019
	County Conservation & Recreation Plan	\$40,000		\$40,000	County	April 2019
	County General Plan	\$170,000		\$85,000	County	June 2019
<b>Brigham City</b>						
	Senior Center Flooring	\$149,700	\$149,700			
<b>Howell Town</b>						
	Water System Improvements	\$280,000	\$200,000			
<b>Randolph</b>						
	Community Building	\$300,000	\$200,000			2020
	Sidewalk Construction	\$200,000	\$100,000		\$100,000	2023
	Water Meters	\$150,000	\$100,000		\$50,000	2025
<b>Snowville Town</b>						
	Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk along Stone Road entrance to town	\$213,000	\$199,350			
<b>Trenton</b>						
	Water System Improvements	\$405,000	\$200,000			
<b>Bear River Association of Governments</b>						
	CDBG Administration & Planning	\$50,000	\$50,000			
	Housing Assistance	\$173,000	\$173,000			
	Special Planning & Economic Development	\$47,500	\$30,000		\$17,500 State Match	

# **BRAG Homeless Plan**

# Plan to End Chronic Homelessness in the BRAG Area by 2014

**Vision:** Everyone has access to safe, decent, affordable housing with the needed resources and supports for self-sufficiency and well-being.

## BACKGROUND

### Homeless in America

Tonight 750,000 people will be homeless in America. It is estimated as many as 3.5 million or about 1% of all Americans, will experience some degree of homelessness during the year.

Who are the homeless Americans? According to the National Alliance to End Homelessness (NAEH), close to 59% of the homeless identified by the 2005 national count were individuals and 41% were persons in families with children. Over the course of a full year, however, about half of the people who experience homelessness live in family units and 38% of the homeless each year are children. There are also single homeless people who are not adults — runaway and “throwaway” youth. The size of this group has not been measured and is often not included in counts of homeless people.<sup>1</sup>

To be homeless is to be without a permanent place to live that is fit for human habitation. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has defined the following categories of homelessness:

- **Temporary:** Those that stay in the shelter system for brief periods and do not return. This group comprises about 88% of the homeless population, and according to national research, consume about 50% of the resources devoted to support the homeless.
- **Chronic:** Those unaccompanied individuals with a disabling condition who have been homeless for a year or more, or have experienced at least four episodes of homelessness within three years. This group represents about 12% and consumes up to 50% of the resources supporting the homeless.

Chronically homeless Americans are 75% male, at least 40% are African-American and over one-third are veterans.<sup>2</sup> This group is burdened with significant issues: 40% have substance abuse disorders, 25% have severe physical disabilities and 20% have serious mental illness. According to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), chronic homelessness is associated with extreme poverty, poor job skills, lack of education, and serious health conditions, such as mental illness and chemical dependency.

### Homeless in Utah

Tonight nearly 3,000 people will be homeless in Utah and close to 14,000 will experience homelessness sometime this year. Ninety percent of the homeless are along the Wasatch Front with the greatest concentrations in Salt Lake and Weber counties. The remaining 10% are in the rural areas. No longer are Utah’s homeless mostly transient. As many as 85% are Utah residents. Additionally, although not homeless by HUD’s definition, many individuals and families are doubling-up, resulting in a substandard living environment.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Alliance to End Homelessness. 2000. *A Plan, Not a Dream: How to End Homelessness in Ten Years*.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Veterans Affairs Fact Sheet, January 2003

Utah conducts an annual **Point-in-Time Count** (including a “street count”) of homeless persons the last week of January. The most recent count, conducted January 23, 2007, found and identified 2,853 homeless persons statewide. Statistical projection models estimate that Utah can expect that 13,773 people will have at least a short period of homelessness during the year.

The 2007 homeless count shows Utah has a slightly lower percentage (35.1%) of homeless persons in families than nationally (41%). Of the 2,853 homeless, 765 were classified as chronically homeless. Although HUD does not include long-term homeless families in their definition of chronic homelessness, Utah will be including chronically homeless families in placement into housing. Nationally, the chronically homeless are about 12% of the homeless population and consume 50% of the resources provided the homeless. This has been confirmed in Utah. The Road Home, the State's largest homeless shelter, located in Salt Lake City, recently conducted a five-year analysis of shelter bed usage. They found the high users of the shelter are consistent with results from national studies. Between July 1, 2002 and June 30, 2007, there were 1,047,645 shelter nights provided to 12,286 unduplicated individuals. Of the 12,286, 1,675 or 14%, used 664,214 shelter nights, or 63% of the facility's services.

This plan will reference an Annualized Baseline of the last three annual counts, which were all conducted using the same methodology, in order to reduce the impact of measurement error in any one count. This plan will measure progress of strategic initiatives against the following three-year Annualized Baseline of the Point-in-Time Counts for 2005–2007:

**Statewide Homeless Point-in-Time Counts\***  
**(2005 - 2007 Annualized Baseline)**

	2005		2006		2007		Point-in-Time Count Ave 2005 - 2007		3 Year Annualized Baseline	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Individuals	1,621	59.2%	2,035	62.5%	1,816	63.7%	1,858	62.3%	8,149	59.2%
Persons in Families	1,113	40.7%	1,182	36.3%	1,000	35.1%	1,100	36.8%	5,494	39.9%
Unaccompanied Children	4	0.1%	38	1.2%	37	1.3%	26	0.9%	130	0.9%
<b>Total Homeless</b>	<b>2,738</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3,255</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,853</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,984</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13,773</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total Chronic Homeless</b>	<b>966</b>	<b>35.3%</b>	<b>957</b>	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>765</b>	<b>26.8%</b>	<b>918</b>	<b>30.8%</b>	<b>1,840</b>	<b>13.4%</b>

\*See Attachment I

**Homeless in the BRAG Area**

The Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Area participates in the annual Utah **Point-in-Time Count** (including a “street count”) of homeless persons. The most recent three counts, conducted 2005-2007, identified an average of 47 homeless persons in the BRAG Area, including 6 (12.1%) chronically homeless. The State Plan references an Annualized Baseline of the last three counts. This plan will measure progress of strategic initiatives against the following three-year Annualized Baseline of the BRAG Area Point-in-Time Counts for 2005–2007:

**BRAG**  
**Homeless Point-in-Time Counts\***  
**(2005 - 2007 Annualized Baseline)**

	2005		2006		2007		Point-in-Time Count Ave 2005 - 2007		3 Year Annualized Baseline	
Individuals	9	30.0%	16	27.6%	7	13.2%	11	22.7%	46	20.4%
Persons in Families	21	70.0%	42	72.4%	46	86.8%	36	77.3%	180	79.6%
Unaccompanied Children	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Total Homeless</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total Chronic Homeless</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>20.7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5.3%</b>

\*See Attachment I

## HISTORICAL RESPONSE

### State of Utah

The homeless shelter and services system in Utah has evolved over the past two decades to address the changing homeless population. Presently, there are approximately 3,248 temporary shelter beds in Utah within a range of service models (see Attachment II). This system stretches from short-term emergency shelter facilities to transitional housing for both individuals and families that allow longer lengths of stay (some up to two years) in a services-enriched environment.<sup>3</sup>

The impetus for creating the present shelter service models has been threefold. First, it derived in part from the dramatic influx of families into the system that began in the late 1980's. As single, female-headed households increased as a percentage of the homeless, it was apparent that children, in particular, were ill suited to spend 12 hours each day on city streets. In response, providers developed family shelter units and other transitional housing programs. Secondly, this shift in service philosophy reflected a growing awareness of the cyclical nature of homelessness for many who experience it. The fact that many who became homeless were experiencing repeated and prolonged episodes of homelessness suggested that the basic needs approach, while effective at protecting people from the troubles of street life, were insufficient to move people beyond homelessness. Finally, recognizing that homeless face obstacles to accessing mainstream resources, homeless service providers responded by providing an increasing range of direct services such as mental health and on-site substance abuse intervention.

Over time, in the absence of responsive, affordable, permanent supportive housing alternatives, this approach expanded to include a residential service model designed to equip homeless households with the skills and resources needed to succeed in permanent housing. This has culminated in the evolution of a tiered system of care that moves those who are homeless through a succession of shelter programs designed to graduate them to permanent housing and self-sufficiency (see Attachment III).

While this approach may be logical on its face, it has ultimately proven ineffective for a variety of reasons. A shelter-based response that aims to "fix" the individual factors contributing to a

<sup>3</sup> From the State's 2007 three Continuum of Care submissions

household's homelessness does little to address the larger structural causes of homelessness. Moreover, many of the problems faced by deeply impoverished households, such as lack of education and marketable skills, histories of trauma and domestic abuse, and serious disabilities, are not resolved in such a short time period and to the degree that would enable them to succeed in the competitive private housing market. Thus, many remain in the homeless service system for long periods of time, or leave only to return. To compound this issue, the services and supports tied to shelters significantly diminish, or end, once the resident leaves the shelter. At the same time that shelter programs have become more service-intensive, they have frequently adopted more demanding eligibility criteria and strict program rules that have often effectively barred those households with the greatest needs.

## **BRAG Area**

The Bear River Region does not have a looming homeless problem. There is no visible "skid row" anywhere in the Region. Casual observers might claim this is due to an inhospitable winter climate or the current implementation of "bus therapy" sending transients to Ogden, Salt Lake City, or Pocatello.

Utah's present system and resources have proven inadequate to the challenge of significantly reducing, let alone ending, chronic homelessness. A new approach is needed.

## **COSTS OF HOMELESSNESS**

### **Cost to Communities**

People experiencing chronic homelessness not only suffer as individuals, communities suffer as well. Placement of homeless people in shelters, while not the most desirable course, at least appears to be the least expensive way of meeting basic needs. Research shows, however, this is not the most effective approach and the hidden costs of homelessness can be quite high, particularly for those with chronic physical or mental illness. Because they have no regular address, the homeless face serious barriers accessing mainstream service systems and resort to a variety of very expensive public systems and crisis services.<sup>4</sup>

- **Emergency Shelter:** Emergency shelter generally works well for the temporarily homeless in assisting them to stabilize and move into transitional and permanent housing. The 12% of homeless who are chronically homeless will use over 50% of the emergency shelter services.
- **Health and Medical Care:** Homelessness both results from and causes severe physical and mental health problems. Homeless people are far more likely to rely on costly services such as emergency rooms and inappropriate inpatient stays.
- **Incarceration:** Homeless spend significant time in jail or prison, often for petty offenses such as loitering. Frequently, the penal system is used as emergency shelter for the chronically homeless. This is significantly more expensive than other, more appropriate shelter.

The cost of chronic homelessness is most acutely felt by the overburdened health and mental health systems. A recent study found that hospitalized homeless people stay an average of more

---

<sup>4</sup> National Alliance to End Homelessness. 2000. *A Plan, Not a Dream: How to End Homelessness in Ten Years*.

than four days longer than other inpatients, and that almost half of medical hospitalizations of homeless people were directly attributable to their homeless condition and therefore preventable.<sup>5</sup> Recent studies have also found that homeless persons are three times more likely to use hospital emergency rooms than the general population, and are higher users of emergency department services because of their poor health, elevated rates of injuries and difficulty obtaining standard physician office care for non-emergency conditions.<sup>6</sup> A San Francisco study found that placing homeless people in supportive housing reduced their emergency room visits by more than half.<sup>7</sup> And, in 2006 the Denver Housing First Collaborative (DHFC) published a study of chronically homeless individuals, comparing costs of services for two years before and after placement in permanent supportive housing. DHFC found that emergency room costs were reduced 34.4% and inpatient nights declined 80%. Incarceration days and costs were reduced 76%. The total average cost-savings per individual was \$31,545. After deducting the cost for providing permanent supportive housing, Denver realized a net cost-savings of \$4,745 per person.<sup>8</sup>

Clearly, getting the chronically homeless, those that live in shelters and on the streets for long periods, into housing will make a significant impact in the process of reducing homelessness in America.<sup>9</sup>

### **Cost to Utah**

Preliminary studies of homelessness costs to Utah communities indicate that providing permanent supportive housing is significantly less expensive than the present approach. Based on information from The Road Home, the annual costs for a person in permanent supportive housing is about \$6,504. This compares with annual costs of \$7,165 for shelter (including case management) at The Road Home, \$23,608 in the State prisons, \$26,736 in the Salt Lake County Jail, and \$166,000 in the State Mental Hospital (see Attachment IV). In Utah, inpatient psychiatric care charges average \$455 a day.<sup>10</sup> Medicaid pays an average of \$2,800 per day for medical hospitalizations (with an average stay of 3.9 days) and pays emergency room an average \$648 per episode.<sup>11</sup>

### **Cost to the BRAG Area**

Currently the cost to shelter someone at CAPSA (DV Shelter) is \$15,500 for 4 months. Based on information from the Pilot Project which helps homeless people fleeing domestic violence, the average cost to get people into permanent housing is \$5142.00 per family or individual. This includes case management costs. The average time families are on program is 4.6 months. All areas of self-sufficiency improved during that time.

## **TEN-YEAR PLANNING EFFORT**

### **Ten-year Challenge**

Addressing the issue of chronic homelessness is a national effort. In 2000, the National Alliance to End Homelessness issued a national challenge in *A Plan, Not a Dream: How to End Homelessness in Ten Years*. The following year, HUD Secretary Martinez endorsed the goal of

---

<sup>5</sup> Sharon A. Salit, M.A., et al., "Hospitalization Costs Associated with Homelessness in New York City," *New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 338:1734-1740, #24, June 1998.

<sup>6</sup> Kushel MB, Vittinghoff E, Haas JS. Factors associated with the health care utilization of homeless persons. *JAMA*. 2001;285:200-206.

<sup>7</sup> Tony Proscio. *Supportive Housing and its Impact on the Public Health Crisis of Homelessness*, California, 2000.

<sup>8</sup> Denver Housing First Collaborative. *Cost Benefit Analysis and Program Outcomes Report*. December 2006.

<sup>9</sup> National Alliance to End Homelessness. 2000. *A Plan, Not a Dream: How to End Homelessness in Ten Years*.

<sup>10</sup> Utah Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health, personal correspondence.

<sup>11</sup> Utah Department of Health, Division of Health Care Financing, personal correspondence.

ending chronic homelessness in ten years. President Bush has since made ending chronic homelessness an administration-wide goal. As part of this effort, he re-established the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness to coordinate this effort among the 20 federal departments and agencies serving the homeless.

### **State and Local Commitment**

In 2002 Lt. Governor Walker committed the state of Utah to participate in the ten-year planning process to end chronic homelessness. In May 2003, nine individuals, representing the State's Homeless Coordinating Committee, attended HUD Policy Academy training in Chicago. The Policy Academy training outlined the Bush Administration's efforts to end chronic homelessness in ten years and provided tools for the development of local plans. The nine attendees were:

Kerry Bate, Executive Director, Salt Lake County Housing Authority  
Bill Crim, Executive Director, Utah Issues  
Mark Manazer, Vice President of Programs, Volunteers of America  
Leticia Medina, Director, State Community Services Office  
Matt Minkevitch, Executive Director, The Road Home  
Lloyd Pendleton, Volunteer, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints  
Mike Richardson, Director, Department of Workforce Services  
Jane Shock, Vice President, American Express  
Robert Snarr, Coordinator, State Mental Health Housing and Case Management.

This team accepted the assignment to prepare a ten-year plan to end chronic homelessness in Utah by 2014.

In 2005, the State Homeless Coordinating Committee (HCC) published *Utah's Ten-year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness* setting forth key strategies to achieve the goal. The HCC called upon each of the twelve Local Homeless Coordinating Committees to prepare a plan to implement the key strategies locally.

### **BRAG Area Commitment**

The Bear River Association of Governments established the BRAG Local Area Homeless Coordinating Committee. The committee is responsible for developing and implementing a Plan to End Chronic Homelessness in the BRAG Area by 2014.

## **KEY STRATEGIES**

### **Overview**

The ten-year plan sets forth broad perspectives, guidelines, targets and an organization of committees and stakeholders to achieve the goal of ending chronic homelessness reducing overall homelessness by 2014.

The present federal, state, and local funding could be used more effectively but still is insufficient to end chronic homelessness and reduce overall homeless in ten years. Present funding for homelessness at the federal, state, and local level must be maintained and new resources added, especially in affordable housing and supportive services. Some of the funding sources and programs in Utah include the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund, the Pamela Atkinson Homeless

Trust Fund,<sup>12</sup> HOME, the Section 8 Voucher Choice Program, Medicaid, Emergency Shelter Grants, Critical Needs Housing and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF).

### **Homeless Prevention/Discharge Planning**

Ending homelessness is impossible without implementing strategies to prevent it from occurring. Public institutions and support systems such as jails, prisons, hospitals, the child welfare system, and mental health facilities, often release people directly into homelessness. Coordinated **Discharge Planning** is crucial to ensure that people leaving these institutions have stable housing and some means for maintaining it.<sup>13</sup> The state's HCC subcommittee on Discharge Planning coordinates efforts in support of this key strategy.

### **Affordable Housing**

One proven key to ending chronic homelessness and long-term family homelessness is a **Housing First** strategy. Housing is more than a basic need. Finding and maintaining housing is a fundamental indicator of success in community life. Placing the chronically homeless and long-term family homeless in appropriate housing with supportive services is more effective for the community than letting the homeless continue to live on the street.

Housing First is an approach that centers on providing homeless people with housing quickly and providing services as needed. What differentiates a Housing First approach from other strategies is an immediate and primary focus on helping individuals and families quickly access and sustain permanent housing. This approach has the benefit of being consistent with what most people experiencing homelessness want and seek help to achieve. Housing First programs share these critical elements:

- There is a focus on helping chronically homeless and long-term homeless families access and sustain rental housing *as quickly as possible* and the *housing is not time-limited*;
- A variety of services are delivered primarily *following* a housing placement to promote housing stability and individual and family well-being;
- Such services are time-limited or long-term depending on individual and family needs;
- Housing is not contingent on compliance with services – instead, participants must comply with a standard lease agreement and are provided with the services and supports that are necessary to help them succeed.

A central tenet of the Housing First approach is that social services that enhance well-being can be more effective when people are in their own home. Studies of Housing First programs with chronically homeless individuals and long-term homeless families have found that many who have remained outside of housing for years can retain housing with a subsidy and wraparound supports.<sup>14</sup>

The greatest obstacle to affordable housing is insufficient income. For the last 30 years the gap between income and housing costs has steadily widened. Over the same period of time, the supply of affordable rental housing has become increasingly scarce. Much of the stock has been converted to higher-priced and higher-profit housing such as condominiums. More has been

---

<sup>12</sup> The funds for this come from an annual state tax check-off for homeless service providers which is periodically supplemented with general funds approved by the legislature.

<sup>13</sup> National Alliance to End Homelessness. *A New Vision: What is in Community Plans to End Homelessness*. November 2006.

<sup>14</sup> National Alliance to End Homelessness. *What is Housing First?* November 2006.

claimed by urban renewal. In many cases, higher income households are occupying low-income housing, further depleting the supply. NAEH reports there are now 5.2 million more low-income households than there are affordable housing units.<sup>15</sup> The average fair market value of a two-bedroom apartment has grown by nearly 28% in the last seven years, outpacing both overall inflation and average household income growth by a wide margin. This rate is also nearly double the income growth experienced by the poorest 20% of American households.<sup>16</sup> The widening gap between income and housing costs puts pressure on the affordable housing supply, placing larger numbers of people at risk for homelessness.

Overall, Utah personal income has risen about 5% over the last 3 years while housing prices have increased 25% to 30%. The widening gap between income and housing costs, combined with subsidy, cuts means more lower-income households will live in overcrowded and substandard conditions.<sup>17</sup>

Utah projected in its most recent Consolidated Plan that an average of 4,342 new affordable housing units needed to be produced each year from 1996–2002. Over the same period, only 2,621 units were actually developed on average each year, building up an affordable housing deficit at the rate of 1,721 units annually. According to the 2000 census, 625 new subsidized housing units need to be produced annually just for those Utah families living in poverty or below 30% of Area Median Income (AMI). In addition to the growing shortage of new affordable housing units, Utah has a critical housing quality problem.<sup>18</sup> The Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund (OWHLF) Annual Report estimates that almost 2,500 low-income housing units require rehabilitation each year to remain habitable.<sup>19</sup>

The state's HCC has formed a subcommittee on Affordable Housing to coordinate initiatives driving this key strategy.

### **Supportive Services**

In many respects, housing stability hinges on a household's ability to access fundamental resources and supports when a crisis occurs, so the security of housing is not threatened. The necessary supports include: 1) creative leasing options, locating appropriate units, deposit assistance and rent and utility assistance; 2) health care with mental health and substance abuse services; 3) skill and employment training leading to livable wage employment and other income supports; 4) transportation; and 5) quality child care. Access to resources and supports is even more critical for low-income households, for whom a crisis often means choosing between paying the rent and paying for food. Utah has implemented use of a Self-sufficiency Matrix for tracking resources and supports available to and utilized by homeless individuals. Case managers use this matrix to assess the present status of the homeless, target interventions, and measure progress in improved self-sufficiency (see Attachment V).

The state's HCC has formed a subcommittee on Supportive Services to focus efforts on this key strategy.

---

<sup>15</sup> National Alliance to End Homelessness. *Chronic Homelessness*. March 2007.

<sup>16</sup> National Low Cost Housing Coalition. *Out of Reach 2006*.

<sup>17</sup> Utah Department of Community and Economic Development, Division of Housing and Community Development. *State of Utah Consolidated Plan 2006–2010*. p.19 .

<sup>18</sup> Utah Department of Community and Economic Development, Division of Housing and Community Development. *State of Utah Consolidated Plan 2006–2010*. p.8.

<sup>19</sup> Utah Department of Community and Culter, Division of Housing and Community Development. *Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund Annual Report to the State Legislature 2007*.

## **Homeless Management Information**

Critical, up-to-date information on the homeless and services must drive the planning process. Critical information includes who is homeless, why they became homeless, what homeless and mainstream assistance sources are available and accessed, and what is effective in ending their homelessness. This information will allow monitoring trends to determine causes and develop indicators, assess available assistance and fill the existing gaps. Self-sufficiency Matrix data is gathered and entered by agencies statewide, providing a valuable tool for planners and decision makers. The state's HCC has also appointed a subcommittee to define, gather, and analyze homeless and services data.

## **IMPLEMENTATION ORGANIZATION**

### **State and Local Homeless Coordinating Committees**

The State's Homeless Coordinating Committee (HCC) seeks to coordinate all activities that serve the homeless. The HCC was established in 1988. Members are appointed by the governor and encompass community organizations, individuals from not-for-profit and for-profit sectors and cabinet members (see Attachment VI). The HCC scope of responsibilities include establishing priorities for present funding, streamlining and increasing access to mainstream resources, reporting on the results and funding effectiveness, obtaining additional resources and implementing *Utah's Plan to End Chronic Homelessness and Reduce Overall Homelessness by 2014*.

The HCC has formed subcommittees to focus on each of the four key strategies: 1) Discharge Planning (in support of Homeless Prevention); 2) Affordable Housing; 3) Supportive Services; and 4) Homeless Management Information. A fifth organizational approach has organized twelve regional Local Homeless Coordinating Committees (LHCC), chaired by an elected official and organized by the local Association of Governments or Council of Governments (see Attachment VI).

Each LHCC is responsible for 1) developing and implementing local ten-year plans with detailed action steps to drive the key strategies of the State's ten-year plan; 2) prioritizing and coordinating funding to implement housing and supportive service programs to reduce and prevent homelessness; 3) use Homeless Management Information to track results; and 4) develop a "pathway" to self-reliance for the homeless (see Attachment VI).

### **Continua of Care**

Utah is divided into the following three Continua of Care (CoC): Salt Lake City County, Mountainland Association of Governments and Balance of State. The CoCs are comprised of homeless care providers representing the spectrum of homeless services. They are funding entities recognized by HUD. Local ten-year plans are used in preparing the annual CoC submissions for HUD funding. BRAG Area is a member of the Balance of State Continuum of Care.

### **BRAG Local Homeless Coordinating Committee**

The Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Local Homeless Coordinating Committee represents a broad range of community stakeholders and is chaired by a County Commissioner (see Attachment VII for current membership). The committee seeks to coordinate all activities that serve the homeless in the BRAG area and, at its discretion, may appoint subcommittees and workgroups to further the goals.

# BRAG AREA IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

## Area Profile

The BRAG Area Local Homeless Coordinating Committee (LHCC) is responsible for overall coordination activities on behalf of the homeless for Box Elder, Cache and Rich Counties. The area is located in the Northwestern part of the state and includes the cities of Brigham City and Logan. Box Elder County's economy is based on agriculture and manufacturing. Over 43 percent of the county's land is used either for growing crops or livestock. Manufacturing accounts for 40 percent of total nonagricultural employment. Prominent manufacturing includes space technology, motor vehicle parts, iron and steel products and furniture. Cache County is the agricultural center of Utah. The county has a substantial dairy and meat production industry. The major employer in the county is Utah State University. USU's research activity has spawned many companies which has lead to positive job growth in the service producing sector, while the county's manufacturing industry has decreased. Livestock grazing and the related feed crops are an important component of Rich County's economy. The important sector in the Bear Lake area is tourism. One in five jobs in the county is in the hospitality industry. Government is a strong employer, contributing one-third of the county's jobs. This corner of the state also provides an important place for food production and recreation.<sup>20</sup>

The BRAG Area has an overall population of 153,779 (July 2006 estimate), 5.9% of the Utah total. The overall Poverty Rate is 12.9%, 26.6% higher than the state, and the Child Poverty Rate is 8.3% lower at 11.4%. The Unemployment Rate, 2.6%, is 11.4% lower than the state and less than the national rate. The Area Median income is \$44,598 compared to state average of \$47,224.

<b>Economic Indicators<sup>21</sup></b>			
	<b>BRAG</b>	<b>% of Utah</b>	<b>Utah</b>
Population	153,779	5.9%	2,615,129
Poverty Rate	12.9%	126.6%	10.2%
Child Poverty Rate	11.4%	91.7%	12.4%
Unemployment Rate	2.6%	88.6%	2.9%
Area Median Income	\$44,598	94.4%	\$47,224

## Homeless Prevention/Discharge Planning Strategic Initiative

Jails, prisons, hospitals, the child welfare system, and mental health facilities often release people directly into homelessness. Coordinated **Discharge Planning** is crucial to stop these discharges into homelessness and to assure stable housing and some means for maintaining it.<sup>22</sup>

The LHCC has asked Reed Ernstrom to pull together a group representing local hospitals, mental health facilities, and correctional institutions to focus on effective discharge planning as a way to avoid releasing individuals into homelessness.

<sup>20</sup> Utah Community Action Partnership. *Data Book on Poverty in Utah 2007*.

<sup>21</sup> Data Sources: Utah Community Action Partnership. *Data Book on Poverty in Utah 2007*.

U.S. Census Bureau. *2005 American Community Survey*.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2006.

U.S. Census Bureau. *2004 Small Area Income & Poverty Estimates*

<sup>22</sup> National Alliance to End Homelessness. *A New Vision: What is in Community Plans to End Homelessness*. November 2006.

## Affordable Housing Strategic Initiative

The most successful model for housing the chronically homeless is permanent supportive housing using a Housing First approach. Housing First is a strategy that provides immediate access to rental housing without requiring initial participation in treatment. Social services to enhance well-being can be more effective when people are in their own home.<sup>23</sup>

The existing emergency shelter and transitional housing system works well for most of the temporarily homeless. However, additional needs for these services exist in some communities. Some LHCCs, after a review of their overall needs and services, have elected to include additional transitional housing and emergency shelter for the temporarily homeless as part of an overall effort to bolster and maintain a comprehensive homeless service delivery system. Other LHCCs have determined that their existing emergency shelter and transitional housing capacity is adequately matched with the need.

In 2006 the average monthly Fair Market Rent (FMR) for a two-bedroom apartment in the area was \$610. In order to afford this level of rent and utilities, without paying more than 30% of income on housing, a family would require an annual income of \$24,400. This translates into an hourly wage of \$11.73, based on a 40-hour work week, 52 weeks per year. Current BRAG Area renters actually earn an estimated average hourly wage of \$8.48. To afford a two-bedroom apartment at this wage, a renter must work 55 hours per week, 52 weeks per year or a family must have 1.4 workers.

Chronically homeless individuals can be adequately housed in smaller one-bedroom (FMR \$487) apartments. In order to afford this level of rent and utilities, an individual would require an annual income of \$19,470. Utah's monthly Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments for an individual are \$603. If SSI represents an individual's sole source of income, \$181 in monthly rent is affordable.<sup>24</sup>

<b>Housing Affordability<sup>25</sup></b>			
	<b>BRAG</b>	<b>% of Utah</b>	<b>Utah</b>
Mean Renter Wage*	\$8.48	85.5%	\$9.92
Fair Market Rent 1-bedroom	\$487	86.2%	\$565
Housing Wage** 1-bedroom	\$9.36	86.2%	\$10.86
Fair Market Rent 2-bedroom	\$610	90.0%	\$678
Housing Wage** 2-bedroom	\$11.73	90.0%	\$13.04
* <b>Mean Renter Wage</b> = average hourly wage earned by persons currently renting in the county ** <b>Housing Wage</b> = hourly wage required (working 40 hr/wk, 52 wks/yr) to rent without spending over 30% of total income on housing			

The three-year Annualized Baseline, derived from the 2005-2007 Point-in-Time Count, shows that the BRAG area has a chronic homeless population of 12 individuals. In order to house these individuals an additional 12 suitable affordable housing units are required in the area by 2014. These units could be a mix of rental units presently on the market, rehabilitated older units, and

<sup>23</sup> National Alliance to End Homelessness. *What is Housing First*. November 2006.

<sup>24</sup> National Low Cost Housing Coalition. *Out of Reach 2006*.

<sup>25</sup> Data Sources: Utah Community Action Partnership. *Data Book on Poverty in Utah 2007*. National Low Income Housing Coalition. *Out of Reach 2006*.

new construction. The LHCC has recommended the following affordable housing plan to end chronic homelessness in BRAG area by 2014 (also detailed on Attachment VIII):

### Chronically Homeless

**Existing Stock – 28 Units** – CAPSA and BRAG are committed to lease existing stock of 28 units by the year 2014. There is a gap of 14 units which we will look for additional funding to provide services for that gap.

**New Construction – 0 Units** – With a vacancy rate at 20% one of the highest in Utah, the need for new construction does not make sense at this time.

### Transitional Housing

**Rehabilitation of Existing Structures – 24 Units** – Plans are in progress to locate and renovate existing structures for CAPSA. These units will be used as transitional housing for families fleeing domestic violence. CAPSA anticipates that 12 units will be ready by the end of 2008 and another 12 ready by 2014.

### Emergency Shelter

The LHCC, after comprehensive review, has determined that the goals of this plan can be achieved with the current level of emergency shelter services.

### BRAG Homeless Housing Investment Summary\* (2007 – 2014)

	Existing Stock		Rehab Existing		New Construction		2007 to 2014 Total	
	Units	Cost	Units	Cost	Units	Cost	Units	Cost
Chronically Homeless	28	\$28,000	0	\$0	0	\$0	28	\$28,000
Transitional Housing	0	\$0	24	\$1,920,000	0	\$0	24	\$1,920,000
Emergency Shelter	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>\$28,000</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>\$1,920,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>\$1,948,000</b>

\*See Attachment IX

**BRAG**  
**Homeless Housing Investment Schedule\***  
**(2007 – 2014)**

	Capital Investment		Supportive Services Annual Investment	2007 to 2014 Total Investment
	Units	Cost	Cost	Cost
2007	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2008	12	\$960,000	\$135,600	\$1,095,600
2009	0	\$0	\$135,600	\$135,600
2010	0	\$0	\$135,600	\$135,600
2011	0	\$0	\$135,600	\$135,600
2012	0	\$0	\$135,600	\$135,600
2013	40	\$988,000	\$587,600	\$1,575,600
2014	0	\$0	\$587,600	\$587,600
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>\$1,948,000</b>	<b>\$1,853,200</b>	<b>\$3,801,200o</b>

\*See Attachment IX

In early 2008, the LHCC will identify potential funding sources to support this recommended investment (summarized on Attachment IX).

**Supportive Services Strategic Initiative**

Housing stability depends on these necessary supports: 1) housing assistance; 2) affordable health care with mental health and substance abuse services; 3) skill and employment training; 4) transportation; and 5) affordable quality child care.

The LHCC has asked BRAG & CAPSA to oversee the provision and coordination of Supportive Services for the Homeless in the BRAG Area. They will form an advisory panel representing the principal homeless service providers in the area. The group will work closely with housing providers and will focus on Housing First approaches.

**Homeless Management Information Strategic Initiative**

Critical, up-to-date information on the homeless themselves, gathered at agency, regional and state-wide levels, must drive the planning process. This information will allow monitoring trends to determine causes and develop indicators, assess available assistance and fill the existing gaps.

The LHCC has asked BRAG to take on an area-wide role of Data Quality Management. They are currently responsible for their own agencies' data collection and reporting and have many contacts in other agencies.

# **Public Outreach & Consultation**



1. AOG: Bear River Association of Governments Employee: Brian Carver

2. Name of Agency Consulted: BRAG Governing Board Date of Consultation: 1/23/2019

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"/> Publically funded institution/System of Care* | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Federal       | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-State                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-County                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Local         | <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee Department                    |
| <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Housing Needs Assessment               | <input 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 Needs-Unaccompanied Youth | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Strategy                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special Needs  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: CDBG                |  |

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

During a CDBG public hearing, discuss was held on project eligibility, regional priorities and the nature of sponsorship of non-profit entities.

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

Additional input from communities and service providers will be collected to help refine the prioritization process for future applications.

1. AOG: Bear River Association of Governments Employee: Brian Carver

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Bear River Area Agency on Aging Date of Consultation: 1/30/2019

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 checked="" 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"/> Publically funded institution/System of Care* | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Federal            | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-State                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-County                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Local              | <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee Department                    |
| <input checked="" 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: Veterans                       |
| <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 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 Needs-Unaccompanied Youth | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Strategy                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special Needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy              | <input type="checkbox"/> Other:                                |  |

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

Michelle Benson, the Agency director was contacted regarding the needs of local aging populations in regards to housing and social services.

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

The consultation provided information on regional priorities for access to housing, transportation, and other services that affect livability and affordability for seniors. It also provides more opportunity to coordinate outreach to citizens to educate them on available services and programs.

1. AOG: Bear River Association of Governments Employee: Brian Carver

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Bear River Housing Authority Date of Consultation: 1/24/2019

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

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Children                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Education                    |
| <input checked="" 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 Health Agency               | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Health Child Welfare Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Fair Housing Civil Leaders   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Publically funded institution/System of Care* | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Federal             | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-State                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-County                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Local               | <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee Department                    |
| <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 Needs-Unaccompanied Youth | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Strategy      | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special Needs  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy              | <input type="checkbox"/> Other:                                |  |

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

I met with the PHA director and staff to collect information regarding the needs of housing authority clients, condition of properties inspected, and overall attitudes towards housing in the region. Affordability, discrimination and homelessness were discussed.

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

This input is used to inform elected officials and the public of the actual demands for and utilizations of affordable housing subsidies. This drives education efforts against housing discrimination and for the inclusion of affordable housing in land use policy development.

1. AOG: Bear River Association of Governments Employee: Brian Carver

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Trenton Town Date of Consultation: 12/04/2018

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"/> Publically funded institution/System of Care* | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Federal          | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-State                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-County                       | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Housing Needs Assessment               | <input 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 Needs-Unaccompanied Youth | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Strategy                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special Needs  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: CDBG                |  |

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

Discussed eligibility for funding for public infrastructure.

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

Increased awareness of need for funding assistance and capital project planning in rural, moderate-income communities.

1. AOG: Bear River Association of Governments Employee: Brian Carver

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Box Elder Family Support Center Date of Consultation: 1/12/2019

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

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing                                       | <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child Welfare Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Civil Leaders                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Publically funded institution/System of Care* | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Federal        | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-State                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-County                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Local          | <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee Department                               |
| <input checked="" 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 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 Needs-Unaccompanied Youth | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Strategy                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special Needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: CDBG                |  |

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

The Box Elder Family Support Center was consulted directly to gather organizational information on activities and services for families fleeing domestic violence.

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

This organizational contact helped clarify needs for domestic violence victims for shelter, transitional housing, and rehabilitative services. It also helped gather information to influence funding policies for CDBG.

1. AOG: Bear River Association of Governments Employee: Brian Carver

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Options for Independence Date of Consultation: 1/8/2019

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

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

\*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          | <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Needs-   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> homeless                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Families with Children          | <input type="checkbox"/> Veterans              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Needs-                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Unaccompanied Youth                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Strategy                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needs      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development            | <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy           | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Persons with             |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>                                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disabilities         |  |

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

BRAG met with Options staff to discuss the needs of the adult disabled and aging populations in the region.

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

The coordination provides information on demand for housing and services as well as estimates of costs.

1. AOG: Bear River Association of Governments Employee: Brian Carver

2. Name of Agency Consulted: State of Utah, Dept. of Workforce

Services Date of Consultation: 1/25/2019

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

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

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

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

BRAG meets monthly with regional DWS staff to review employment statistics, business needs, workforce education, and other welfare and system of care programs.

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

Consultations provide insight into demographic and economic changes in the region to help guide BRAG staff and elected officials in prioritizing projects and program delivery.

1. AOG: Bear River Association of Governments Employee: Brian Carver

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Northern Utah Hispanic Healthcare Coalition

Date of Consultation: December 18, 2018

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

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Children               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Services-Education         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PHA   | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Elderly Persons        | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health Agency                    | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Other government-County                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Local          | <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee Department                    |
| <input checked="" 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: Minority Advocacy              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Major Employer                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Foundation                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>                            |

\*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 type="checkbox"/> Housing Needs Assessment               | <input 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 Needs-Unaccompanied Youth | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Strategy                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special Needs  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy              | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Minority outreach, Limited     |  |
|   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> English Proficiency        |  |

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

BRAG participates regularly in meetings with the NUHHC to share information on services and programs with the regional Hispanic population. BRAG also seeks input from this organization on methods to increase participation from minority populations in local planning processes and programs.

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

Input from the NUHHC helps BRAG adjust its language access policies and bilingual documentation on programs and services. It also helps identify community needs and priorities for future project development.

1. AOG: Bear River Association of Governments Employee: Brian Carver

Bear River Association of Governments Community Development Block Grant 1<sup>st</sup> Public Hearing, January 23, 2019

2. Mode of Outreach:

Public Meeting  
 Newspaper Ad

Public Hearing  
 Internet Outreach

Other:

URL if applicable: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Target of Outreach:

Non-targeted/Broad Community  
 Minorities  
 Non-English Speaking- Specify language \_\_\_\_\_

Persons with Disabilities  
 Residents of Public and Assisted Housing

Other:

4. Summary of response/attendance

The hearing was held at the Bear River Association of Governments bi-monthly Governing Board meeting on January 23<sup>th</sup>, 2019. BRAG's use of set-aside CDBG funds for administration, consolidated planning, economic development assistance and housing program delivery was discussed.

No representatives of the public were in attendance.

5. Summary of comments received

No comments were received.

6. Summary of comments not accepted and reasons

## Appendix E

---

# **2019 CDBG Rating & Ranking Criteria**

**Bear River Association of Governments  
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)  
2019 Rating & Ranking Criteria**

This application can be found on the web at [www.brag.utah.gov/CDBG/CDBG.htm](http://www.brag.utah.gov/CDBG/CDBG.htm)

**1) What percent of the project beneficiaries fall into the following income groups?**

**20 points possible**

							My Project Percentage
<b>80% CMFI*</b>	<51%	51-55%	56-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-100%	
	<b>0 points</b>	<b>8 points</b>	<b>9 points</b>	<b>10 points</b>	<b>11 points</b>	<b>12 points</b>	
<b>50% CMFI</b>	65% or more of total project beneficiaries have household income at or below 50% CMFI <b>4 points</b>						
<b>30% CMFI</b>	40% or more of total project beneficiaries have household income at or below 30% CMFI <b>4 points</b>						
<b>Opting to meet a HUD National Objective without income data**</b>	Projects that meet a HUD National Objective by meeting the criteria for “presumed Low-to-Moderate Income (LMI)” groups or qualified Urgent Need projects may opt to not document specific LMI beneficiaries and receive <b>9 points</b> automatically. Qualified Slum & Blight projects may opt to receive <b>8 points</b> without providing income documentation					<b>Project Meets Criteria and opts to not document LMI</b>	
						___ Yes	

\* County Median Family Income (see <http://jobs.utah.gov/housing/cdbg/applications.html> or State Application Appendix C).

**How to Document: Consult BRAG staff to determine the best way to document income for your project.** \*\*Projects that meet a HUD National Objective (see Chapter III of State Application Guide) by serving a HUD specified “Presumed Low-to-Moderate income (LMI) group or that aid in the prevention of slum or blight (National Object #2) or respond to an Urgent Need (National Object #3) may opt to receive “default” points in this category automatically without having to document LMI beneficiaries. Otherwise they must document LMI benefit and will not be eligible for default points. You must consult with BRAG staff if you think your project may qualify.

**2) Is the jurisdiction implementing Fair Housing, Civil Rights**

**My Jurisdiction Is Participating**

**and Quality Growth Principles? 10 points possible**

<b><u>3 Points</u></b>	Has your jurisdiction addressed moderate income housing in its general plan as required by State Code Title 10-9a-403(2)(a)(iii)? (Towns with populations under 1,000 receive 2 points if no plan)	
<b><u>2 Points</u></b>	Does this project implement moderate income housing or homeless goals as identified in your general plan (whether required by state code or not) or in BRAG's Consolidated Plan?	
<b><u>3 Points*</u></b>	Has your jurisdiction adopted ordinances to protect and conserve water, air, energy resources, critical lands, important agriculture lands and/or historic places?*	
<b><u>1 Point</u></b>	The Community has completed an "ADA Checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal" for the main administrative office.	
<b><u>1 Point</u></b>	The Community has adopted the following policies – 1) Grievance Procedure under the Americans with Disabilities Act, 2) Section 504 and ADA Effective Communication Policy, 3) Language Access Plan and 4) Section 504 and ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy	

\* Applicants will receive one point for each ordinance adopted to protect or conserve water, air quality, energy resources, critical lands, important agriculture lands, and/or historic places. Up to three points possible. Attach copies of ordinances and planning documents to Application Packet.

**3a) For Community-wide Projects – Does the jurisdiction have capacity to fund the project through increased taxes?**

**10 points possible**

<b><u>Tax Rate as a % of Ceiling*</u></b>	Tax rate <15% of ceiling <b>0 points</b>	Tax rate 16-25% of ceiling <b>5 points</b>	Tax rate >25% of ceiling <b>10 points</b>	<b><u>Your Jurisdiction’s Tax Rate as a Percentage of State Ceiling</u></b>

**How to Document:** BRAG staff will use the tax rate data produced by the Utah Tax Commission to confirm your jurisdiction taxing position. No documentation required.

**OR**

**3b) For Drinking Water/Waste Water Projects – Are the system user fees competitive according to State Drinking Water and Water Quality standards?**

**10 points possible**

<b><u>Maximum Affordable Water Bill (1.75% of MAGI)</u></b>	Fee rate <0.6% of MAGI <b>0 points</b>	Fee rate 0.61-1.40% of MAGI <b>5 points</b>	Fee rate >1.40% of MAGI <b>10 points</b>	<b><u>Your Jurisdiction’s Utility Rate as a Percentage of MAGI</u></b>

**Regional Priority**

**4) How does the project rate with regional priorities, goals, and policies? Regional priorities are determined by the Community Investment Council and BRAG Governing Board.**

**20 points possible**

<b>Regional priorities, goals, and policies</b>	Public Utility Infrastructure 20 points	Public Safety Activities 16 points	Removing Barriers 12 points	Community Facilities (non-recreational) 8 points	LMI Housing 4 points	Other Projects 0 points	
---	--	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	-------------------------	----------------------------	--

**Public Utility Infrastructure** – Projects designed to increase the capacity of public utility systems to better serve the community. May include drinking water, wastewater disposal projects and transportation facilities.

**Public Safety Activities** - Projects related to the protection of life or property, would include activities such as flood control, fire protection, or abuse prevention projects in a community.

**Community Facilities** – Non-administrative and non-recreational facilities and service activities such as senior citizen centers, health clinics, and food banks.

**LMI Housing** – Projects designed to provide for the housing needs of very low, low, and moderate income families. May include the acquisition and/or rehabilitation of existing dwelling units or the development of public infrastructure that would serve LMI housing projects or homeless shelters.

**Removing Barriers** – Accessibility to public facilities by disabled persons is mandated by federal law. Projects will remove accessibility barriers in existing public buildings and facilities.

Targeted population includes LMI populations and HUD-specified “presumed” LMI populations such as homeless, elderly, disabled adults, victims fleeing abuse, etc.

**6) What is the overall project impact? 15 points possible**

<b>Project Impact Geography</b>	The project benefits fewer than 50 individuals  <b>1 Point</b>	The project benefits between 51 and 100 individuals  <b>4 Points</b>	The project benefits between 101 and 500 individuals  <b>6 Points</b>	The project benefits between 501 and 1000 individuals  <b>8 Points</b>	The project benefits more than 1000 individuals  <b>10 Points</b>	
<b>Project Impact Beneficiaries</b>	The project benefits a targeted population.  <b>2.5 Points</b>  <b>AND</b>  The project addresses a critical need.  <b>2.5 Points</b>					

“Critical need” would include health and safety emergencies and special needs as defined in the Consolidated Plan such as transitional housing, mobility, respite care, etc.

**7) Per Capita Funding – How much CDBG money is invested in each beneficiary?**

**5 points possible**

<b>Project CDBG \$'s per Beneficiary</b>	<b>&gt;\$800</b>	<b>\$401-800</b>	<b>\$201-400</b>	<b>\$101-200</b>	<b>\$1-100</b>	
	<b>1 point</b>	<b>2 points</b>	<b>3 points</b>	<b>4 points</b>	<b>5 points</b>	

**8) Does the project have competitive matching funds or leverage of funds?**

**10 points possible**

<b>Applicant contribution and any other outside funding (Beneficiary Population &gt;5,000)</b> Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in project	>40%	30.1-40%	20.1-30%	10.1-20%	<10%	
	<b>10 Points</b>	<b>7.5 Points</b>	<b>5 Points</b>	<b>2.5 Points</b>	<b>0 Points</b>	
<b>Applicant contribution and any other outside funding (Beneficiary Population 1,001-5,000)</b> Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in project	>30%	23.1-30%	15.1-23%	7.1-15%	<7%	
	<b>10 Points</b>	<b>7.5 Points</b>	<b>5 Points</b>	<b>2.5 Points</b>	<b>0 Points</b>	
<b>Applicant contribution and any other outside funding (Beneficiary Population 501-1,000)</b> Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in project	>20%	15.1-20%	10.1-15%	5.1-10%	<5%	
	<b>10 Points</b>	<b>7.5 Points</b>	<b>5 Points</b>	<b>2.5 Points</b>	<b>0 Points</b>	
<b>Applicant contribution and any other outside funding (Beneficiary Population &lt;500)</b> Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in project	>10%	7.1-10%	4.1-7%	1-4%	<1%	
	<b>10 Points</b>	<b>7.5 Points</b>	<b>5 Points</b>	<b>2.5 Points</b>	<b>0 Points</b>	

# Bear River Region

## CDBG Allocation Policies

### 2019 Funding Year

- 1) The Bear River Regional Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) project rating and ranking and funding allocation process will be administered by the Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG) Community Investment Council (the Council). This council is created by and responsible as a sub-committee to the BRAG Governing Board. Its core composition shall consist of at least one county and one city elected official from each county. All elected officials serving on the BRAG Community Investment Council shall also serve as members of the BRAG Governing Board. At least one representative for each of the following categories must be seated on the council: low income persons, small business owners, and private lenders. It will consist of no more than ten (10) members. Appointments of members shall be made by the BRAG Governing Board. Elected officials shall have no specified term of office. Other Council members shall serve two-year terms and may be reappointed.
- 2) The highest ranked CDBG project will be funded first. As a rule, funding requests will not be reduced if it would mean a reduced scale of the project unless the project is the last one funded. The next ranked project will be considered and funded similarly. This process will continue until the funds available are exhausted.
- 3) In the event of a tie for the last funding position, the project with the most project beneficiaries will be funded.
- 4) After all requests have been fully funded in the order of their Rating and Ranking prioritization and a balance remains insufficient for the next project in priority to complete a project in the current year, the available funds will be first applied to the highest scoring project and then to the next project, etc.
- 5) Any project that does not score a minimum of 40 points in the BRAG Rating & Ranking Application will not be considered for funding.
- 6) Applicants must participate in the regional consolidated planning process which ensures that projects considered for funding are those which are of high priority and part of the applicant's previous planning process. Applicants and those submitting projects through a sponsoring city or county must make reasonable effort to amend the sponsor's capital improvement list in a timely manner as determined by the Council.
- 7) The Council and BRAG staff will review and rate and rank all applications. The Council determines final rating and ranking and recommends to the Governing Board for approval.
- 8) These policies will be revised annually and will be published for public comment in August preceding the program year.

9) Since funds are available from the Safe Drinking Water Committee and the Board of Water Resources, the maximum CDBG allocation per water project will be 50% of total project cost.

10) The Council may request an allocation of emergency funding outside of the regular CDBG application cycle from or on behalf of a city or county, from the next program year's allocation, (i.e. 2020). The Council has defined "emergency" to mean any public health and safety crisis experienced by a city or county which could not have been foreseen (i.e. fire, flood, act of God) and where no other alternative funding or temporary solution is available. Such projects must meet a CDBG national objective. The Council will review and forward all such applications to the State CDBG Policy Committee for final approval on a case by case basis.

11) When a city or county presents a project that is intended to address an emergency situation that is a clear threat to public health and safety, the Council may determine said project to meet the urgent need national objective of the CDBG program. In this case the applicant may present their application in accordance with Policy 7 above. There are strict CDBG program requirements that must be met. State CDBG staff will determine if the project meets the national thresholds.

12) When an applicant submits more than one application, only the highest ranked application will be considered for funding unless all other projects have been funded. This excludes applications that are sponsored by a city or county on behalf of another organization.

13) The minimum CDBG allocation per project will be \$30,000 and the maximum shall be \$200,000. At the discretion of the Council, applicants can request the ceiling be raised for their projects based on the following: multiple entity collaboration or emergency health and safety needs. Any applicant that receives the maximum award of \$200,000 must wait 24 months before applying for a new grant.

14) Multiple year projects are discouraged and will be allowed only at the discretion of the Council for a maximum of two (2) years. The applicant must demonstrate clearly why two years are required to complete the project.

15) The Council may approve regional CDBG set-asides under the following three conditions: a) they are consistent with the priorities established in the Bear River District Consolidated Plan; b) they are approved prior to the CDBG applicant "How-to-Apply" meetings for the region; and c) the opportunity for public comment is accommodated by publishing the proposed allocation on the State Public Notice website and receiving public input via a public hearing.

16) Public service providers, traditionally non-profit organizations, are encouraged to apply for CDBG funds for capital improvements and major durable equipment purchases. Examples are fixtures, construction, remodeling, and facility expansion. State policy prohibits the use of CDBG funds for operations and maintenance. This includes paying administrative costs, salaries, purchasing non-durable equipment, supplies, etc. No more than 15 percent of the state's yearly allocation of funds may be expended for public service activities.

17) BRAG will only act as sponsor for non-profit organizations with CDBG projects having regional implications.

18) Should an applicant feel that their project was unfairly rated, ranked, or otherwise considered by the Council, they may file a grievance in writing no later than ten (10) business days following the Rating & Ranking date of March 27, 2019 to Brian Carver, Community & Economic Development Director, Bear River Association of Governments, 170 North Main, Logan, Utah. Responses will be provided in writing within 15 business days of receipt. If a response satisfactory to the aggrieved is not issued by the Committee, an appeal may be made to the BRAG Governing Board. Any appeal of the local determination made by the BRAG Governing Board should be filed with the State of Utah CDBG Policy Board, as set forth in the State of Utah CDBG policies and procedures.

## **REGIONAL PROJECT ALLOCATIONS 2019**

The following set-asides are recommended for the 2019 CDBG Program Year.

**A) ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING (\$50,000):**

In order to assure that applicants have the assistance they need in accessing the CDBG Program, \$35,000 will be provided to fund staff at the Bear River Association of Governments to help the CDBG applicants in Box Elder, Cache, and Rich Counties; and \$15,000 will be provided to complete the Regional Consolidated Plan Action Plan Update.

**B) ASSISTANCE TO LOW INCOME FAMILIES FOR WATER/SEWER REPAIRS OR HOOK-UPS AND HOUSING REHABILITATION (\$40,000):**

In order to remedy health hazards associated with failing water and waste water systems and provide urgently needed housing rehabilitation, BRAG will operate a grant/loan program to assist low income families in Box Elder, Cache, and Rich Counties.

**C) DELIVERY OF HOUSING REHAB PROGRAM (\$19,250):**

Single Family Housing Rehab program delivery costs for BRAG staff.

**D) FIRST TIME HOME BUYER PROGRAM (\$55,000):**

Up to \$2,000 loan to first time low to moderate income home buyers to pay costs related to purchasing a home. Grantees must complete home ownership workshops. \$10,000 will be used to provide homeownership workshops. (\$5,250 in Administration)