

CR-05 - Goals and Outcomes

Progress the jurisdiction has made in carrying out its strategic plan and its action plan. 91.520(a)

This could be an overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the program year.

One of the highlights was the continued collaborative decision-making process for the grant funds. This includes the County Mayor, the Mayors of the Urban County participating cities and the leaders of the unincorporated areas. This method creates a more streamlined, efficient and effective grant process for everyone involved and enables the County to collectively have a greater impact on the challenges faced on a regional basis. It is focused on programs meeting specific goals and priorities with measurable outcomes that make an impact on the lives of the clients they serve.

Using a Collective Impact approach, Salt Lake County is working with providers and other stakeholders to set a common agenda, determine outcome measures, and foster a culture of continuous improvement in homeless service delivery. To guide these efforts, Mayor McAdams convened a Collective Impact on Homelessness Steering Committee in early 2015. Thus far, the Committee has adopted a common vision and recommended 14 strategically linked outcomes to help redesign the homeless service system and align funding so that we reach our collective vision. This is a major initiative for all parties involved. The common vision is, "In Salt Lake County, provide housing and services as quickly as possible to those who are homeless. We want everyone in our community to have a safe place to live. We want our homeless housing and services solutions to be system-oriented rather than agency-oriented and to promote engagement rather than enablement. We use our collective expertise, resources and data to continuously improve our homeless housing and service systems so that they are safe, integrated, efficient and focused on self-sufficiency." These shared outcomes signify support for a redesign of the homeless housing and service system. This will require coordination with the State, local governments, service providers, businesses, community leaders, private funders and representatives of individuals who are homeless. This initiative continues to move forward and is providing decisions founded on the shared outcomes, public engagement efforts and transparency.

Comparison of the proposed versus actual outcomes for each outcome measure submitted with the consolidated plan and explain, if applicable, why progress was not made toward meeting goals and objectives. 91.520(g)

Categories, priority levels, funding sources and amounts, outcomes/objectives, goal outcome indicators, units of measure, targets, actual outcomes/outputs, and percentage completed for each of the grantee's program year goals.

Goal	Category	Source / Amount	Indicator	Unit of Measure	Expected – Strategic Plan	Actual – Strategic Plan	Percent Complete	Expected – Program Year	Actual – Program Year	Percent Complete
Decent Housing H-1: Housing Rehab & Accessibility	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	1300	175	13.46%	275	210	76.36%
Decent Housing H-2: Homeownership	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Homeowner Housing Added	Household Housing Unit	5	0	0.00%	5	4	80.00%
Decent Housing H-2: Homeownership	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Homeowner Housing Rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	5	0	0.00%			
Decent Housing H-2: Homeownership	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers	Households Assisted	40	60	150.00%	53	60	113.21%
Decent Housing H-6: Rental Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	100	0	0.00%	100	0	0.00%

Decent Housing H-6: Rental Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	100	0	0.00%			
Decent Housing H-7: Senior Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / ESG: \$	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	60	0	0.00%			
Decent Housing H-8: Special Needs Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	20	0	0.00%			
Decent Housing H-8: Special Needs Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	20	0	0.00%			
Decent Housing Homeless and Special Needs -3	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / ESG: \$	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	10	0	0.00%			
Decent Housing Homeless and Special Needs -3	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / ESG: \$	Rental units rehabilitated	Household Housing Unit	10	0	0.00%			
Decent Housing Homeless-1: Rental Housing	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / ESG: \$	Rental units constructed	Household Housing Unit	20	0	0.00%			

Decent Housing Homeless-2: Rental Assistance-RRH	Affordable Housing	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	295	0	0.00%	219	251	114.61%
Economic Opportunity & Job Creation	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Facade treatment/business building rehabilitation	Business	0	0		0	0	
Economic Opportunity & Job Creation	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Jobs created/retained	Jobs	100	6	6.00%	20	6	30.00%
Economic Opportunity & Job Creation	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Businesses assisted	Businesses Assisted	75	20	26.67%	15	20	133.33%
Housing H-3: Social Services-Stability & Safety	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	1200	3861	321.75%	625	3861	617.76%

Housing H-3: Social Services- Stability & Safety	Homeless Non- Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Households Assisted	0	975		100	975	975.00%
Housing H-3: Social Services- Stability & Safety	Homeless Non- Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing	Households Assisted	0	48		25	48	192.00%
Housing H-3: Social Services- Stability & Safety	Homeless Non- Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	0	2242		625	2242	358.72%
Housing H-3: Social Services- Stability & Safety	Homeless Non- Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Homelessness Prevention	Persons Assisted	0	0		10	0	0.00%

Housing H-4: Social Services- Access to Crisis Serv	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	20000	4802	24.01%	4000	4802	120.05%
Housing H-4: Social Services- Access to Crisis Serv	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Households Assisted	625	214	34.24%	125	214	171.20%
Housing H-4: Social Services- Access to Crisis Serv	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	2450	2140	87.35%	490	2140	436.73%
Housing H-5: Social Services- Econ Independence	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Households Assisted	100	0	0.00%			
Sustainable Living Environment CD- 2 Infrastructure	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	10000	4274	42.74%	4000	4274	106.85%

Sustainable Living Environment CD-3 Public Fac.	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	25000	22640	90.56%	10000	22640	226.40%
Sustainable Living Environment CD-3 Public Fac.	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Homeless Person Overnight Shelter	Persons Assisted	0	30		0	30	
Sustainable Living Environment CD-3 Public Fac.	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Overnight/Emergency Shelter/Transitional Housing Beds added	Beds	0	30		0	30	
Sustainable Living Environment CD-4 Neighborhood	Non-Housing Community Development	CDBG: \$ / HOME: \$ / ESG: \$	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit	Persons Assisted	5000	4400	88.00%	1000	4400	440.00%

Table 1 - Accomplishments – Program Year & Strategic Plan to Date

Assess how the jurisdiction's use of funds, particularly CDBG, addresses the priorities and specific objectives identified in the plan, giving special attention to the highest priority activities identified.

The priorities outlined in the Consolidated Plan for 2015-2020 included Housing, Access to Crisis Services, Economic Independence or Support, Stability and Safety, and Infrastructure Improvements. All applicants were required to apply for projects that addressed one of these categories to be given consideration for funding. In addition to meeting one of the priorities, each applicant was required to provide the outcomes they would provide and the impact the program would have on the lives of their clients or the impact a project would have on the neighborhood.

CR-10 - Racial and Ethnic composition of families assisted

Describe the families assisted (including the racial and ethnic status of families assisted).

91.520(a)

	CDBG	HOME	ESG
White	24,817	931	0
Black or African American	3,034	94	0
Asian	490	56	0
American Indian or American Native	1,553	21	0
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	415	9	0
Total	30,309	1,111	0
Hispanic	5,263	162	0
Not Hispanic	25,046	949	0

Table 2 – Table of assistance to racial and ethnic populations by source of funds

Narrative

The families and individuals served with the federal funding is reflective of the population of the County as a whole. The largest minority group in 2010 in Salt Lake County was Hispanic/Latino which accounted for 17.1% of the total population. CDBG served 5,263 clients that identified as Hispanic/Latino which represents 17.3% of the 30,309 clients served. The HOME program had slightly lower but similar numbers with 162 households representing 14.6% of the 1,111 households served.

The County has stressed the importance of providing outreach to all underserved populations for all programming. This is covered in the two trainings that are provided to all agencies interested in applying for the federal dollars and again during the contract training provided to agencies that are successful recipients of the funds. Outreach and non-discrimination is also assessed for all agencies when they are monitored during the program year.

For a more detailed description of those households living in rental housing, whose development was in part financed by the Salt Lake County HOME funds, see section CR-50. Through the Lead Safe Salt Lake Program and the Green & Healthy Homes Initiative Salt Lake, we have implemented a continuous outreach effort to identify those with the greatest health and housing needs. We target outreach to the neighborhoods with the oldest housing, lowest income households and the highest concentration of children. The outreach has been effective in generating applications for our two main programs and providing education on available resources and the need for a healthy home.

The ESG Program does not collect demographic information in IDIS or in HMIS.

CR-15 - Resources and Investments 91.520(a)

Identify the resources made available

Source of Funds	Source	Resources Made Available	Amount Expended During Program Year
CDBG			1,369,118
HOME			1,279,801
ESG			200,462

Table 3 - Resources Made Available

Narrative

The CDBG funds include the grant allocation and \$300,000 in Program Income which consists of loan payments received from economic development and housing loans. Programming was allocated for Administration, Economic Development, Housing activities, Public and facility improvements and Community & Support Services. Many of the contracts for facility and public improvements are two-year contracts due to the timing of the grant and the construction season here in Utah. It often takes this additional time to fully expend the funds.

The ESG Funds included only the grant allocation. Funds were allocated for Administration, Emergency Shelter (shelter operations & essential services), Street Outreach, and Rapid Re-Housing. All funds were expended during the fiscal year; however, not all funds were drawn during the fiscal year because June expenses are never drawn until at least the end of July when agencies are able to close their books.

The HOME funding included the grant allocation, \$1,837,516 in Program Income and \$395,870 in prior year resources. Funding was allocated for Administration, Acquisition, Homebuyer Assistance, Homeowner Rehabilitation, Tenant-Based Rental Assistance, Multi-Family Rental Housing, and New Construction.

The County works in concert with the nonprofit social services providers to identify gaps in service delivery and enhance coordination among providers. As the regional government for the Salt Lake Valley, Salt Lake County understands that a collaborative, thoughtful approach to regional planning will help us maintain the small town feel that sets us apart from other metropolitan regions. The Office of Regional Development works collaboratively with state and local governments, businesses, and community organizations to accomplish goals today so we can have "The Future We Choose" for our families and our homes. The Program Managers from Community Development, Housing, Green & Healthy Homes Initiative, Social Services Block Grant, the Lead Program, AmeriCorps, and Homeless Services all participate along with the Division Executives in coordination, issue identification and program implementation for the effective use of resources. This helps eliminate the duplication of funding and ensures the County is able to receive the greatest benefit from the limited resources available from the County and from Federal and State Grants.

Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Target Area	Planned Percentage of Allocation	Actual Percentage of Allocation	Narrative Description
Salt Lake County	75	100	Activities funded were either located in eligible areas of the County or served eligible residents

Table 4 – Identify the geographic distribution and location of investments

Narrative

For the CDBG Program, maps have been included in the Attachment section of this report of the eligible areas for the Urban County and of the eligible Census tracts for the Urban County which delineate the low- to moderate-income areas located in Salt Lake County. The Analysis of Impediments indicates that there is a need to improve access to economic opportunities (jobs) and housing choice. There is a concentration of low-income minority populations in West Valley City and Salt Lake City that often limit these choices. The overall strategy is to reduce the barriers to choices that the low-income households face. By funding various programs through CDBG, ESG, HOME and the other funding, we work to reduce these barriers for the residents of the Urban County.

Leveraging

Explain how federal funds leveraged additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements were satisfied, as well as how any publicly owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that were used to address the needs identified in the plan.

The County has encouraged the funding of activities that bring other resources to the table. In all housing development projects involving construction of both rental and home ownership undertaken with HOME funds, the County continues to average a ten-to-one leveraging ratio. The additional funds have come from tax credits, financial institutions, other governmental agencies, and, in some cases, owners' equity. CDBG activities have also had matching funds voluntarily brought into the mix. A major part of the application review and recommendation process is to ensure that each applicant includes some form of additional, non-federal funds into their program or project. For the HOME Investment Partnership Program, Salt Lake County provides \$200,000 cash match from the general fund. This match is committed to help with the development and construction of homes in the Magna and Kearns areas through the contract with Community Development Corporation of Utah and Habitat of Humanity.

The Emergency Solutions Grant requires a 100% match. Each of the agencies receiving ESG dollars leveraged at the required 100%. Specific ESG matching sources include Burton Foundation, Eccles Foundation, TANF funding, and Utah Critical Needs funds from the State of Utah. See below for other ways the County is leveraging resources for a broader impact on the identified needs of County residents.

During this time period, Salt Lake County also administered a Lead-Based Hazard Contract Grant for \$2.5 million. A total of 112 housing units were made lead safe.

Fiscal Year Summary – HOME Match	
1. Excess match from prior Federal fiscal year	470,034
2. Match contributed during current Federal fiscal year	200,000
3. Total match available for current Federal fiscal year (Line 1 plus Line 2)	670,034
4. Match liability for current Federal fiscal year	85,706
5. Excess match carried over to next Federal fiscal year (Line 3 minus Line 4)	584,328

Table 5 – Fiscal Year Summary - HOME Match Report

Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year								
Project No. or Other ID	Date of Contribution	Cash (non-Federal sources)	Foregone Taxes, Fees, Charges	Appraised Land/Real Property	Required Infrastructure	Site Preparation, Construction Materials, Donated labor	Bond Financing	Total Match
CDCU rehab	07/01/2015	200,000	0	0	0	0	0	200,000

Table 6 – Match Contribution for the Federal Fiscal Year

HOME MBE/WBE report

Program Income – Enter the program amounts for the reporting period				
Balance on hand at begin-ning of reporting period \$	Amount received during reporting period \$	Total amount expended during reporting period \$	Amount expended for TBRA \$	Balance on hand at end of reporting period \$
0	476,935	476,935	0	0

Table 7 – Program Income

Minority Business Enterprises and Women Business Enterprises – Indicate the number and dollar value of contracts for HOME projects completed during the reporting period						
	Total	Minority Business Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Contracts						
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	Women Business Enterprises	Male			
Contracts						
Dollar Amount	0	0	0			
Number	0	0	0			
Sub-Contracts						
Number	0	0	0			
Dollar Amount	0	0	0			

Table 8 – Minority Business and Women Business Enterprises

Minority Owners of Rental Property – Indicate the number of HOME assisted rental property owners and the total amount of HOME funds in these rental properties assisted						
	Total	Minority Property Owners				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dollar Amount	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 9 – Minority Owners of Rental Property

Relocation and Real Property Acquisition – Indicate the number of persons displaced, the cost of relocation payments, the number of parcels acquired, and the cost of acquisition						
Parcels Acquired		0		0		
Businesses Displaced		0		0		
Nonprofit Organizations Displaced		0		0		
Households Temporarily Relocated, not Displaced		0		0		
Households Displaced	Total	Minority Property Enterprises				White Non-Hispanic
		Alaskan Native or American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	
Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 10 – Relocation and Real Property Acquisition

CR-20 - Affordable Housing 91.520(b)

Evaluation of the jurisdiction's progress in providing affordable housing, including the number and types of families served, the number of extremely low-income, low-income, moderate-income, and middle-income persons served.

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of homeless households to be provided affordable housing units		
Number of non-homeless households to be provided affordable housing units		
Number of special-needs households to be provided affordable housing units		
Total		

Table 11 – Number of Households

	One-Year Goal	Actual
Number of households supported through Acquisition of Existing Units	0	0
Total	0	0

Table 12 – Number of Households Supported

Discuss the difference between goals and outcomes and problems encountered in meeting these goals.

Two rental housing projects will begin construction in the fall of 2016: 58 units for seniors at Sharon Gardens and 132 units for low-income households at Liberty Village. A third 130 rental unit project for those with disabilities will also possibly start construction by the spring of 2017.

Discuss how these outcomes will impact future annual action plans.

This will help meet those goals as stated in the five year plan

Include the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons served by each activity where information on income by family size is required to determine the eligibility of the activity.

Number of Persons Served	CDBG Actual	HOME Actual
Extremely Low-income	40	251
Low-income	8	0
Moderate-income	0	70
Total	48	321

Table 13 – Number of Persons Served

Narrative Information

Several initiatives are occurring to help reduce the number of poverty-level families. The improvement in the economy has increased the number of jobs that are available. The Collective Impact for Homelessness is part of an effort to more effectively help low-income households become self-sufficient and divert families from homelessness. Improving the health of homes through the Green & Healthy Homes Initiative helps low-income families with severely sick children to become more stable, be able to keep jobs, and help the children to attend school. Providing education and case management through the Community & Support Services that support individuals and families in becoming more self-sufficient and reducing dependency is ultimately assisting these families to work their way out of poverty.

The tenant-based rental assistance provided through the HOME Investment Partnership Program with the Road Home, the Housing Authority of the County of Salt Lake, and the Utah Community Action Program assisted 251 households. Down-payment assistance was provided to 22 households, and housing rehabilitation assistance was provided to 44 households. Four idea house were completed by CDCU and sold to moderate-income households.

CR-25 - Homeless and Other Special Needs 91.220(d, e); 91.320(d, e); 91.520(c)
Evaluate the jurisdiction's progress in meeting its specific objectives for reducing and ending homelessness through:

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

A Collective Impact Steering Committee on homelessness has been formed. Members of the Committee include: State and local Government and representation from the CoC Board and HMIS Lead. Members of the Committee are meeting monthly for two hours to refine local efforts on reducing homelessness. The Committee is creating: 1) a shared community vision 2) a set of 14 shared outcomes 3) clear, defined, measurable indicators and 4) a shared evaluation lens for funding decisions.

The CoC also works with Con Plan Jurisdictions on a specific basis: 1) Grant Coordination meetings; Meetings are held every six months for two hours. The CoC presents info about goals, system performance, policy priorities, and data. 2) CoC provides PIT level data for the Salt Lake County HOME Consortium Consolidated Plan and ESG CAPER reports.

Further, the CoC works with ESG recipients on a specific basis. This includes: 1) a formal mechanism to provide CoC perspective on ESG funding for 2/3 ESG recipients 2) training on HEARTH system performance measures to 3/3 ESG recipients 3) narrative and PIT data input on CAPER reporting for evaluation of outcomes to 3/3 ESG recipients. Further, 3/3 ESG recipients sit on the CoC ranking committee and receive training and instruction on CoC funded project performance standards and evaluation of outcomes which includes APR, PIT, and HIC level data.

In addition, the CoC applied and was accepted into Zero: 2016 which is centered on ending Veteran and Chronic Homelessness. Part of the application process was a MOA signed by the CoC Collaborative Applicant, CoC Board, HMIS Lead, PHAs, Local VA, City and County Mayors, largest Emergency Shelter, and largest non-PHA homeless housing provider. In conjunction with Zero: 2016, the work of MOA stakeholders has led to the use of a named list for homeless veterans and chronically homeless individuals, monthly housing placement tracking, and monthly housing placement goals.

Service providers engage unsheltered individuals by outreach to the following locations: parks, nature areas, convenience stores, motels, recreation centers, libraries, shopping malls, and mass transit stops. The CoC has four main outreach programs: 1) Homeless Outreach Program - provides basic survival items. Once contact is established, outreach staff will refer the homeless individual to agencies in the community that conduct human services work. 2) Medical Outreach Services Team brings medical assistance to clients living on the street; also provides referrals to services and housing. 3) Library Engagement Team focuses outreach to individuals who gather at the Salt Lake City library; work to identify each person's needs and link them with other services and housing. 4) Street Engagement Team focuses outreach to individuals who gather in the downtown area. They assess needs and set up a

system to refer unsheltered persons into services and housing.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

The CoC developed a Coordinated Access plan in 2014. Domestic Violence (DV) is considered in any interaction and referrals are made to ensure safety. Homeless and at-risk households enter and receive information about the system through many access points, including agencies, outreach, or community entities. Once identified, the household is assessed for prevention or diversion. If neither intervention nor diversion is appropriate and/or available, the household is referred to shelter. There are 3 housing processes in place for homeless persons in the CoC:

1) Rapid Rehousing and Progressive Engagement available to all families; 2) Housing placement process for Veterans; 3) Chronically Homeless. These processes are communicated to staff from referral and access points through regular training. Recent topics within the past year have included: Chronically Homeless Housing Prioritization, Veteran Housing Placement, Family Referral Process, and Diversion.

The CoC is further committed to rapidly rehousing every family that becomes homeless within 30 days of becoming homeless, on the street or entering shelter. The CoC works on this by: 1) Using the AHAR to track length of time spent in ES; 2) Participating in Cloudburst RRH study to better understand the number of families who resolve their homelessness within 30 days without accepting the offered RRH assistance; 3) VA, CoC, TANF, and ESG funding sources are used for RRH; In FY15, 797 households were rapidly re-housed; 4) Central RRH provider accepts referrals from DV, outreach, and other homeless assistance providers; 5) CoC utilizes progressive engagement to ensure housing stability; all homeless families are offered RRH assistance; 6) Having staff dedicated to managing and maintaining landlord relationships; 7) Adding 5,000 units of affordable housing within 5 years. Initiative adopted by Salt Lake City.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: likely to become homeless after being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); and, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

The CoC has adopted many strategies to reduce the number of individuals and families who become homeless for the first time:

1) A homeless prevention/diversion program is funded by SL County to identify and assist individuals and families at risk of homelessness with rental assistance and landlord tenant mediation services; 2) The State of Utah conducted a study on the use of prevention monies funded by HPRP; lessons from the study have been incorporated into current diversion and targeting techniques; 3) The State and CAP began a pilot diversion project at the emergency shelter. The project uses the VI-SPDAT to assess clients

and determine service needs; 4) Collective Impact Steering Committee has adopted an outcome measure that focuses on those at risk of homelessness and prioritizing diversion techniques as well a separate prevention measure. This allows community planners to identify risk factors and determine appropriate solutions at a systems planning level.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again

Our HMIS Lead drafted system performance measure reports in 2014 enabling us to track the length of time individuals and families remain homeless. Reports include average the average number of days in-shelter for individuals/families and average number of months in transitional housing. Since that time, we have:

1) Increased RRH efforts through the use of TANF, CoC and ESG dollars; 2) Are working to improve efficiency and effectiveness of RRH through lessons learned by participating in a Cloudburst RRH study; 3) The principles of Progressive Engagement for families have been adopted Continuum wide; 4) Adopted prioritization guidance for PSH projects giving priority to those with the highest service needs and the longest histories of homelessness; 5) Adopted the use of VI-SPDAT assessment as one of part of the procedure for placing CH persons in housing; 6) Developed a Pay for Success project will operationalize in late 2016. The Pay for Success project will provide rapid rehousing services to long term shelter stayers.

CR-30 - Public Housing 91.220(h); 91.320(j)

Actions taken to address the needs of public housing

The housing needs of low-income individuals in Salt Lake County remains substantial. The Section 8 Housing Program continues to feel the constraints of the federal sequester, and, as the public housing ages, there are significant needs for building modernization and improvement. The Housing Authority of the County of Salt Lake (HACSL) increased affordable housing units and rental subsidies by completing construction on phase two of the Bud Bailey Apartments, increased housing rental assistance by 24 VASH Vouchers, and provided supportive services that helped residents maintain their housing assistance and gain skills to increase self-sufficiency. They created the ROSS Program and increased after-school programming from 3 days/week to 5 days/week for youth in three public housing and special needs properties. Two hundred twenty-seven public housing households who were at risk of losing their housing assistance received case management services. Eighty-eight percent of these households were able to maintain their housing assistance. Fifteen clients successfully completed the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) program receiving a combined total of \$111,449.36 in escrow. Seven FSS households moved off of housing assistance, and three of these families became first-time homebuyers.

Salt Lake County works closely with HACSL to provide TBRA funding for special populations to assist with the availability of rental housing options. HACSL works to preserve their existing buildings and grounds through the preventative maintenance and capital fund programs. To prevent and reduce crime, HACSL contracts with the Unified Police Department to provide community policing in all of its developments. They have implemented smoke-free policies within the family developments and work to develop service components for residents to promote self-sufficiency so they may maintain their apartments independently.

Actions taken to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership

The Housing Authority of the County of Salt Lake works to increase resident involvement in program and policy decisions. A Resident Advisory Board (RAB) represents all of the developments and Section 8 Voucher holders living in Salt Lake County and deals with management at the executive level. The RAB serves to represent the views and concerns of HACSL residents and is one of the ways HACSL receives input about policies and procedures that affect residents. This past year, HACSL has supported the RAB by providing funding, staff support, and a meeting space. They have added three new members and implemented a new meeting schedule that includes three additional meetings per calendar year. Two of the larger properties have their own tenant association with board members elected by and consisting solely of residents. The residents meet to discuss such issues as community policy, individual resident concerns, and strategies to address such concerns. The tenant association also plans social

functions for the resident community.

Actions taken to provide assistance to troubled PHAs

The Housing Authority of the County of Salt Lake is not designated as a troubled Public Housing Authority.

CR-35 - Other Actions 91.220(j)-(k); 91.320(i)-(j)

Actions taken 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. 91.220 (j); 91.320 (i)

In the next couple of months, the County will complete the Moderate Income Housing Plan with an Analysis of Impediments Action Plan which will identify the greatest needs and outline a plan to address and mitigate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing. We work with all the jurisdictions within the HOME Consortium to provide information and learning opportunities as they become available.

Salt Lake County continues to have a strategic focus on the barriers to affordable housing. The most cost-effective and practical approach includes job training, case management, counseling, and crisis intervention. This approach has been integrated into the program design for our Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing funding received through the Community & Support Services funding. We consistently work with the Apartment Association and housing providers to ensure compliance with fair housing laws and the requirements of the federal funding we receive. Recently, a better agreement between the service provider and the landlord was designed that more clearly met HUD guidelines and was less concerning to the property owners. This was definitely a positive move forward. The County works with the Disability Law Center to facilitate solutions to any issues identified with projects or housing providers.

Salt Lake County is actively involved with, often provides funding, and coordinates activities that promote Family Self-sufficiency. Salt Lake County Housing Authority has a strong self-sufficiency program. Salt Lake County also provides funding to the Salt Lake County Community Action Program to cover the cost of financial planning and a rental housing outreach program. Salt Lake County Division of Youth Services administers a Youth Program for the State of Utah Department of Workforce Services. This funding helps cover the cost of providing job training and schooling for 500 young adults each year. Utah Community Action Program administers the Salt Lake Head Start Program.

A new development in the West Millcreek area has been approved by the County called the Artesian Springs Development. This is a \$51 million investment and includes housing, small businesses, restaurants, and excellent access to mass transit.

Actions taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

Actions taken to reduce lead-based paint hazards. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

The strongest comprehensive effort by Salt Lake County to address and meet underserved needs is the Collective Impact Initiative for Homelessness. From this effort, additional resources are coming from the State of Utah to help fund the development and construction of a new homeless shelter and housing for very low-income households. The four key categories for outcomes include outcomes for those at risk for or experiencing homelessness, improving our homeless services and housing systems, preventing homelessness, and ensuring that all neighborhoods in which homeless services are offered are welcoming and safe for all who live, work, recreate, receive services, or do business there. A pay for success project is being put together to further help the homeless. The GHHI/UUHP pay for success, the Lead Safe Salt Lake Program, and the GHHI Home Improvement Program for those with asthma are bringing the community together to provide coordinated assistance to those with critical health conditions and substandard housing. These initiatives are also working with the medical community to coordinate assistance for households most in need. Most of those to be assisted are underserved and lack resources to mitigate the challenges they face.

Actions taken to reduce the number of poverty-level families. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

There are several initiatives which will help reduce the number of poverty level families. The GHHI effort will stabilize families through improving the condition of the home, which leads to improved health, so children are more often able to go to school and free their parents to pursue full-time employment. The Collective Impact on Homelessness also provides assistance to families by diverting them from homelessness and providing support services needed to reduce dependency and increase self-sufficiency.

Actions taken to develop institutional structure. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

As the Regional government for Salt Lake County, our office works very closely with all the other Entitlement jurisdictions in the valley. A new grants management system has been implemented for both Salt Lake County and Salt Lake City, the two largest jurisdictions, to manage the grant process for the funds received through HUD. This new system has been very beneficial in streamlining the ability to identify the priorities for each jurisdiction and the outcomes needed to have a positive impact on those priorities. It has provided consistency for the non-profit entities that apply for funding and helped to ensure compliance with the guidelines and regulations attached to these funding sources. The system will take the grant process from application, through the citizen participation process, to awarding funds, contracting, reporting, billing, and closeout.

A new process has been implemented where all CDBG funds will be pooled and distributed through a collaborative decision-making process. Under this new process, both non-profit service providers and local jurisdiction applicants will apply for funding through an RFP process. The Citizen Participation Process has been amended to include a citizen review committee, which scores and ranks the applications, that better reflects the various jurisdictions. The County will then hold a joint public

hearing to solicit public input on the preliminary budget recommendations from the citizen committees. Following the public hearing, the approval body will either consent to the preliminary budget, or, in consultation with the County Mayor, recommend modifications to it. Upon receiving the final budget recommendation of the approval body, final approval will be made and submitted to HUD. This process will create a more streamlined, efficient, and effective grant process for all involved and will enable the County to collectively have a greater impact on the challenges we seek to address. The format of the Community & Economic Development Advisory Council (CEDAC) was changed to include citizens from the participating Cities and the unincorporated areas of the County to assist with the collaboration of the priorities.

Actions taken to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies. 91.220(k); 91.320(j)

The County works in concert with the nonprofit social service providers to identify gaps in service delivery and enhance coordination among providers. As the regional government for the Salt Lake Valley, Salt Lake County understands that a collaborative, thoughtful approach to regional planning will help us maintain the small town feel that sets us apart from other metropolitan regions. The Office of Regional Development works collaboratively with state and local governments, businesses, and community organizations to accomplish goals today so we can have “The Future We Choose” for our families and our homes. The Program Managers from Community Development; Housing, Green & Health Homes Initiative, Social Services Block Grant, the Lead Program, AmeriCorps, and Homeless Services all participate along with the Division Executives in coordination, issue identification, and program implementation for the effective use of resources. This helps eliminate the duplication of funding and ensures the County is able to receive the greatest benefit from the limited resources available from the County and from Federal and State Grants.

Identify actions taken to overcome the effects of any impediments identified in the jurisdictions analysis of impediments to fair housing choice. 91.520(a)

There are several efforts which improve the fair housing choice for many of the low-income households living in Salt Lake County, including:

1. HOME and ESG funding for TBRA housing programs assists very low-income households who have limited funds for housing costs and includes the efforts of the Road Home, Utah Community Action Program and the Housing Authority of the County of Salt Lake.
2. HOME funding will help finance the construction of three new affordable housing projects which will provide housing for 318 households.
3. The Moderate Income Housing Plan and the Analysis of Impediments Action plan for Salt Lake County will be completed shortly and will help promote the development of other affordable housing projects.

4. Promoting the retrofit of homes to improve energy efficiency improves the financial condition of low-income households.
5. The collective impact for homelessness addresses many of the barriers low-income households and homeless individuals and families face on the road to becoming more self-sufficient. Their efforts include providing job training, support services, decent housing, and programs with a housing first model.

CR-40 - Monitoring 91.220 and 91.230

Describe the standards and procedures used to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and used to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements

CRD conducts an annual Risk Assessment of all agencies after funding has been awarded through the various grant programs. This evaluation is performed by the Program Managers, Fiscal Manager, CRD Management, Accountants, and the Contract & Compliance Analyst (CCA). Areas included in the analysis are fiscal matters (including past audit findings), program management concerns, the impact of agency staff changes, the age and size of the agency, the most recent and the prior year's performance measurements, and the organization's experience and compliance history with CRD-funded programs.

The result provides the basis for determining the initial monitoring schedule for the year, and the group specifies programs to be reviewed on-site versus those receiving desk reviews or technical assistance. Those involved in monitoring hold monthly meetings with CRD executive management to review progress, confront issues related to monitoring, and to reassess strategies and focus.

There are several levels of monitoring. The type conducted is dependent upon many factors, including risk-analysis results, agency organization assessment, indicators of potential issues, and the availability of staff resources. The most common onsite monitoring done by the division focuses on Program or Fiscal matters, or a combination of the two, which is referred to as a Comprehensive Monitoring. Fiscal Monitorings are done by the CCA or by CRD Fiscal Staff. Program Monitorings are typically done by Program Managers, their staff, or the CCA.

Program Monitorings have specific requirements related to funding source. For example, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) monitoring involves review of specific CDBG requirements. Thus, additional funding-specific monitoring Policies and Procedures (P&Ps) supplement the overall monitoring P&Ps. Technical Assistance, Desk Reviews, and Closeout Monitorings are briefer, less formal, and generally occur in the office.

HOME program: As described in section CR-50, CRD completed on-site monitoring and inspection of 14 rental units and reviewed demographic, race, and ethnic information on 1,807 rental units. All of these units are for low-income households and provide housing for the homeless, low-income seniors, and low-income people with mental and physical disabilities. This number of affordable units helps reduce the number of households who could otherwise end up being homeless.

CDBG: 13 Construction projects were monitored for compliance with the labor and Davis Bacon requirements for facility improvements during the fiscal year. These projects included Boys & Girls Club of Greater Salt Lake, Catholic Community services, Cottonwood Heights, Salt Lake Community Action Program, House of Hope, Asian Association of Utah, Bluffdale City, First Step House, Murray City, South

Salt Lake City, Township Services, and Midvale City. Some agencies had more than one project.

Citizen Participation Plan 91.105(d); 91.115(d)

Describe the efforts to provide citizens with reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment on performance reports.

CRD actively solicits participation from public and private agencies that provide assisted housing, health services, and social services, including those focusing on services to children, elderly, persons with disabilities, persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families, and the homeless. Participation will also be sought from public and private agencies that represent minority groups living in Salt Lake County and organizations representing non-English speaking residents and limited English proficiency residents in Salt Lake County to promote dialogue on needs and program performance. The County will also consult with community-based and regionally-based organizations that represent protected class members and organizations that enforce fair housing laws when preparing both the AFH and the consolidated plan. The consultation process will include contacting regional government agencies, adjacent units of general local government, and local government agencies. This includes local government agencies with metropolitan-wide planning and transportation responsibilities, particularly for problems and solutions that go beyond a single jurisdiction.

Forms of Public Notice: All activities requiring public notice are placed on the Division of Community Resources and Development's web page at <http://www.slco.org/crd>. Public notices are published as notices in the legal section of The Salt Lake Tribune and The Deseret News at least 15 days before the date of a hearing. Press releases are sent to the County's Public Information Officer for distribution to the local media. Notice is sent to organizations that have received funds or collaborated with CRD in the past, neighborhood organizations, community councils, and any other parties on our mailing list. The list includes, but is not limited to:

- Units of local government
- Public and private agencies that provide housing, health, and social services, including those that provide services to children, elderly, disabled, persons living with HIV/AIDS
- The homeless
- Public and private agencies that represent minority groups living in Salt Lake County
- Organizations representing non-English speaking and limited English proficiency residents in Salt Lake County
- Other interested parties on the Salt Lake County CDBG mailing list.

Notice is also sent out through the County Mayor's Diversity Website email listing. As appropriate, notice will be posted on the Utah Public Notice website and on the public bulletin board outside the County Council Chambers. Notice will also be given to any person or group that requests information. Notice through social media is currently being explored.

CR-45 - CDBG 91.520(c)

Specify the nature of, and reasons for, any changes in the jurisdiction's program objectives and indications of how the jurisdiction would change its programs as a result of its experiences.

The Division of Community Resources and Development (CRD) refined the new grant process where all CDBG and ESG funds were pooled & distributed through a collaborative decision-making process. The Social Services Block Grant was included to further align funding for the priorities and needs identified in the Consolidated Plan. This process created a more streamlined & effective grant process, and it enabled the Urban County to have a greater impact on both the challenges we seek to address and the priorities set for the year. Each program continues to focus on the specific goals and outcomes.

Through the development of the Consolidated Plan and the implementation of activities, the County is more aware of the needs in specific neighborhoods. The priorities that were set for the County this year included Access to Crisis Services, Housing, Economic Independence/Support, Stability and Safety, Public Facilities and Infrastructure Improvements, and Economic Development. One of the main improvements of the new combined process is that all programs that provide services can work anywhere in the eligible Urban County rather than just within their specific city boundaries. This is just one more way to allow all the Urban Cities to participate in affordable housing programs as they complete their planning processes. This process was recognized in a publication from Georgetown University "Beeckcenter Social Impact & Innovation".

The Mayor convened a Collective Impact on Homelessness Steering Committee which has adopted a common vision and recommended 14 outcomes to help redesign the homeless service system and align funding so we can reach our collective vision. The common vision is, "In Salt Lake County, provide housing and services as quickly as possible to those who are homeless. We want everyone in our community to have a safe place to live. We want our homeless housing and services solutions to be system-oriented rather than agency-oriented and to promote engagement rather than enablement. We use our collective expertise, resources and data to continuously improve our homeless housing and service systems so that they are safe, integrated, efficient and focused on self-sufficiency."

The shared outcomes signify support for a redesign of the homeless housing & service system, describe how we will get there, and provide a set of clear, defined & measurable indicators, and shared data to tell us how we are progressing. The four key categories include:

- Outcomes for those at risk for or experiencing homelessness
- Improving our homeless services & housing systems
- Preventing homelessness
- Ensuring that all neighborhoods in which homeless services are offered are welcoming & safe for all who live, work, recreate, receive services, or do business there

The County continues to refine and expand its housing improvement program. This program is meeting the critical housing improvement needs of lower income households, disabled, and elderly residents. A meeting of all housing service providers is held each month to discuss any issues, new programs that might be available, updates on policies or programs, and discuss any changes that may need addressing. Agencies that provide complementing services are also invited to attend so that residents are able to take advantage of all programs available to assist with housing improvements. This includes the Lead Hazard Control Program administered by the County. The slowly rebounding economic times, along with deep cuts in federal revenue budgets, have had a huge impact on the ability of the County to provide services to the public. As always, increased resources would help meet more of the specific goals and the identified needs of the low- to moderate-income community.

Does this Jurisdiction have any open Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grants?	No
--	----

[BEDI grantees] Describe accomplishments and program outcomes during the last year.

CR-50 - HOME 91.520(d)

Include the results of on-site inspections of affordable rental housing assisted under the program to determine compliance with housing codes and other applicable regulations

Please list those projects that should have been inspected on-site this program year based upon the schedule in §92.504(d). Indicate which of these were inspected and a summary of issues that were detected during the inspection. For those that were not inspected, please indicate the reason and how you will remedy the situation.

We completed monitoring and inspection of 14 rental housing projects that included 654 units of which 64 were HOME units.

The projects monitored and inspected include the following: Aspenview, 16 units for the homeless, 4 home assisted; Artspace project, 53 units for low income households, 2 HOME assisted; Gerald Wright, 79 units for low income seniors, 4 HOME assisted; Grace Mary Manor, 84 units for the homeless, 5 HOME assisted; Liberty City Walk, 73 units for low income households, 2 HOME assisted units; Campbell Court, 26 units for the homeless, 5 HOME assisted; Merrill (202 project), 30 units for those with disabilities, 3 HOME assisted; Pleasant Villa, 10 units for those with disabilities, 4 HOME assisted units; Safe Haven 1, 25 units for those with mental disabilities, 2 HOME assisted units; Safe Haven 2, 24 units for those with mental disabilities, 4 HOME assisted units; Taylorsville Senior Housing, 60 units for low income seniors, 6 HOME assisted; Valley Horizon, 20 units for those with mental disabilities, 6 HOME assisted units; Valley Wood, 89 units for those with mental disabilities, 7 HOME assisted units; West Jordan Senior Housing, 65 units for low income seniors, 10 HOME assisted units.

Provide an assessment of the jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions for HOME units. 92.351(b)

We also monitored all projects for compliance with fair housing requirements. Of the 1,807 units, 74.49% or 1,449 units are occupied by White households, 7.58% or 134 units are occupied by African-American households, 7.75% or 140 units are occupied by Asian households, 14.83% or 268 units are occupied by Hispanic households, and 8.02% or 145 units are occupied by other minority households.

No issues were identified, and all properties were encourage to complete outreach to those with disabilities and other protected classes.

Refer to IDIS reports to describe the amount and use of program income for projects, including the number of projects and owner and tenant characteristics

A total of \$476,935.96 was received in HOME program income. This program income helped cover the

cost of the TBRA and GHHI programs. Assistance was provided to 251 households with Tenant Based Rental Assistance and 48 households received assistance through the GHHI program.

Describe other actions taken to foster and maintain affordable housing. 91.220(k) (STATES ONLY: Including the coordination of LIHTC with the development of affordable housing). 91.320(j)

CR-60 - ESG 91.520(g) (ESG Recipients only)

ESG Supplement to the CAPER in *e-snaps*

For Paperwork Reduction Act

1. Recipient Information—All Recipients Complete

Basic Grant Information

Recipient Name	SALT LAKE COUNTY
Organizational DUNS Number	128055613
EIN/TIN Number	876000316
Identify the Field Office	DENVER
Identify CoC(s) in which the recipient or subrecipient(s) will provide ESG assistance	Salt Lake City & County CoC

ESG Contact Name

Prefix	Ms
First Name	KAREN
Middle Name	E
Last Name	WILEY
Suffix	0
Title	Community Development Manager

ESG Contact Address

Street Address 1	2001 S. State St., Suite S2-100
Street Address 2	P.O. Box 144575
City	Salt Lake City
State	UT
ZIP Code	-
Phone Number	3854684870
Extension	0
Fax Number	3854684881
Email Address	kwiley@slco.org

ESG Secondary Contact

Prefix	Ms
First Name	KAREN
Last Name	KUIPERS
Suffix	0
Title	Program Development Coordinator
Phone Number	3854684863
Extension	0
Email Address	KKUIPERS@SLCO.ORG

2. Reporting Period—All Recipients Complete

Program Year Start Date 07/01/2015
Program Year End Date 06/30/2016

3a. Subrecipient Form – Complete one form for each subrecipient

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: THE ROAD HOME
City: Salt Lake City
State: UT
Zip Code: 84101, 1104
DUNS Number: 613496802
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 78909

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: YWCA
City: Salt Lake City
State: UT
Zip Code: 84111, 2605
DUNS Number: 073008047
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: Y
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 68550

Subrecipient or Contractor Name: VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA
City: Salt Lake City
State: UT
Zip Code: 84101, 1116
DUNS Number: 931851265
Is subrecipient a victim services provider: N
Subrecipient Organization Type: Other Non-Profit Organization
ESG Subgrant or Contract Award Amount: 40000

CR-65 - Persons Assisted

4. Persons Served

4a. Complete for Homelessness Prevention Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	0
Children	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	0

Table 14 – Household Information for Homeless Prevention Activities

4b. Complete for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	0
Children	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	0

Table 15 – Household Information for Rapid Re-Housing Activities

4c. Complete for Shelter

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	408
Children	281
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	689

Table 16 – Shelter Information

4d. Street Outreach

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	0
Children	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	0

Table 17 – Household Information for Street Outreach

4e. Totals for all Persons Served with ESG

Number of Persons in Households	Total
Adults	408
Children	281
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	689

Table 18 – Household Information for Persons Served with ESG

5. Gender—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Male	210
Female	479
Transgender	0
Don't Know/Refused/Other	0
Missing Information	0
Total	689

Table 19 – Gender Information

6. Age—Complete for All Activities

	Total
Under 18	408
18-24	0
25 and over	2
Don't Know/Refused/Other	279
Missing Information	0
Total	689

Table 20 – Age Information

7. Special Populations Served—Complete for All Activities

Number of Persons in Households

Subpopulation	Total	Total Persons Served – Prevention	Total Persons Served – RRH	Total Persons Served in Emergency Shelters
Veterans	0	0	0	0
Victims of Domestic Violence	0	0	0	689
Elderly	0	0	0	0
HIV/AIDS	0	0	0	0
Chronically Homeless	0	0	0	0
Persons with Disabilities:				
Severely Mentally Ill	0	0	0	0
Chronic Substance Abuse	0	0	0	0
Other Disability	0	0	0	37
Total (Unduplicated if possible)	0	0	0	0

Table 21 – Special Population Served

Explanation for manual entry of CR-65 screen and eCart data

The eCart attachment represents data collected on persons assisted with ESG funds from TWO of the THREE providers that received ESG funds from Salt Lake County in the 2015 program year. Rapid Re-Housing activities were provided by the Road Home, and Street Outreach activities were provided by

Volunteers of America. YWCA Utah conducted Emergency Shelter activities, which are NOT included in the eCart totals; however, the data specific to the YWCA Emergency Shelter activities has been reported in the CR-65 screen per the guidance of our HUD field representative. As a victim services provider, YWCA Utah has been entering into a HMIS comparable database for the past decade. Due to the learning curve associated with the new HMIS data requirements, YWCA Utah did not start collecting all of the required data elements on their emergency shelter clients until July 1st of 2016. Once it was discovered that the assessment which was being used did not comply with updated HUD data requirements, the agency took action to implement the necessary processes. They will be able to provide all the necessary data in the required format for the 2016 program year. The agency HAS tracked the basic information which is reported in the CR-65 tables, and they ARE able to provide a spreadsheet with information on the number served, ages, genders and special populations. They are also able to export CSV data from their system using the HMIS-APR Generation tool. Although the data is neither available nor obtainable to export in a CSV format for the 2015-2016 CAPER, the necessary corrective action has been taken to resolve the issue for 2016-2017.

CR-70 – ESG 91.520(g) - Assistance Provided and Outcomes

10. Shelter Utilization

Number of New Units - Rehabbed	0
Number of New Units - Conversion	0
Total Number of bed-nights available	68,255
Total Number of bed-nights provided	38,207
Capacity Utilization	55.98%

Table 22 – Shelter Capacity

11. Project Outcomes Data measured under the performance standards developed in consultation with the CoC(s)

Salt Lake County is an active and engaged partner with the Salt Lake and Tooele Counties' CoC. Salt Lake County Government Community Resources and Development (CRD) is responsible for coordinating the HUD CoC Grant Application for Salt Lake and Tooele Counties (UT-500). CRD staff participates in the prioritization process for the HUD CoC grants. A citizen review panel (the Community and Support Services Advisory Committee or "CSSAC") reviews all proposals submitted under the Salt Lake County consolidated RFA for Community and Support Services and allocates funds from CDBG (Public Services), SSBG, and ESG.

Each agency that had a project which was awarded FY15 ESG funds was contracted with Salt Lake County to achieve outcomes that are associated with the goals identified in the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness' "Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to End Homelessness". These goals, which have been adopted by the Salt Lake and Tooele Counties' CoC are focused on: Reducing the number of unsheltered homeless persons, Ending Veteran Homelessness by 2015, Ending Chronic Homelessness by 2017, Ending Youth Homelessness by 2020, and Ending Family Homelessness by 2020.

Community-wide reporting and planning is a significant part of the HUD CoC Grant Application requirements, and the performance standards for agencies that have been awarded CRD funds are in alignment with the CoC priorities and goals. A major highlight of CRD's involvement with community-wide planning to end and prevent homelessness that are impacted by ESG funds includes the Adoption of Collective Impact. Salt Lake County, together with the State of Utah and local governments, businesses, and nonprofit partners, is coordinating a system-wide effort to identify gaps in current homeless services and improve services delivery to individuals and families experiencing or at risk for homelessness. This collective effort helps to identify best practices and drive our resources where they will have the greatest impact. Through this approach, we are creating a shared vision of what we want as a community, a set of shared outcomes to describe how we will get there, and clear, defined, measurable indicators, and shared data to tell us if we are achieving the future we envision.

CR-75 – Expenditures

11. Expenditures

11a. ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	0	29,607	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	23,120	2,241	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	12,880	54,899	0
Expenditures for Homeless Prevention under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Homelessness Prevention	36,000	86,747	0

Table 23 – ESG Expenditures for Homelessness Prevention

11b. ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Expenditures for Rental Assistance	58,803	0	55,236
Expenditures for Housing Relocation and Stabilization Services - Financial Assistance	20,000	0	0
Expenditures for Housing Relocation & Stabilization Services - Services	0	0	23,673
Expenditures for Homeless Assistance under Emergency Shelter Grants Program	0	0	0
Subtotal Rapid Re-Housing	78,803	0	78,909

Table 24 – ESG Expenditures for Rapid Re-Housing

11c. ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
Essential Services	0	58,552	68,550
Operations	13,418	1,673	0
Renovation	0	0	0
Major Rehab	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0
Subtotal	13,418	60,225	68,550

Table 25 – ESG Expenditures for Emergency Shelter

11d. Other Grant Expenditures

	Dollar Amount of Expenditures in Program Year		
	2013	2014	2015
HMIS	0	0	0
Administration	2,513	11,144	13,003
Street Outreach	15,000	33,000	40,000

Table 26 - Other Grant Expenditures

11e. Total ESG Grant Funds

Total ESG Funds Expended	2013	2014	2015
449,312	130,734	158,116	160,462

Table 27 - Total ESG Funds Expended

11f. Match Source

	2013	2014	2015
Other Non-ESG HUD Funds	150,087	63,117	0
Other Federal Funds	0	47,276	78,909
State Government	54,149	52,450	68,162
Local Government	38,879	11,145	13,003
Private Funds	202,205	110,634	40,388
Other	220,726	44,530	0
Fees	0	0	0
Program Income	0	0	0
Total Match Amount	666,046	329,152	200,462

Table 28 - Other Funds Expended on Eligible ESG Activities

11g. Total

Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities	2013	2014	2015
1,644,972	796,780	487,268	360,924

Table 29 - Total Amount of Funds Expended on ESG Activities

