



# Third Program Year CAPER

The CPMP Third Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report includes Narrative Responses to CAPER questions that CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, and ESG grantees must respond to each year in order to be compliant with the Consolidated Planning Regulations. The Executive Summary narratives are optional.

The grantee must submit an updated Financial Summary Report (PR26).

## GENERAL

### Executive Summary

This module is optional but encouraged. If you choose to complete it, provide a brief overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the first year.

Program Year 3 CAPER Executive Summary response:

The goal of the City of Waterbury's Third Annual Plan of its Five Year Consolidated Plan (2008-2013) remains constant; that is, to make Waterbury a City of Choice for residents and businesses alike. In more specific terms, Waterbury should be a place where businesses can take root, grow and flourish, and all residents can live in vibrant, thriving neighborhoods that offer quality choices in housing, recreation and employment.

In order to accomplish this with the use of HUD funds in the past program year (CD YEAR 36 the period from 10/1/10 to 9/30/11), the City of Waterbury looked to create a suitable living environment, provide decent, affordable housing, and create economic opportunities for Waterbury's low-moderate income residents. In order to achieve this, the following priority goals were established:

- To bring about a suitable living environment (i.e., revitalize distressed areas of Waterbury); priority was given to activities that involve rehabilitation, adaptive reuse, expansion of commercial opportunities and improvement of public infrastructure, facilities and services.
- To achieve decent, safe and affordable housing, priority was given to projects that involve rehabilitation or infill. Mixed income projects were encouraged.
- To expand economic opportunity, priority was given to making homeownership affordable and projects that create jobs for low and moderate income persons or in targeted neighborhoods.
- Projects that leverage funds (i.e., have other sources of funding) were encouraged.
- Projects and activities that enhanced Waterbury's disinvested neighborhoods were a priority.

During the planning process for the Five Year Consolidated Plan a consensus emerged to focus Federal grant funds on community and economic development activities within specific neighborhoods of the City including:

(1) the upper South End and South Main Street corridor, (2) North End neighborhoods in the vicinity of the future North Main Street school site, and (3) Brooklyn. These areas were chosen because they met one or more of the criteria described below:

- Areas with crime, vacant/blighted buildings, lack of retail development, and absence of educational and social enrichment opportunities.
- Areas with some development momentum and where residents need housing assistance to prevent dislocation.
- Areas surrounding the sites of proposed new schools.
- Areas with a concentration of tax-delinquent, vacant, abandoned and underutilized buildings.
- Areas that are gateways to the City and set the tone for visitors' interaction with Waterbury.

These areas continue to remain the focus of the City's Community Development Block Grant Program.

Allocation of resources in these targeted revitalization areas is anticipated to result in increased affordable housing, home-ownership, employment and economic opportunities, neighborhood revitalization, and community facility and infrastructure improvements.

The goals and initiatives for the Third Year Plan have been measured by the outcomes of availability/accessibility, affordability and sustainability.

The purpose of this report is to illustrate and measure the progress, accomplishments, growth, beneficiary data and project success that was completed by the City of Waterbury, through the Waterbury Development Corporation (WDC) in carrying out the following programs: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG); Emergency Shelter Grant program (ESG); and HOME Investment Partnership program (HOME) (including American Dream Downpayment Initiative or ADDI). During the program year the following funds were available:

• \$2,481,638	New CDBG Funds
• \$162,722.43	CDBG Program Income
<hr/>	
• \$2,644,360.40	Total CDBG
• \$1,042,698	New HOME Funds
• \$37,226.52	HOME Program Income
<hr/>	
• \$1,079,924.52	Total HOME
• \$100,023	New ESG Funds
• \$100,023	Total ESG

The total expenditure in CD Year 36 for each funding source was:

• \$2,542,575.78	CDBG Funds
• \$1,015,140.27	HOME Funds
• \$97,832.19	ESG Funds
<hr/>	
• \$3,655,548.00	Total Expended

As previously reported in last year's CAPER, the City was also the recipient of funds through The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act or ARRA). The following programs were and continue to be administered by WDC:

- Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP-1) thru the State Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) \$3,486,000
- Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP) \$931,128
- Community Development Block Grant Recovery (CDBG-R) \$608,548

While the above have separate and distinct reporting requirements from the CAPER, it is important to include them within this document as they are important to the City's efforts to mitigate the effects of foreclosures and prevent further community decline. They have been designed to stabilize property values; prevent homelessness and prevent further neighborhood blight.

Needs assessment data, goals and objectives, and specific methods for distributing these program allocations are located in the City of Waterbury 2010 -2011 Annual Action Plan for the formula entitlement programs. Details of the City's NSP; HPRP and CDBG-R Programs can be found on the City's website ([www.waterburyct.org](http://www.waterburyct.org)) and WDC's website ([www.wdconline.org](http://www.wdconline.org)).

In an effort to meet HUD goals and objectives, while also meeting the City's mission and its specific objectives, the City of Waterbury and the WDC worked to partner with City departments, local nonprofits, housing developers and Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO's).

The City of Waterbury's CAPER provides a complete listing of all program activity for the 2010 -2011 year and includes program accomplishments and financial data. During this program year, a total of 75.31 % of its Community Development Block Grant funds was expended on activities and projects which primarily benefit low and moderate income persons. HUD mandates that the City of Waterbury provide specific technical information for all programs funded by the Consolidated Plan. This is also provided in the on-line computer system Integrated Disbursement and Information System, (IDIS). The CAPER, like the Action Plan, is provided to the community to encourage citizen participation. The CAPER integrates IDIS technical information with narrative information to describe the City's Consolidated Plan and funded programs, how they meet priorities established in the Consolidated Plan, and how successful implementation includes active community participation.

The City values community involvement in its Consolidated Plan programs. The Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) oversees the use of funds received under the Consolidated Plan. The CAC consists of seventeen volunteers that represent various ethnic, cultural, neighborhood, political, social service and business interests in the City. It conducts regular meetings, holds public hearings on the Annual Plan, reviews proposals/applications, makes recommendations, and provides valuable input to the staff who administers programs. The City's Citizen Participation Plan (CPP) addresses HUD regulations as they relate to participation by the public in the Consolidated Plan process and also goes beyond the requirements to embrace a proactive approach to engaging community involvement.

The information provided in this CAPER represents a comprehensive array of programs that address the many needs of the low-moderate income community in Waterbury. Using established objectives and outcomes this document will provide a

summary of the City's progress in addressing its goals, objectives and priorities during the reporting period October 1, 2010 -September 30, 2011.

The Waterbury Development Corporation is responsible for the preparation of the CAPER, but the document represents program accomplishments achieved through a collaboration of partners including the Office of the Mayor, the Health Department, the Public Works Department, the Waterbury Police and Fire Departments, the Continuum of Care, various City boards and Commissions, Main Street Waterbury, the Chamber of Commerce, and many business, neighborhood and social service organizations. In fact, these collaborative efforts are essential to the delivery of the program services and the completion of Consolidated Plan objectives.

## General Questions

1. Assessment of the one-year goals and objectives:
  - a. Describe the accomplishments in attaining the goals and objectives for the reporting period.
  - b. Provide a breakdown of the CPD formula grant funds spent on grant activities for each goal and objective.
  - c. If applicable, explain why progress was not made towards meeting the goals and objectives.
2. Describe the manner in which the recipient would change its program as a result of its experiences.
3. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing:
  - a. Provide a summary of impediments to fair housing choice.
  - b. Identify actions taken to overcome effects of impediments identified.
4. Describe Other Actions in Strategic Plan or Action Plan taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs.
5. Leveraging Resources
  - a. Identify progress in obtaining "other" public and private resources to address needs.
  - b. How Federal resources from HUD leveraged other public and private resources.
  - c. How matching requirements were satisfied.

Program Year 3 CAPER General Questions response:

1. a-c.

The City of Waterbury and the WDC continued its progress in meeting the goals and objectives set forth in its Five-Year Consolidated Plan (2008-2013), specifically the third year of the Plan which this CAPER covers. The Five Year Plan established the following priority goals for the City as follows:

- To bring about a suitable living environment (i.e., revitalize distressed areas of Waterbury); priority was given to activities that involve rehabilitation, adaptive reuse, expansion of commercial opportunities and improvement of public infrastructure, facilities and services.

- To achieve decent, safe and affordable housing, priority was given to projects that involve rehabilitation or infill. Mixed income projects were encouraged.
- To expand economic opportunity, priority was given to making homeownership affordable and projects that create jobs for low and moderate income persons or in targeted neighborhoods.
- Projects that leverage funds (i.e., have other sources of funding) were encouraged.
- Projects and activities that enhanced Waterbury's disinvested neighborhoods were a priority.

The goals are similar to previous years which focused on six major housing and community development areas and reflect the input of the Citizens Advisory Committee, WDC, the City and its many partners during the process of developing the Five Year Plan. To the degree that the activities that fulfill these goals fit HUD's national objectives and are eligible for funding support, CPD formula funds have been expended. The City also leveraged its funds as well as additional State and Federal dollars, to accomplish these goals and their objectives.

***Goal #1: To Bring About a Suitable Living Environment and Revitalize Distressed Areas of Waterbury***

The City allocated a large share of its HUD funds during CD Year 36 to community redevelopment programs as part of a holistic approach to enhancing the living environment within the City. The programs are broad in scope but serve to generate vital, healthy and safe neighborhoods.

As an older industrial City, Waterbury is home to more than 40 Brownfield sites; the vestiges of a once proud, dynamic manufacturing base. In CD Year 34, a total of \$150,000 was allocated for the **Acquisition of Brownfield Sites**; in addition a total of \$45,991.75 in carry over funds was also available for this project. It should be noted that the carryover funds were originally allocated in 2006 and were originally designated as acquisition of a brownfields site or vacant lot and/or vacant building in order to eliminate slums or blighted conditions. Due to the City's success in securing funds from the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection and the federal Environmental Protection Agency, the immediate need for these funds has changed. The \$150,000 was reprogrammed as part of the recent CD Year 36 Annual Action Plan. The older carryover funds were used to acquire a vacant, blighted structure that was unable to be rehabilitated under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP 1) due to a lack of funds. After the City took ownership of this property a highest and best use appraisal was performed by a local appraisal firm. The study shows that without deep funding subsidies this property will not be easily renovated to proper housing standards. A final determination of use for this property is still in process.

Acquisition of real property including Brownfield sites was a high priority in the City's Five Year Plan (2008-2013). A total goal of 3 sites over the five years of the Consolidated Plan was noted, with an annual goal of 1.

**Clearance and Demolition** of blighted and vacant/abandoned buildings was funded in CD Year 36 for a total of \$150,000; in addition a carryover of \$264,495.90 as well as \$98,747.15 in program income was also available to eliminate these slum and blighted properties. A high priority was placed on this activity which cited the need throughout the City for selective demolition and clearance to remove the worst offenders that have outlived their useful life. A total five year goal of 20 sites was

noted. During CD Year 36, the following 7 CDBG funded projects representing 9 properties were completed:

- 1162 Bank Street - \$ 82,299.70
- 12 Alder Street/224 Congress Avenue - \$ 83,389.90
- 12 Ward Street - \$ 31,121.39
- 121 North Main Street - \$148,546.30
- 148 East Farms Street - \$ 35,636.73
- 267 Walnut Street - \$27,005.16
- 292-298 Mill Street - \$43,772.55

The **Commercial Rehabilitation Program aka Downtown Façade Program (CT 3501.00)** was awarded an additional \$126,198.60 in CD Year 36. 4 projects have now been completed, 2 are under contract with construction starting shortly and 1 was terminated (see chart below). It became evident that the complexity of the projects undertaken, due to age of the buildings and likelihood of the buildings contributing factors to the downtown historic district, required a single architect to work with the WDC. A request for qualifications was advertised and subsequently awarded to BL Companies for architectural and construction administration services for the Commercial Rehabilitation Program aka Downtown Façade Program, The Downtown Signage and Awning Program, which was funded with \$10,000.00 from CD Year 35 and The Brooklyn Neighborhood Façade Program also funded in CD Year 35 with \$100,000.00. BL Companies has been designing the newly awarded projects for the Downtown Façade Program, the Downtown Signage and Awning Program and the Brooklyn Neighborhood Façade Program.

The Downtown Façade Program project locations and status at the program year's end are:

<b>Address:</b>	<b>Stage:</b>
68 Bank Street	Complete
42 Bank Street	Complete
64 Bank Street	Construction under contract
142 Grand Street	Terminated
60 Bank Street	Complete
73 Bank Street	Construction under contract
471 West Main Street	Complete
498 West Main Street	Plans and specification design
193 Grand Street	Plans and specification design
44-50 North Elm Street	Plans and specification design
111 Bank Street	Plans and specification design
324-330 East Main Street	Plans and specification design

**The Commercial Rehabilitation Program** received a high priority in the five year plan with a total five year goal of 20 facades and an annual goal of 4.

**The Downtown Signage and Awning Program** has been designed with the assistance of BL Companies with the intent to assist 5 downtown businesses with improvements to their exterior appearance without the major investment of a full blown façade improvement project. Only one grant was given in CD Year 35 to a former Façade Project in order to put the finishing touches on the building.

**Address:** **Stage:**

60 Bank Street

Plans and specification design

**The Brooklyn Neighborhood Façade Program** has been designed and implemented in the Brooklyn Neighborhood (CT 3517.2) first in keeping with the targeting effort undertaken in the City. The program awarded 3 grants in CD Year 36.

**Address:**

8 John Street  
358 Washington Avenue  
20 North Leonard Street

**Stage:**

Plans and specification design  
Plans and specification design  
Plans and specification design

Under **NRZ Community Development** there was a beginning balance of \$90,361.46. Funds for this project date back to the 2000-2005 Consolidated Plan. The goal of this project or line item was to fund neighborhood improvement projects proposed by neighborhood associations in low-moderate income areas that were state-recognized Neighborhood Revitalization Zones and were also 501 c.3 organizations. The St. Margaret's/Willow Plaza NRZ applied for funding in CD Year 35 for the first phase of its expansion project for the purchase of two adjacent lots to the Elmwood Community Center (CT 3508.00-4) where St. Margaret's/Willow Plaza runs its senior and after school programs. The application was received by the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and unanimously approved. St. Margaret's/Willow Plaza NRZ acquired one of the adjacent lots by City Auction with Non-Federal Funds and purchased the second lot, providing Willow Street frontage, with private funds. After ownership of both adjoining lots was established an RFQ was advertised for architectural and construction administration services which was awarded to Milone and MacBroom, Inc. This project is being leveraged with \$215,277.61 of DECD funds which were originally made available to the City for Willow Street and West Main Street Improvements. It is now anticipated that this project will begin in early spring, 2012.

**Fire Station Improvements** started with a carryover balance of \$409,459.50 and an allocation of \$227,500 in CD Year 36. The funds are being used for the final phase of the Baldwin Street Fire House, (Census Tract 3505.00-1). A total of \$11,988.51 in CDBG funds was spent on architectural/engineering services. The plans were approved by SHPO and were put out to bid. This final phase which consists of correcting additional fire code violations, renovating bathroom and kitchen facilities and site improvements to the rear parking lot was awarded to T&T Electrical Contractors. Also during CD 36 an overhead door replacement project was carried out at the Northside Firehouse which cost \$12,812.00 and the Roof at the Highland Avenue Firehouse was replaced at a cost of \$97,200. Fire stations/equipment received a high priority in the five year plan with a five year goal of 13 and an annual goal of 2.

**Neighborhood Park Improvements** started with a carryover balance of \$42,232.86 and an additional \$315,000.00 was allocated in CD Year 36 for improvements to the Pearl Street Park. During the program year, both the Fulton Park tennis courts and North End Recreation Center improvement projects previously reported in last year's CAPER were completed upon payment of retainage to the contractors. The Fulton Park retainage paid out was for \$6,329.43 and the North End Recreation Center retainage paid out was for \$16,731.75.

The Pearl Street Park project, which is intended to fully overhaul the park and possibly expand the footprint into a neighboring parcel which the City has a demolition lien on, has been slowed down by the discovery of needed environmental remediation based on a limited phase one study which was paid for with brownfield grants. Because the possibility of expansion existed a limited phase one study was undertaken which turned up pollutants in the neighboring parcel and the existing park. Now that these issues are known additional environmental grant applications are being filed in order to clean the park to the required level and still be able to improve the park amenities with the CDBG funding available. The City has also allocated \$100,000.00 in general funds to the project as an indication of the intent to see this project come to fruition.

Parks and/or recreation facilities received a high priority in the five year plan with a total goal of 10 and an annual goal of 4.

**Sidewalk Improvements** were given a high priority in the five year plan with a five year goal of 20,000 linear feet of new sidewalks and an annual goal of 3,800 linear feet. That translates into approximately 4 to 6 blocks of typical Waterbury residential streets. CD Year 36 started with a carryover balance of \$396,632.19 and a new allocation of \$150,000.35 which was added to the additional \$114,725.94 that was re-allocated by way of a Substantial Amendment to the CD Year 34 Annual Action Plan. The reallocation of the remaining funds in the Emergency Relocation line item to the Public Improvement-Neighborhood Sidewalks line item was approved in June 2010. These funds were reallocated so that the funds would be available sooner to assist those areas most in immediate need, including the area around the Gilmartin School which opened in September 2010. A total of \$179,700.96 was expended during the program year for these sidewalks in the Gilmartin area.

The final payment of \$3,339.72 was made to the contractor working on the Brooklyn Neighborhood (CT 3517.2) sidewalks. Also during CD Year 36 a total of 141,198.41 has been expended on new sidewalks were installed in the area of the currently under construction Rev. Reed K-8 neighborhood school. Additionally, \$106,942.08 was expended on Division Street sidewalks which is in the vicinity of the Rev. Reed School and is one of the main roads of the Police Activity League campus.

**Neighborhood Facilities** were given a high priority in the five year plan with a total goal of 5 and an annual goal of 1. In CD Year 34, funding was awarded to Brass City Harvest, a non-profit whose mission is to engage inner city youth in land stewardship and community activities to create a sustainable community food system. They were awarded \$110,000 for the construction of a greenhouse and aquaponics bay which provides fresh vegetables and fish to needy city residents and local food pantry/soup kitchens. The 20' x 25' year round greenhouse was built at 75 Hill Street (CT 3510.00-2). The greenhouse was installed on the first lot roughly 50 by 100. The other 2 lots contain raised boxes/beds where the vegetables, flowers and herbs are grown. The greenhouse is outfitted with video cameras and an internet connection which assists in the security of the site by transmitting the security feed and alerting the director of any breaches. The greenhouse also contains an aquaponics area where fish are grown for consumption.

Brass City Harvest continued its mission with \$43,600 of CD Year 35 funds and \$18,007.85 in carry over funds by completing the Hill Street greenhouse and starting a similar greenhouse project on Mill Street in the City's South End. This project is being completed in phases with the sitework of the lot, including environmental



remediation efforts, being done first then the construction of the prefabricated greenhouse structure being completed second.

The Greater Waterbury YMCA was funded \$187,286,000 in CD Year 35 for a Neighborhood Facility project (CT 3501.00). The outside playscape was in need of replacement. This playscape is available to the public during typical City park hours of operation which are dawn until dusk. This project was completed with the expenditure of \$187,286.00.

The Greater Waterbury YMCA was funded with \$28,700.00 for an ADA door installation project in CD Year 36 which was completed in the program year. The entire facility is now accessible by people with disabilities through the use of elevators and ADA compliant doors throughout the building.

A \$140,000.00 grant was awarded to Waterbury Youth Service Systems, Inc. (WYSS) to assist in the purchase of a new facility. The funds were fully spent early in the program year allowing WYSS to fully move its operation and to enjoy owning its own facility allowing them to expand their programs which are vital to the youth of the City.

Another public facility project which was complete in the program year was the Boys and Girls Club of Greater Waterbury who was awarded \$97,454.00 for the purchase and installation of a new boiler system for the facility. The new system is a highly energy efficient system which will bring the clubs utility bills down exponentially and permanently.

The final public facility improvement project which was funded in CD Year 35 with \$185,000.00 but is still on the drawing board is the Police Activity League Park. While no CDBG funds have been spent yet a great deal of progress has been made on the brownfield site. Deconstruction of the structures was undertaken and nearly complete. Environmental remediation work is set to begin in the spring of 20012 with the eventual construction of the park following shortly thereafter.

The following **Public Services** were funded in CD Year 36 in order to provide needed services to the City's youth, seniors, disabled, veterans and/or persons with special needs or substance abuse problems. The City commits the maximum allowed by HUD, 15% of its allocation to Public Services due to the great need within Waterbury.

Boys & Girls Club, 1037 East Main St.: \$10,437. Funds were used for administration and program costs of technology program. A total of 870 people benefitted

Brass City Harvest, Fulton Farms: \$13,944.70. Funded salaries and insurance for vocational training program. A total of 14 people benefitted

Catholic Charities, 56 Church St.: \$7,000. Funds were used for salaries, benefits, building facilities and program supplies that provide city-wide case management services for families and children to include food stamps and early childhood workshops. A total of 7,541 people benefitted.

Children's Community School, 31 Wolcott St.: \$10,500. Funded salaries, insurance and operating costs for after-school programs. A total of 55 people benefitted

Connecticut Legal Services, 62 Washington St. 4<sup>th</sup> floor, Middletown, CT: \$15,500. CDBG funds supported salaries for the provision of legal services to low-moderate income residents with attention to fair housing issues. A total of 23 people benefitted.

Family Services of Greater Waterbury, Inc., 34 Murray St.: \$14,700. Funds were used to support salary, benefits and building expenses that serve the behavioral health program which provides a wide range of therapeutic interventions related to mental health issues, personal situations, parental situations, substance abuse or family violence. A total of 341 people benefitted.

Greater Waterbury Interfaith Ministries, Inc., 515 South Main St.: \$30,000. Provided support to a food pantry, soup kitchen, and resource center to the homeless and low/moderate clients city-wide. Funds were used to purchase food and supplies, pay utilities and fund salaries. A total of 1,858 people benefitted.

Hispanic Coalition of Greater Waterbury: 135 East Liberty St.: \$9,000. Funds were to be used for salaries for Hispanic community case managers. The funding was cancelled due to the organizations inability to execute a contract during the program year.

La Casa Bienvenida, 135 East Liberty St.: \$11,500. Services provided include nutrition, arts and crafts, education, and transportation services to Hispanic elderly. Funds were used for administration, staff salaries, insurance and operating costs. A total of 93 people benefitted.

Literacy Volunteers, Silas Bronson Library, 267 Grand St.: \$8,000. Provided reading materials and training to city-wide individuals who are unable to read and write. Funds were used for salaries and program expenses. A total of 216 people benefitted.

Mattatuck Senior Center, 117 Southmayd Rd.: \$8,500. Services provided include nutrition, exercise, arts and crafts, education and entertainment to elderly persons. Funds were used for salaries, utilities and insurance. A total of 94 people benefitted.

Mt. Olive Senior Center, 86 Pearl St.: \$13,500. Services provided include nutrition, arts and crafts, education, entertainment and transportation for elderly persons. Funds were used for salary, fringe benefits, utility and insurance costs. A total of 151 seniors benefitted.

Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury, Inc., 161 North Main Street: \$19,000. Services provided included delinquency and foreclosure prevention assistance; first time homebuyer education and financial literacy classes. Funds were used for salaries, utilities and insurance costs. During the program year their offices moved from Prospect Street to North Main Street. A total of 215 people benefitted.

Police Activity League of Waterbury, Inc., 58 Griggs St.: \$25,000.00. This program promotes partnerships among City youth, law enforcement and the community through educational, athletic and recreational activities. Funds were used for utilities, payroll and insurance costs. A total of 1,679 youth benefitted.

Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury, Inc., 29 Central Ave.: \$15,000. Services provided include counseling, education, advocacy, and referrals to victims and their children of

physical or severe psychological abuse. Funds were used for utilities and insurance. A total of 402 persons benefitted.

St. Margaret/ Willow-Plaza NRZ Assoc. Inc., 60 Elmwood Ave.: \$12,500. Provided youth after-school programs and senior citizen programs. Funds were used for staff salaries. A total of 427 people benefitted.

Staywell Health Care Inc., 80 Phoenix Ave.: \$8,000. Provided high quality dental services to the City's low-moderate income population. Funds were used for staff salaries. A total of 7,541 people benefitted.

Waterbury Day Nursery, 74 Buckingham St.: \$7,100. Provided a day care program including nutrition, education and entertainment. Funds were used to pay salaries. A total of 35 children benefitted.

Waterbury Senior Shuttle, WDC, 24 Leavenworth St.: \$98,360. City of Waterbury sponsored activity, which provided senior citizens with on-demand response transportation. Funds were used for operating costs of the livery service. A total of 302 seniors benefitted.

Waterbury Youth Service System, 83 Prospect St.: \$12,000. Provided a truancy prevention program primarily to students in elementary and middle school. Funds were used for salaries. A total of 262 youth benefitted.

Wellpath, 70 Pine St.: \$11,000. Provided city-wide counseling for youth, including initial and periodic evaluations, family therapy and psychotherapy crisis intervention. Funds were used for clinical and support staff. A total of 1,574 people benefitted.

WOW-NRZ Association, Inc., 308 Walnut St.: \$11,704. Provided youth after-school and resident life skill programs. Funds were used for building operating expenses, heat, sewer, and utilities. A total of 475 residents benefitted.

### ***Goal # 2: To Achieve Decent, Safe and Affordable Housing In Waterbury***

The Consolidated Plan identifies the need for the expansion of affordable rental units through acquisition, rehabilitation and construction financing assistance and for improvement to the quality of the existing stock of affordable rental housing for very, very low and very low income renters. In the area of owner housing, the need for improvement to the quality of the existing affordable housing stock through rehabilitation financing assistance; increased opportunities for very low and low income households to become and remain homeowners through home purchase or rehabilitation financing assistance; and the provision of pre and post-purchase housing counseling and mortgage foreclosure assistance were identified as the top priorities for owner occupied housing. The Year 3 goal for increasing the opportunities for very low and low income households to become and remain homeowners was 2, actual households that received assistance was 0.

The City promotes safe, affordable housing through the use of its **HOME** funds. In 2010-2011 the City received \$ 1,042,698 in HOME funds. Ten percent (10%) of the funds were allocated to administrative costs and 15% were directed towards CHDO housing development. The City expended \$ 1,015,140.27 in carry over HOME funds and \$ 37,226.52 in HOME Investment Trust Fund program income during the program year.

**Priority Housing Activities  
Year 3 Goals & Actual Units Assisted**

Priority Need	Year 3 Goal	Actual
HOME		
Production of new rental units	0	0
Rehabilitation of existing rental units	161	2
Rehabilitation of existing owner units	28	19
Homeownership assistance	0	0

The HOME Program continued to fund both investor, owner occupied and provided CHDO operating funds to Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury (NHSW) and Loyola Development Corporation (LDC) to assist their organization in the development of future HOME funded projects. The WDC worked with Grace Development Corporation of Waterbury on their Hearth Homes of Waterbury project for the new construction of 41 units of supportive elderly housing. Grace expects to begin site work in late Fall 2011. WDC also worked with Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury's (NHSW) on their 885 North Main Street Project for the new construction of 10 town house style rental units of affordable housing located in the targeted North End Neighborhood and anticipated to break ground in Spring 2012. The City has invested significant monies in the North End including the Reverend Jonathan Reed Elementary School (Grades K – 8) which is currently under construction and the Police Athletic League's (PAL) community center and park. It is anticipated to break ground in spring 2012.

The number of rental units rehabilitated fell short due to a rehabilitation project of 151 units not moving forward. The homeownership assistance goal for Year 3 was 0 but should have been 2 which is the number of loans that could be made with the balance of ADDI funds. No additional funds were put toward down payment assistance due to the lack of interest and qualified homebuyers for the existing ADDI Program.

NHSW worked on the development of clusters of now vacant buildings in the North End that would have the greatest impact in the neighborhoods once rehabilitated. They met with WDC and potential local developers to actively pursue and to determine the feasibility of such a venture. Comment about NSP????

**HOME ADDI** - NHSW continued to run the City's American Dream Down Payment Initiative (ADDI) Program. Waterbury's high unemployment rate, the economic crisis and lack of interest made it difficult to find qualified first time homebuyers and expend the remaining ADDI monies. Although lower interest rates and low home values increased participation in NHS' homebuyer education classes, the increase is largely due to the referrals from the CHFA and SMARTMOVE/Workforce first time homeowner down payment assistance programs. The qualifications for these programs are less restricted than the ADDI. Due to Waterbury being a distressed City, CHFA's Program has no income limit and the SMARTMOVE/Workforce Program's income limit is 120% of median family income while the ADDI Program's limit is 80%

of median family income. NHSW received very little interest in ADDI and those who were did not have the equity needed and or were over the income limit. The WDC continues to work with NHSW to find qualified first time homebuyers that could utilize the remaining ADDI funds.

NHSW offered a range of financial and homebuyer education, homeownership assistance and foreclosure intervention, including reverse mortgage counseling. As the financial crisis continues, foreclosure assistance continues to be in high demand. The goal for providing housing/foreclosure counseling was 500 people. The total number of Waterbury residents assisted by NHSW during the program year was 533. Of the 533 counseled, approximately 60% (320) were seeking foreclosure intervention assistance. With low interest rates and declining home values, homebuyer education experienced increased participation from area residents. NHSW continues to administer ADDI, SMARTMOVE/Workforce and CHFA down payment assistance programs. They also partner with Workforce, Inc. to provide financial education classes and with the Jewish Federation to provide financial and foreclosure assistance the Waterbury Orthodox Jewish community when needed. They assisted 2 Waterbury Households in receiving SMARTMOVE/Workforce Housing down payment assistance. NHSW also held post purchase counseling for landlords of both owner occupied and investor properties. Out of the 28 individuals that attended these classes during Year 3, 95% of them were for owner occupied properties.

**Housing Rehabilitation-Engineering** is a CDBG-funded activity that provides engineering services for HOME and/or CDBG rehabilitation projects. Such services would include inspection activities, the determination of project eligibility and the review of projects. The balance available is \$ 47,150.00. Housing rehabilitation was identified as a high priority in the Consolidated Plan. No funds were expended from this account during 2010 - 2011.

**Emergency Relocation Assistance** had an allocation for the 2010-2011 program year of \$125,000 and a carryover balance of \$319,725.18 for a total allocation of \$444,725.18. Total expenditures were \$36,211. The five year plan set a high priority for emergency relocation and set a five year goal of 1,000 people and an annual goal of 200. A total of 28 families were assisted with these funds representing 76 people.

This program affords payments to individuals displaced for code violations along with rental payments to retain lead free housing and storage facility to alleviate displacement-related problems. These households/individuals were assisted for lack of essential services, water, heat, electricity etc. Tenants displaced were either returned to their original unit or another apartment.

As mentioned above, 28 households representing 76 people were relocated during the past program year. The clients were relocated for lack of essential services water, heat, fire and electricity. Tenants displaced were either returned to their original unit or another apartment.

Breakdown of displaced tenants:  
15 white 10 of which are of Hispanic descent  
13 Black/African American  
18 Female Head of Households

**Goal# 3: To Expand Economic Opportunity By Making Homeownership Affordable and Funding Projects That Create Jobs For Low and Moderate Income Persons**

The Consolidated Plan identified employment and job training services as a high priority need with a five year goal of assisting 725 people and a one year goal of helping 145 people. For the first two years of the five year plan the **Community Based Development Organization (CBDO), In-The-Making** received \$30,000 in CDBG funding to empower, educate, train, employ, service and advocate for the low-income community of the Waterbury. The agency worked in conjunction with area businesses to provide job training and hands-on job skills to women for employment. The group served an average of 85 clients during those two years. In the spring of 2010, gave up their independence and became an organization affiliated with New Opportunities. No other group has sought funding from the program since then.

WDC staff have also partnered in matching local residents to job opportunities provided under the City's "Good Jobs Ordinance," and ordinance which sets a 25% target on publicly-funded construction projects for the hiring of local residents. WDC is presently working to achieve that target in the construction of three new City schools. The City is currently reviewing its existing procurement ordinance and is considering at least four potential amendments to it, including Section 3; Good Jobs; Minority set-asides and local preferences.

As previously reported in last year's CAPER, the City received \$608,548 in CDBG-R funds under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Awards were made to two Waterbury companies both of which were to create needed employment opportunities for low and moderate income residents of the City. Volubilis Food Inc located at 407 Brookside Road (CT 3522.00-1) received \$200,000 for their olive production and bottling line. The project was completed in April 2011 and six jobs were created all were Waterbury residents and came thru the Northwest regional Workforce Board. The continued sluggish economy resulted in the company receiving fewer contracts than anticipated. They are hopeful of increasing their employment during the next year if their marketing leads to increased sales. The second project is the rebuilding of a supermarket by JD 91 Cooke LLC at 91 Cooke Street in ordered to replace one that was destroyed by fire. With a grant of \$350,000 for equipment and fixtures, the company had estimated they will create 25 full time and 17 part time jobs in this low and moderate income community. The store will be located in the northeast corner of Census Tract 3501.00-4 and is surrounded by several low and moderate income neighborhoods. The store will primarily serve the residents of these neighborhoods all of which are low to moderate income. The jobs require no specialized education and training and the owner has estimated that most will be filled by neighborhood residents who can walk or bus to the site. The City remained hopeful that the project would be completed during the year. In late June 2011, the private lender foreclosed on the developer and the City continued working with the private lender in hopes of saving the project. The City terminated its agreement with the developer and will reprogram the funds shortly. It is anticipated that the funds will be used by the City for fire equipment, another high priority goal cited in the City's Five Year Consolidated Plan.

The City received a direct allocation of Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) funds from the State Department of Economic and Community Development. The City structured its program to provide Acquisition/Rehabilitation grants for the

purchase of foreclosed homes by low, moderate and middle income persons. The NSP is focused on 3 tier one neighborhoods while still allowing the flexibility of additional streets throughout the City that qualified using multiple data sets. The 3 tier one neighborhoods were chosen by such factors as being listed as local target neighborhoods in the 5 year plan, neighborhoods with new schools being built and neighborhoods where recent City and State investments had recently been made. The tier one neighborhoods are Brooklyn (CT 3517.00-2), North End ((CT 3502.00-1,2,3,4),(CT 3503.00-1,2,3)) and Willow-Plaza/Hillside CT 3501.00-3,4),(CT 3508.00-1,2,3,4)).

All NSP projects but one, consisting of three units, were completed over the last program year. In addition, one other project consisting on two units was withdrawn from the program due to insufficient funds. This withdrawn property at 750 Baldwin Street was purchased with CDBG funds slated for acquisition of blighted properties.

The following/attached spreadsheets show the units completed or currently underway, the current values of the properties and the anticipated increased values once the rehabilitation work is completed.

The City of Waterbury has been granted a direct allocation of \$1,036,101.00 of NSP3 funds to continue NSP eligible activities. This amount has been augmented by the State of Connecticut who provided the City with additional funds. The local NSP3 program will focus on the North End Neighborhood surrounding the new Rev. Reed School End ((CT 3502.00-1,2,3,4),(CT 3503.00-1,2,3)). NSP3 is anticipated to allow acquisition and rehabilitation of 15 rental units, to be undertaken by the selected developer of an RFP, and acquisition and rehabilitation or construction of 4 home owner occupied units which the City and WDC will undertake in house. Once home owner, single family projects are coming to completion WDC will take applications from NSP3 eligible buyers and offer the property for sale via lottery. The new and/or fully rehabilitated housing units will be on streets that the Rev, Reed School will be drawing its students from providing more decent affordable housing in the NSP3 micro target and Con Plan Target area.

**Goal # 4 Projects That Leverage Funds**

As can be seen from the list below most, if not all of the projects selected for funding in CD Year 36 had additional funds for the project through other sources.

**Leveraging of HUD Funds**

**CDBG Projects:**

Boiler – Public Facilities Improvement, The Boys and Girls Club Of Waterbury, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$97,454.00 Funds Leveraged:\$24,746.00
Public Facilities - Neighborhood Community Garden, Hill Street - Brass City Harvest Inc.	Funds Expended: \$18,007.85 Funds Leveraged: \$90,290.00
Neighborhood Sidewalks - North Main Area, City of Waterbury, Bureau of Engineering -	Funds Expended: \$141,198.41 Funds Leveraged: 0
Neighborhood Sidewalks - Gilmartin Area City of Waterbury Department of Public Works -	Funds Expended: \$179,700.96 Funds Leveraged: 0

Public Facilities Improvement - Park - Police Athletic League Of Waterbury, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$0 Funds Leveraged:\$936,031.00
Demolition - Waterbury Development Corporation-	Funds Expended: \$451,771.73 Funds Leveraged:\$369,152.75
Emergency Relocation - Waterbury Development Corporation	Funds Expended: \$36,210.66 Funds Leveraged:\$0
Downtown Awning Program Waterbury Development Corporation	Funds Expended: \$1,290.00 Funds Leveraged: 0
Residential Housing Rehabilitation Waterbury Development Corporation	Funds Expended: \$1,734.75 Funds Leveraged: 0
Fire Station Improvements - Waterbury Fire Department	Funds Expended: \$122,000.51 Funds Leveraged: 0
Public- Facilities Improvement Waterbury YMCA - ADA	Funds Expended: \$28,700.00 Funds Leveraged: \$14,724.00
YMCA Playground	Funds Expended: \$187,286.00 Funds Leveraged: \$3,122.90
Public Facilities Improvement - Building - Waterbury Youth Service System, Inc	Funds Expended: \$140,000.00 Funds Leveraged:\$1,465,021.00
Brooklyn Façade Program	Funds Expended: \$14,339.51 Funds Leveraged: 0
Neighborhood Park Improvement	Funds Expended: \$23,061.18 Funds Leveraged: 0
Neighborhood Sidewalks (Congress & Division)	Funds Expended: \$110,281.80 Funds Leveraged: 0
Commercial Rehabilitation/ Downtown Facade	Funds Expended: \$61,290.04 Funds Leveraged: \$5800.48
Acquisition	Funds Expended: \$45,991.75 Funds Leveraged: 0
Public Facilities Improvement – Brass City Harvest – Mill Street	Funds Expended: \$995.00 Funds Leveraged: \$90,290.00
<b>Public Services:</b>	
The Boys and Girls Club Of Waterbury, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$10,437.00 Funds Leveraged:\$ 4,500.00
Brass City Harvest, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$13,944.70 Funds Leveraged: \$10,000.00



City of Waterbury, Connecticut

---

Catholic Charities, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$7,000.00 Funds Leveraged:\$203,539.00
Children’s Community School, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$10,500.00 Funds Leveraged:\$6,655.00
Connecticut Legal Services, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$15,500.00 Funds Leveraged:\$ 5,685.00
Family Services Of Greater Waterbury, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$14,700.00 Funds Leveraged:\$894,530.00
The Greater Waterbury Interfaith Ministries, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$30,000.00 Funds Leveraged:\$189,566.00
La Casa Bienvenida, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$11,500.00 Funds Leveraged:\$41,551.00
Literacy Volunteers Of Greater Waterbury, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$8,000.00 Funds Leveraged:\$140,710.00
Mattatuck Senior Center, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$8,500.00 Funds Leveraged:\$40,324.00
Mount Olive A.M.E. Zion Senior Citizens Center, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$13,500.00 Funds Leveraged:\$24,250.00
Neighborhood Housing Services Of Waterbury, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$19,000.00 Funds Leveraged:\$286,599.00
Police Athletic League Of Waterbury, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$25,000.00 Funds Leveraged:\$911,031.00
Safe Haven Of Greater Waterbury, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$15,000.00 Funds Leveraged:\$1,250,350.00
St Margaret/Willow Plaza Neighborhood Revitalization Zone Association, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$12,500.00 Funds Leveraged:\$66,000.00
Staywell Health Care, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$8,000.00 Funds Leveraged:\$2,445,425.00
Walnut-Orange-Walsh Neighborhood Revitalization Zone Association, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$11,704.00 Funds Leveraged:\$12,000.00
Waterbury Day Nursery Association	Funds Expended: \$7,000.00 Funds Leveraged:\$519,200.00
Waterbury Senior Shuttle	Funds Expended: \$89,657.70 Funds Leveraged:\$34,595.70
Waterbury Youth Service System, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$12,000.00 Funds Leveraged:\$72,303.00

Wellpath, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$11,000.00 Funds Leveraged: \$1,781,196.69
----------------	--

**Total Public Service Funds Expended: \$ 354,443.40**  
**Total Non-CDBG Funds Leveraged: \$ 8,420,810.40**

**ESG Funds:**

Safe Haven Of Greater Waterbury, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$13,400.00 Funds Leveraged: \$1,235,350.00
St Vincent DePaul Mission Of Waterbury, Inc.	Funds Expended: \$72,722.00 Funds Leveraged: \$771,989.00
The Salvation Army	Funds Expended: \$8,900.00 Funds Leveraged: \$374,401.00

**Total ESG Funds Expended: \$ 95,022.00**  
**Total Non-ESG Funds Leveraged: \$ 2,396,740.00**

**HOME Funds**

**Total HOME funds Expended: \$ 1,015,140.27**  
**Total non-HOME Funds Leveraged: \$ 9200.00**

**5c. Required Matches**

The Salvation Army allocation was matched with Other Federal Funds of \$21,617.00, Local Government Funds of \$288,804.00, and \$39,337.00 in Donations.

The Safe Haven allocation was matched with \$50,000 in Other Federal funds, \$153,500 in Local Government funds, \$85,000 in Private Funds, and \$30,500 in Donations.

The St. Vincent DePaul ESG grant was matched with Private Funding of \$22,500, \$42,000 in Donations and other Funding of \$25,000.

***Goal #5 Projects and Activities That Enhanced Waterbury's Disinvested Neighborhoods***

As stated in its Five Year Consolidated Plan, Waterbury's housing problems continue to be centered in those areas of the City with concentration of extremely low and very low income households and where homeownership rates are the lowest. Non-housing community development needs include a wide spectrum of physical facilities, services and programs throughout the City but most apparent in those neighborhoods (1) the upper South End and South Main Street corridor, (2) North End neighborhoods in the vicinity of the future North Main Street school site, and (3) Brooklyn specifically chosen because they meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Areas with crime, vacant/blighted buildings, lack of retail development, and absence of educational and social enrichment opportunities.
- Areas with some development momentum and where residents need housing assistance to prevent dislocation.
- Areas surrounding the sites of proposed new schools.

- Areas with a concentration of tax-delinquent, vacant, abandoned and underutilized buildings.
- Areas that are gateways to the City and set the tone for visitors' interaction with Waterbury.

**3. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing:**

- a. Provide a summary of impediments to fair housing choice
- b. Identify actions taken to overcome effects of impediments identified.

During the CD YR 36 CAPER period, the City of Waterbury was monitored by HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity. The monitoring began in the fall 2010 and concluded with HUD's letter dated September 15, 2011. The four page letter concluded that the City of Waterbury is in compliance with the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing requirements of the Fair Housing Act; however it also stated that continued compliance will require actions on the part of the City in furtherance of the recommendations contained within the letter. The letter was critical of the actions taken during the course of the previous CAPERS and suggested that ..."a meaningful effort to AFFH must address, among things, factors such as demographic trends and cultural tendencies that lead to segregated neighborhoods or limit housing choice. Exclusively tackling bureaucratic concerns, such as lack of fair housing staff and direct marketing efforts, effectively sidesteps a municipality's focus on meaningfully and affirmatively furthering fair housing. A fair housing officer is necessary and affirmative marketing is essential. However, these items do not exclusively constitute an effective effort to AFFH." The letter reminded the City that it must complete a new Analysis of Impediments in conjunction with the new five year plan which will cover the period Fiscal Years 2013 to 2018. The City told HUD that it fully intends to comply and will begin the process early.

For this CAPER, the actions taken during the year will be detailed as they relate to the original and updated Analysis of Impediments (AI).

**3a. Summary of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice:**

1. The lack of a designated fair housing officer;
2. The lack of an affirmative fair housing marketing plan;
3. The need for housing for special needs persons and disabled persons;
4. The need for a strategy to produce affordable housing and to address associated cost burdens;
5. The lack of assistance to neighborhood groups wishing to become Neighborhood Revitalization Zone Organizations and/or lack of support for solving immediate neighborhood concerns; and
6. The adverse impact of the subprime mortgage crisis on minorities and disabled persons.

The City is committed to the provision of fair housing choice as evidenced by the programs and activities that it supports. The appointment of the **Designated Fair Housing Officer (AI #1)**, as has been previously mentioned was an important action in addressing one of the impediments cited in the original and updated AI. More important however is the increased role which Mr. Gilmore, the Fair Housing Officer plays in the City with regard to its housing and neighborhood development issues. The Fair Housing Officer is an active member of The Fair Housing Association of Connecticut and attends monthly meetings and the annual conference, often times participating on panel discussions. He sponsors fair housing training for the City, nonprofit and legal community. He is an invaluable resource and has consulted with

a number of Connecticut municipalities facing issues dealing with relocation and foreclosures.

**The City of Waterbury and the WDC have established an informative marketing campaign (AI #2):**

In April 2011 The Fair Housing Officer along with the Senior Assistant States Attorney for Housing Matters and Two Sanitarians from the Waterbury Health Department conducted Fair Housing training at the Waterbury Offices of the Department of Children and Families. The purpose of this training was to give these workers a better understanding of Fair Housing Laws, landlord tenant issues, Emergency Relocation and local health codes. Topics Included: Criminal Lockout and Self -Help Eviction, Leases, Subleases, Notices to quit, unlawful entry and health code issues such as lack of essential services such as no heat or hot water and bed bug infestation.

In September 2011 The Fair Housing Officer along with the Supervising Assistant States Attorney for Housing Matters and Two Sanitarians from the Waterbury Health Department conducted Fair Housing training at the Waterbury Housing Authority in attendance was staff along with Housing Authority tenants. The purpose of this training was to give these workers a better understanding of Fair Housing Laws, landlord tenant issues, Emergency Relocation and local health codes. The participants were given a Fair Housing quiz and a discussion followed. A Fair Housing Its your Right pamphlet was distributed. The States Attorney gave an overview of landlord/tenant rights and the responsibility of each. The Health Department gave a presentation on bed bug infestation and responsibilities of the landlord to provide a decent, safe and sanitary unit.

In September of 2011 the Fair Housing Officer participated in a Minority Small Business Workshop put on by The Waterbury Development Corporation. The Workshop included presentations the City of Waterbury's procurement and contract processes and the local jobs ordinance (Good Jobs) and monitoring controls and the hiring of vendors and contractor's. The Connecticut Small Business Development Center gave an overview of business planning, development and risk assessment and financial assistance. WDC gave presentations on Fair Housing, Section 3 compliance and site location assistance and tax abatements.

**The need for housing for special needs persons and disabled persons (AI #3) and the need for a strategy to produce affordable housing and to address associated cost burdens (AI #4) and the lack of assistance to neighborhood groups wishing to become Neighborhood Revitalization Zone (NRZ) organizations (AI #5) were included in the original AI and noted again in the update. The strides which the City had made in addressing these concerns are still applicable. It is fully anticipated that as a result of the new AI which the City undertakes these impediments will change to reflect the changed economic and community diversity.**

**There is a Potential that the Burden of Foreclosures Resulting from the Sub-Prime Mortgage Crisis Might Fall Disproportionately on Minorities and People with Disabilities (AI #6).**

The Fair Housing Officer maintains a list of properties pursuant to Connecticut Public Act 09-144 in which the foreclosing entity must name a local property maintenance/management company. He is constant contact with the foreclosing entities to ensure the quality of life issues are addressed and units are kept safe decent and sanitary.

In February of 2011 The Fair Housing Officer attended a **Facing Foreclosure** informational form seminar at Waterbury City Hall sponsored by the Fair Housing Center of Connecticut. Participants were given a comprehensive handout that walks homeowners through the foreclosure process. A staff attorney and representatives from Waterbury Neighborhood Housing Services answered questions and gave out information.

In April 2011 the Fair Housing Officer attended the Fair Housing Association of Connecticut "*Meeting the Challenges of Fair Housing in 2011*" in which topics included: Fair Housing mobility and integration, increasing the mobility of low-income residents as a way of desegregating Connecticut's communities and providing access to opportunity. Also discussed were reasonable accommodations, emerging issues and creative solutions.

In July 2011 the Fair Housing Officer attended a HUD Hartford CPD all grantee meeting on integration of affordable housing into communities of opportunity.

In addition to these actions, the funding of the Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury (NHSW) through the Community Development Block Grant Program also helps to address this impediment. NHSW provides foreclosure prevention counseling and intervention among their services to Waterbury residents. During the CAPER period fully 60% or 320 residents received foreclosure prevention/intervention services. These workshops are held in both English and Spanish. In 2011, NHSW received assistance to provide increased support for existing homeowners in an effort to prevent future foreclosures and ensure the success of their homebuyer education services. They are building on their homeownership preservation activities with a post purchase workshop series focused on providing the tools homeowners need to sustain and maintain their homes with an increased focus on creative programming and financial education.

Connecticut Legal Services (CLS) also receives funds from the Community Development Block Grant Program in order to address legal issues affecting Waterbury's low income residents who are at risk of becoming homeless. With their Legal Services Support Project (LSSP), CLS helps them to access services and programs so that they can find stability and strengthen their financial security, and to preserve their current housing or receive additional time to relocate. The primary goal of the LSSP is to educate, empower and represent individuals and families who are at risk of becoming homeless.

### **3b. Actions taken to Address Impediments**

As the AI pointed out, action steps must include public, private/public partnerships and private actions. In that regard, the AI separated its recommended action steps into the following three distinct categories. .

#### **b. Recommendation: Preparation of an Affirmative Housing Marketing Program (AFHMP)**

Action Taken: The City Prepared an Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan

- Maintained a relationship with Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities
- Maintained a Fair Housing file with activities/promotions/complaints
- Fair Housing posters placed throughout WDC office
- Took out two Fair Housing Billboards in English and Spanish on heavily traveled roads throughout the city
- Had the Waterbury Board of Alderman approve a resolution proclaiming April 2011 as Fair Housing month in the City of Waterbury. Fair Housing Month is a time to celebrate the progress made in opening the doors of housing opportunity to every citizen of this nation regardless of race, gender, color, national origin, religion, familial status or disability and to acknowledge the fair housing challenges that still remain, and to collectively commit to finding viable solutions to those challenges
- Utilized Spanish translator when needed
- Attended The Fair Housing Association of Connecticut monthly meetings
- Maintained a Fair Housing Section to the WDC website with a link to a Public service announcement
- Continue to meet on a weekly basis with neighborhood groups about housing and quality of life concerns

**c. Recommendation: De-concentration of Publicly Funded Housing Programs**

**Action Taken: HOME Program follows required HUD Regulations regarding New Construction**

- Met with WDC staff and reviewed affirmative marketing plans for HOME and NSP programs
- Became HQS certified to insure both tenants and landlords are in an up to code unit
- Met with Housing Authority to discuss Fair Housing and asked them to direct any complaints/concerns to The Fair Housing Officer

**d. Recommendation: Monitor Fair Housing Complaints**

**Action Taken:**

- Provided listing of affordable housing units to Emergency Relocation tenants.
- Monitored Housing Authority ads in the newspaper and obtained a copy of their policies.
- Successfully relocated Seventy Six tenants representing Twenty Eight households to decent, safe and affordable units
- Attend Housing Court and worked with the Housing Prosecutor and Housing Specialist on landlord tenant issues heard/resolved
- Continued to educate landlords on Fair Housing laws
- Provided a pamphlet to tenants "Is your landlord going through a foreclosure" What a tenant needs to know, published by Connecticut Legal Services.

- Responded fair housing complaints a week. Answering typical questions and concerns such as how a tenant can get their security deposit returned or how a one can access The State of Connecticut Security Deposit program
- Referred unemployed to Workforce Connection
- Continued to make referrals to Connecticut Legal Services
- Monitor and maintain citywide list of foreclosures
- Established a working relationship with the State of Connecticut's Secretary of State's office to assist in getting owner information on Limited Liability Corporation owned properties
- Met and established a contact with the State of Connecticut's Banking Commissioners' office to assist in banks on the properties they own
- Monitored newspaper ads on a weekly basis
- Maintain contact information for Banks
- Maintain a point of Contact with Fannie Mae.
- Provided insight and recommendation to the City of Waterbury's School Building Project in which the City acquired several occupied buildings
- Continue to monitor the State of Connecticut Judicial website for foreclosures

## **2. Public/Private Partnership Step Recommendations**

### **a. Recommendation: Joint Review of Housing Programs and Regulatory Environment**

**Action Taken: WDC Unit Manager Co-Chairs Housing Committee of Ten Year Plan and the City continues to fund programs that advance the partnership.**

The City also consults regularly with WDC HOME and CDBG staff on housing concerns/updates. Staff from WDC participates on the Land Use Regulatory Revision Project (LURRP), a comprehensive review and update of the City's zoning regulations and the re-drawing of the City's zoning map. That process is guided by a public committee of land use officials, city officials and residents (LURRP).

WDC through CDBG funding is partnering with Connecticut Legal Services on a Legal Support Services Project. The project will focus on helping low income families and individuals who are at risk of being homeless access public benefits and other services needed to achieve stability in the current recession and meet their basic needs. Through the project, housing services will be provided to those families and individuals renting apartments in buildings that are being foreclosed. Additional services other than the "core" service areas including special education, disability, and elderly services will be provided.

### **b. Recommendation: Impact of Foreclosures on Housing Choice**

**Action Taken: Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP3)**

The AI described the impact of foreclosures on Housing Choice and pointed out that legislation was in Congress to appropriate funds to address this crisis. Since that time, three rounds of Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds have been appropriated. In NSP 1, the City successfully rehabilitated 13 properties containing 29 units for affordable housing, six of the properties assisted homebuyers, two of whom were Hispanic and all six female to purchase foreclosed homes in targeted

neighborhoods. There was no funding in NSP 2 given to the State. For NSP 3 the program will be administered through the CT Department of Economic and Community Development and it will be targeted to the North Main Street area.

### **3. "Private Step" Recommendations**

The AI recommended no specific action steps as regards the private sector except that there was a role for the private sector similar to the public sector. The AI pointed out that the private sector should participate in public/private partnerships. The WDC actively promotes such partnerships and is pursuing them on a regular basis and through the ongoing NSP process.

#### **Action Taken: WDC and the City have partnered with Webster Bank and the Waterbury Housing Fund in the lending process.**

WDC also partnered with Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) of Waterbury to provide Homeownership and Foreclosure counseling. NHS also is providing a First Time Homebuyer training class for potential purchasers of properties in the NSP Program.

### **5. Leveraging Resources**

- a. Identify progress in obtaining "other" public and private resources to address needs.
- b. How Federal resources from HUD leveraged other public and private resources.
- c. How matching requirements were satisfied.

#### **5. a.**

For a listing of federal, state and local grants obtained by the City of Waterbury in the past fiscal year, see "Attachments" document "City of Waterbury Grants" which lists all grants, excluding those obtained by the Department of Education. Department of Education grants are in a separate attachment.

In the past year, private resources were obtained throughout the City by many social service agencies that are sub-recipients of CDBG/ESG funds. In addition, the volunteer work and contributions of the many nonprofits throughout the City is a private resource of tremendous value in the effort to meet the goals and objectives of the Annual Plan without extensive financial resources.

#### **5. b.**

In order to meet affordable housing needs, serve the homeless, provide for general quality of life concerns, and stimulate community improvement, revitalization, and economic development, a wide variety of public and private funds are needed. The programs, grants and organizational help that can be considered non-HUD funded through federal, state, municipal and private resources were used to address priority needs and leverage HUD dollars. The City also contributed its municipal funds to the greatest degree possible as part of the larger resource pool (non-HUD, federal, state, local, private) that leveraged HUD dollars and addressed the priority needs and objectives defined in the Annual Action Plan. Leveraging has been discussed on a project by project basis under Question 1a-b.

### **5c. Required Matches**



The Salvation Army allocation was matched with Other Federal Funds of \$21,617.00, Local Government Funds of \$288,804.00, and \$39,337.00 in Donations.

The Safe Haven allocation was matched with \$50,000 in Other Federal funds, \$153,500 in Local Government funds, \$85,000 in Private Funds, and \$30,500 in Donations.

The St. Vincent DePaul ESG grant was matched with Private Funding of \$22,500, \$42,000 in Donations and other Funding of \$25,000.

Match obligations for the HOME program were satisfied through the value of the land or real property. The City also matched cash equivalents through non-federal sources that include foundations and the State programs.

## **Managing the Process**

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to ensure compliance with program and comprehensive planning requirements.

Program Year 3 CAPER Managing the Process response:

For fiscal year 2010-2011, all HUD regulations were followed to ensure that each activity that was funded had the potential to be completed. The 2010-2011 Annual Action Plan was the third Plan in the City's Five Year Consolidated Plan (2008-2013). The process was the third one conducted by the Citizens Advisory Committee which was appointed in 2007 following the adoption of the City's Citizen Participation Plan (CPP). The majority of the Committee's members represent low-moderate income neighborhoods, while comprising membership also from social service agencies, business, the Office of the Mayor, the Board of Aldermen, the City Planning Commission and the Waterbury Housing Authority

The following outlines public input and review opportunities provided as part of the CPP:

- Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for CDBG/ESG/HOME Funding Issued - March 3, 2010
- Public Hearing No. 1 Needs Assessment for Annual Plans before CAC - March 24, 2010
- Applications Available for CDBG/ESG - March 5, 2010
- CAC Monthly Meeting - March 9, 2010
- Technical Assistance Workshop: Application Preparation - March 16, 2010
- Technical Assistance: Application Preparation - March 23, 2010
- Application Submission Deadline - March 30, 2010
- Application Review and Evaluation Period by CAC - April 5 - April 21, 2010
- CAC Monthly Meeting: First Review and Evaluation of Applications - April 7, 2010
- CAC Meeting: Review and Evaluation of Applications - April 8, 2010
- CAC Meeting: Review and Evaluation of Applications - April 15, 2010
- CAC Meeting: Vote to Approve Annual Funding Allocations - April 21, 2010
- Public Commentary Period for Annual Plan - April 24 - May 24, 2010
- Public Hearing No. 2: Public Hearing on Proposed Annual Plan - May 13, 2010
- CAC Meeting to Vote for Recommendation of Annual Plan - June 1, 2010
- Board of Aldermen Meeting/Vote to Adopt Annual Plan - June 21, 2010
- Annual Action Plan Due at HUD - August 13, 2010

- Mandatory Orientation and Technical Assistance for CDBG/ESG Awardees  
August 24, 2010

The 2010-2011 program year commenced on October 1, 2010. The WDC had held a technical assistance meeting at the end of August 2010 to review reporting procedures and requirements with the grant awardees.

Subrecipient contracts were prepared by WDC staff and reviewed for compliance with HUD and City regulations by WDC legal counsel and the City's Risk Manager. WDC staff monitored performance of awardees throughout the year. Staff performed one desk review and one monitoring visit of each organization awarded HUD funds. Each subrecipient was required to submit a monthly daily benefit report (DBAR) and quarterly reports detailing their successes and challenges as well as performance outcome measurements. WDC staff also encouraged subrecipients to send newsletters and other publications to WDC on a regular basis so that WDC staff could gain a full understanding of each organization's work. Technical assistance was offered to each subrecipient and WDC staff worked with subrecipients numerous times to assist them with their contracts, instruct them as to reporting requirements and the maintenance of client information. WDC also provided them with a bound monitoring manual which also introduced them to HUD terminology and regulations.

City projects funded by CDBG were managed by WDC staff in cooperation with City staff. WDC staff kept all correspondence and made sure that all HUD regulations were followed in terms of project implementation. Projects that needed to be put out to competitive bidding were done so through the City of Waterbury competitive bidding process. WDC staff ensured compliance with HUD bidding requirements. Visits were made by WDC staff to project locations and wage interviews conducted. WDC staff also verified all payroll records on projects. Project contracts with a value of \$50,000 and above were required to receive approval from the Board of Aldermen and the WDC Board on an individual basis. WDC staff made appearances before each Board and distributed contract information and copies to all members.

## **Citizen Participation**

1. Provide a summary of citizen comments.
2. In addition, the performance report provided to citizens must identify the Federal funds made available for furthering the objectives of the Consolidated Plan. For each formula grant program, the grantee shall identify the total amount of funds available (including estimated program income), the total amount of funds committed during the reporting period, the total amount expended during the reporting period, and the geographic distribution and location of expenditures. Jurisdictions are encouraged to include maps in describing the geographic distribution and location of investment (including areas of minority concentration). The geographic distribution and expenditure requirement may also be satisfied by specifying the census tracts where expenditures were concentrated.

\*Please note that Citizen Comments and Responses may be included as additional files within the CPMP Tool.

Program Year 3 CAPER Citizen Participation response:

As of this writing, there are no citizen comments to date. If any comments, whether written or oral, should be submitted within the 15-day period, they will be included in the appendix of this document. An absence of comments in the appendix is an indicator that no comments were submitted. The hard copy of the CAPER that was provided to the public included the CAPER narrative, Financial Reports and IDIS reports. Per the public ad, the narrative was placed on the City and WDC web sites. The web sites did not have the capacity to contain the IDIS and Financial Reports.

In compliance with HUD's requirement for a 15-day public comment period, a notice was published in the Republican-American on November 27, 2011. The public was invited to comment for 15-day period that started November 28, 2011 and concluded December 12, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. The public was informed that all comments would be incorporated into the CAPER. The following is the text of the notice published in the Republican-American:

NOTICE TO PUBLIC  
City Of Waterbury  
Consolidated Annual Performance & Evaluation Report (CAPER)  
Community Development Year 36 (2010-2011)

The Waterbury Development Corporation (WDC), on behalf of the City of Waterbury, has completed the CD Year 36 (2010-2011) Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) – Community Development Block Grant Program, Annual Performance Report – HOME, and Financial Status Reports – Emergency Shelter Grant Program. These reports show the actual activity done within the program year in comparison to the Annual Plan, which projects expected activity to be completed for the program year. WDC, in compliance with 24 CFR, Part 91.105(d) and 91.520, will have copies available on November 28, 2011 for citizen participation viewing at the City Clerk's Office, 236 Grand Street, the WDC, 24 Leavenworth Street, and at the Silas Bronson Library, 267 Grand Street, Waterbury. The CAPER narrative can be viewed at [www.wdconline.org](http://www.wdconline.org) and [www.waterburyct.org](http://www.waterburyct.org). Written comments will be considered until 5:00 p.m. on December 12, 2011. The CAPER will be submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on or about December 19, 2011, the actual deadline to HUD is December 29, 2011. Citizens should contact:

The Waterbury Development Corporation  
ATTN: Casey Lawlor  
Community Development Program Specialist  
24 Leavenworth Street, Waterbury, CT 06702  
[Lawlor@wdconline.org](mailto:Lawlor@wdconline.org)

All of the required information has been provided in the CAPER. Projects that are area-benefit show census tract information in IDIS. Social service agencies funded through CDBG and HOME-funded rehabilitation projects benefit low-moderate income clients and therefore do not include census tract information.

## **Institutional Structure**

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to overcome gaps in institutional structures and enhance coordination.

Program Year 3 CAPER Institutional Structure response:

The City of Waterbury and the WDC continued their concerted efforts to eliminate institutional gaps and enhance coordination of programs to all segments of the community. The City and nonprofits work closely together with other governmental entities to determine the critical needs of households in order to ensure CDBG funded programs address gaps in services. As previously reported, part of the 2008 planning process for the Ten Year Plan, the position of Housing and Community Planning Director for the WDC was created and continues to be held by Diane C. Toolan. In addition, the Community Development Program Specialist and Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist positions added as a result of the OIG findings remain a critical part of the CDBG process.

The Community Development Program Specialist administers the Community Development Block Grant and Emergency Shelter Grant Programs. In addition, this person assists in the preparation of the yearly Annual Action Plan; the five-year Consolidated Plan and Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER), assists in contract preparation and monitoring of those agencies awarded program money. The Program Specialist also works with the CDBG/ESG Manager in determining short and long-term community development objectives.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist is responsible for the implementation of an effective monitoring and performance system that includes internal audit monitoring, project implementation monitoring, program and long-term monitoring and administrative support in order to ensure compliance with all federally funded HUD programs received by the City of Waterbury and administered by the WDC.

The Mayor's Office and WDC meet regularly with Main Street Waterbury, Waterbury Neighborhood Housing Services and the newly formed Loyola Development Corporation on issues related to neighborhood development. WDC staff also work closely with and maintain staff linkages with City departments, including the Office of the Mayor, the Planning Department, Public Works, the Waterbury Housing Authority, Fire and Police departments and the Health Department.

In addition to the City and WDC's internal network, both have relationships with neighboring jurisdictions through participation in regional planning efforts such as the Naugatuck Valley Council of Government (COG), and the Naugatuck Valley Brownfield Pilot Program and the Comprehensive Economic Development strategy (CEDS). All of these linkages provide opportunities for the sharing of ideas regarding solutions to regional issues as well as the sharing between municipalities of best practices on solving local problems.

The WDC and the City also stay informed of the critical needs of the community through the structure of the CAC. As previously mentioned, the CAC includes members of the Mayor's Office, the Board of Aldermen, the Waterbury Housing Authority and the City Planning Commission. WDC staff support and attend all CAC meetings. The CAC hears and reviews all the needs of the community during the application process and works to provide educational outreach to neighborhoods throughout the year. The CAC plays a crucial role in the dissemination of information and the bridging of institutional gaps, as many social service agencies and representatives from the larger, major organizations, such as United Way, sit on the CAC.

WDC staff serve as advisors to the CAC. In this capacity, WDC staff have developed relationships with the many social service agencies funded by CDBG. They receive notices of their events and social gathering and attempt to attend as many as possible. The goal is to develop a comfortable relationship with those organizations who serve the multi-faceted needs of our community.

Finally, the WDC has structured its board membership so that it can share ideas and information with stakeholders from all sectors of the community: neighborhood group representatives, business groups, social service agencies, City departments and the political community.

## **Monitoring**

Program Year 3 CAPER monitoring response:

1. Describe how and the frequency with which you monitored your activities.

CDBG/ESG funded projects were monitored by the WDC and City Departments responsible for particular projects (i.e. sidewalks, roads, fire station etc.). At the beginning of the year, WDC staff entered into a Sub-Recipient agreement with each of its social service providers. Each agreement incorporated a scope of services and a budget, both of which were reviewed for regulatory compliance by the WDC staff and advisory council. The City of Waterbury Risk Manager reviewed insurance requirements for the agencies. Sub recipients of CDBG and ESG funds were provided with a monitoring handbook containing all reporting forms for the year along with the WDC's Monitoring Plan and HUD's Performance Outcome Measurements. A technical assistance/orientation meeting was held in September 2011 to guide sub recipients through program and reporting requirements and the monitoring process itself. Reporting requirements included the completion of monthly Daily Benefit Activity Reports (DBARs), quarterly reports and a Program Year End Close-Out Report. Monitoring was conducted throughout the Program Year. On-site visits were scheduled during March, April, May and June of 2011 in accordance to a timetable which was developed for each of the CDBG and ESG sub recipients in order to accommodate their workload and staff needs; as well as those of WDC. Unlike the previous years, WDC consolidated its two on-site visits to one visit in addition to an in-office desk review. Factors that would qualify a sub recipient as high risk were identified and additional visits were arranged with organizations that were considered high risk. Desk monitoring consisted of an in-house review of each sub recipient's file, including the application and contract, the completion of required reporting, the timeliness and quality of reporting and the submission of vouchers/bills for eligible activities. Desk reviews were performed in February, March and April 2011; and a copy was sent to all sub recipients. The on-site visits occurred during the months of March-June of 2011. The sub recipients received at orientation, a "Monitoring Visit Checklist" as well as a "Recommended Documents to be Maintained" that would be reviewed at their on-site visit. WDC staff confirmed the visits by mail which included a copy of their in-house desk review. An entrance conference was held at the beginning of each visit, along with an exit review of tentative conclusions at the end of the visit. Desk review performance was discussed at the on-site interviews. A formal letter was sent to each sub recipient within 30 days of the visit detailing any findings or concerns. The on-site visit is structured to provide positive feedback to the sub recipient about what they have done well and what areas may need improvement. Every attempt is made to visit these sub recipients during hours of operation in which the program is being funded. Throughout the year, sub recipients

requested payment for funded activities/projects. WDC's fiscal analyst monitored the account balance, along with budgetary compliance. WDC staff kept in regular contact with funded public service agencies to make sure that they complied with their application and their programs were on target. WDC staff also monitored City-based projects. WDC staff used City procurement for bidding. City procurement encompassed City procurement regulations and WDC staff ensured that HUD bidding regulations were followed. WDC staff prepared contracts, guided these contracts through the WDC Board of Directors and the City Board of Aldermen, lead wage interviews, visited project sites, conducted meetings with City department staff on project progression, processed bills and payments, reviewed certified payroll as to Davis-Bacon wages, and monitored projects for HUD compliance. Housing rehabilitation projects administered with HOME funds were also monitored closely by WDC staff from the application stage through completion. WDC's Construction Specialists monitored the rehabilitation/construction of projects by conducting onsite inspections. Payments were only processed after an inspection was conducted at the project site with the Construction Specialist, homeowner and contractor. Permits, certificates of approval, and certificates of occupancy are obtained, when required, by the City Building Department. The homeowner, contractor, Construction Specialist and HOME Manager were required to sign off on a payment request before being processed. HOME funded rental properties require that income and rents be monitored on an annual basis and Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspections for rental projects on a schedule according to the number of units in a project. Projects consisting of 1 – 4 units must be monitored every 3 years, 5 – 25 units every two years and projects consisting of 26 or more units every year. Most of the rental projects being monitored are smaller; therefore yearly HQS inspections on some of the properties were not required. WDC's, Reinvestment Manager has completed training and received certification as a Housing Quality Standards Inspector. As the HQS Inspector, he has begun inspections of properties that are currently due. Monitoring of income and rents began at the end of CD Year 36 and will continue through CD Year 37. Owners were provided with the income and rent limits, utility allowance charts and lease requirements. Rental property owners were required to fill out and submit the HOME Rental Project Compliance Report (Form 6-D). As a result of the on-going monitoring requirements, WDC replaced the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist in early in 2011. This position is responsible for implementing an effective monitoring and performance system that includes internal audit monitoring, project implementation monitoring, program monitoring and long-term monitoring in order to ensure City compliance with all federally funded programs received by the City and administered by WDC. The position also provides the Neighborhood Reinvestment Group Unit with administrative support.

2. Describe the results of your monitoring including any improvements.

One result of the monitoring resulted in changes to the quarterly forms to clarify the information requested and to avoid duplication of numbers. Another result is the building of positive relationships with the sub recipients. Many of the programs that were funded with CDBG/ESG have been funded in the past and WDC staff is acquainted with the programs and their primary staff. Daily monitoring allows WDC staff to track any changes with staffing or daily operations of these programs, understand any present or future problems they may face and evaluate needs that may arise. The level of detail has increased for on-site project inspections and bid forms. The increased documentation of inspections and bid forms will provide more specific details making it easier to recall the particular issues of each project should there be questions later in the development of the project. The HOME Manager

worked with WDC's two Construction Specialists to improve and stream line WDC's Standards of Rehabilitation and Materials, scope of work/estimates, specifications and bid forms for its HUD funded projects. These bid documents will provide more detail on unit costs making it easier to add and remove items from a bid if necessary and provide a more concise cost analysis.

3. Self Evaluation

- a. Describe the effect programs have in solving neighborhood and community problems.
- b. Describe progress in meeting priority needs and specific objectives and help make community's vision of the future a reality.
- c. Describe how you provided decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanded economic opportunity principally for low and moderate-income persons.
- d. Indicate any activities falling behind schedule.
- e. Describe how activities and strategies made an impact on identified needs.
- f. Identify indicators that would best describe the results.
- g. Identify barriers that had a negative impact on fulfilling the strategies and overall vision.
- h. Identify whether major goals are on target and discuss reasons for those that are not on target.
- i. Identify any adjustments or improvements to strategies and activities that might meet your needs more effectively.

**3. a. Describe the effect programs have in solving neighborhood and community problems.**

Waterbury's Housing stock consists of large number of homes built prior to 1978 making lead paint a serious issue for the City and children under the age of six. All of the HOME funded projects this year included work to make units lead safe. Increasing the number of lead safe units available to lower income families will help decrease the number of lead poisoned children. Healthy Homes, (formally known as Waterbury Eliminates Lead Hazards) the City's lead program also continued to make homes lead safe and educate individuals on the dangers of lead paint. The HOME Program continued to help the City alleviate blight by improving the appearance of a home while making it more energy efficient for the homeowner(s). In some cases it has stimulated other property owners to make improvements to their homes and learn of the programs available to assist them in making their homes lead safe, more energy efficient and code compliant. But for these programs, these families may not have been able to afford the work. Beside lead, code and energy efficiency are also prioritized. By removing the financial burden of the rehabilitation from the homeowner it has allowed them to remain in their homes and save money on the cost of energy allowing them to have money for other life necessities and help them succeed in other areas of their life such as work and school. The funding of two CDBG funded residential rehabilitation programs for owner occupied properties along with the targeting of other CDBG funds will allow the City to address housing and neighborhood problems more strategically. This program year Loyola Development Corporation, whose project area coincides with the South Main target area from the Con Plan was awarded \$70,000.00 in CD Year 34 CDBG residential rehabilitation funds to start their targeted housing rehabilitation program. Loyola Development Corporation was also awarded \$249,073.00 in new CD Year 36 CDBG funding to carry on the housing rehabilitation program. This housing rehab program is in addition to other developments Loyola is making in the target area including new

mixed use affordable housing and collaboration with Brass City Harvest on the Mill Street greenhouse project which is in the same South End target area.

CDBG funds invested in social service agencies (15%) and ESG funds continue to support programs that have a direct impact on the quality of people's lives, whether it be drug counseling, emergency shelter support, soup kitchen support, after-school child care or education, senior activities, mentoring, or literacy programs, to name a few. Project support has always been appreciated by the neighborhoods, especially since due to the City's financial constraints, the neighborhood projects might not have happened without CDBG funds. The City's sidewalks overall are in poor condition and the City tries to budget as much it can without raising taxes in a City that already has a high mill rate. CDBG funded sidewalk replacements are eagerly awaited in most neighborhoods, as are road improvements. Throughout the years, the size of the Park Department and the budget have decreased, as City leaders have made necessary fiscal cutbacks in hard, financial times. The City has wisely chosen to invest its CDBG dollars in public facility (community and recreation center) and park projects in low-moderate income census tracts, since these facilities might not otherwise have been addressed.

**3. b. Describe progress in meeting priority needs and specific objectives and help make community's vision of the future a reality.**

The City believes that HOME funds have greatly helped Waterbury make significant progress towards its objective of rehabilitating existing, older housing stock throughout disinvested neighborhoods, thus offering low-moderate income citizens safe, well-maintained and affordable choices in housing, whether rental, or owner-occupied. The projects chosen for HOME funding have been in keeping with the priorities of local residents and neighborhood associations, as well as those of our Consolidated Plan, which call for investing in pre-existing, older housing stock. The continuation of the ADDI program gives low income individuals and families the opportunity to own their own home.

CDBG funds have also made a significant impact on the quality of life in Waterbury neighborhoods. For a City its size, Waterbury is blessed with a large number of relatively stable neighborhoods. Those neighborhoods that are disinvested still offer hope for revitalization and hold promise for the future, with wise planning and seed money investment. Most of the goals established are very long-term and CDBG funds are viewed as a spur to further private investment in these areas.

The response to the first question of this CAPER (Assessment of Two-year goals and objectives) summarized in detail the achievement of specific goals and objectives, which projects were completed and which are still underway or are non-performing and why. We believe that achieving all the goals, needs and objectives will be a long-term process in Waterbury. Waterbury has made substantial gains in the past several years, as its finances have become more stable, in being able to invest more of its dollars in planning. The 10-Year Plan to End Homeless was completed in 2009 and the implementation and steering committees began meeting in January 2010.

**3. c. Describe how you provided decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanded economic opportunity principally for low and moderate-income persons.**



This year HOME funds were used for the rehabilitation of existing housing stock. HOME helped families and investors create and maintain safe and decent affordable housing by financially assisting and educating property owners in the rehabilitation of their buildings. Lead, code and energy efficiency continue to be the top priorities of the City's HOME Program.

HOME created more energy efficient units that helped lower utility bills for both homeowners and renters. In some cases these funds provided homeowners on a fixed income the assistance needed to maintain a safe living environment. Without the funds they might not have had the ability to remain in their own home.

HOME funds also made 21 lead-safe units in a city with very old housing stock with a large number of units built before 1978. HOME dollars funded the rehabilitation of 19 owner occupied units, 2 rental units. Of the rental units assisted, 1 is occupied by tenants falling in the 30% of median family income (MFI) category and 1 by a tenant in the 60% MFI category. Of the owner occupied units assisted, 2 fell in the 30% of MFI category, 8 in the 50% of MFI category, 3 in the 60% of MFI category and 6 in the 80% of MFI category.

The construction industry continues to suffer under current economic situation and many contracting firms struggle to keep their work crews employed. HOME funded projects have helped local construction companies by providing them work which in turn allows them to keep their employees most of which are low income.

**3. d. Indicate any activities falling behind schedule.**

For the HOME Program, there are three projects that have fallen behind schedule. The first is an investor project located at 102 Fairview Street. The project originally fell behind schedule due to a conflict between the homeowner and the contractor but is currently due to the homeowner being unresponsive. The HOME Manager is working with all parties to bring the project to completion. The second is an owner occupied rental project located at 26 Yates Avenue. This project first fell behind due to performance issues with the general contractor and their subcontractors. After those issues were resolved a new subcontractor was hired and completed all but a couple of small work items. Due to a conflict between the general contractor and the subcontractor the project has been delayed. The HOME Manager is currently working with the contractor, legal, subcontractor, general contractor and homeowner to resolve the issue. The third is a rehabilitation project that couldn't move forward due to an outstanding obligation to the City. At this time it is unclear as to whether or not the project will proceed.

**3. e. Describe how activities and strategies made an impact on identified needs.**

HOME activities made it possible for homeowners and investors to afford the rehabilitation needed to improve the energy efficiency of their homes, created more lead safe units, improved living conditions and for some homeowners the opportunity to stay in their own homes by providing the funding necessary for needed rehabilitation.

The Housing & Community Planning Director and HOME Manager worked with Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs) and non-profits on the development of projects located in targeted neighborhoods which would address the

housing needs of those areas and projects that would target populations in need such as the homeless, low income individuals and families including the elderly and supportive housing.

The WDC is working with Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury (NHSW) on the development of housing projects in the targeted North End Neighborhood that will address the needs of that area. NHSW is anticipated to break ground on their 885 North Main Street project which is the new construction of 10 units of affordable town house style apartments in the North End. This development will compliment the efforts already being made in the North End with the construction of the new Reverend Jonathan Reed Elementary School (grades K – 8), the continued growth of the Police Athletic League (PAL) community center and Park and targeting of NSP III funds. NHSW is also a great provider of a variety of homeowner, landlord and mortgage foreclosure counseling services.

This year Loyola Development Corporation (LDC) continued to focus its efforts in the South End Neighborhood, another targeted area. LDC used CHDO technical assistance offered by HUD through Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) to further develop their revitalization plan. The LDC is expected to submit an application for the rehabilitation of 38 units of affordable housing this Fall 2011.

Grace Development continued to work on the new construction of 41 units of elderly supportive housing s now called Hearth Homes of Waterbury. Construction is expected to begin in late Fall 2011. This project will help address the need for affordable housing for the elderly.

Other projects have made a significant difference on the identified needs (sidewalks, roads, fire station, facilities, demolition, emergency relocation etc.) in that these projects/programs would not have been possible were it not for CDBG funding. Moreover, the dedication of the full 15% of CDBG funds towards social service programs continues to receive support from the City; nonprofits have made it clear that the funding is desperately needed for them to offer the services that they do to the low-moderate income community of Waterbury.

### **3. f. Identify indicators that would best describe the results.**

Indicators for the success of the HOME program are the number of units completed and underway. Another indicator of HOME success is the continued high public interest in the program and the number of individuals renting an assisted unit with income and rent restrictions which allow them a safe, decent place to live.

Indicators for CDBG/ESG include performance measures and actual outcomes that appear in the CPMP project tables. In addition, competition for CDBG and ESG funds remains highly competitive and the request for funds far outweighs available HUD funding.

### **3. g. Identify barriers that had a negative impact on fulfilling the strategies and overall vision.**

Barriers that have had a negative impact on fulfilling the overall vision are several. The major barrier is financial. The City's road to full financial recovery is long, although significant achievements have been made in a steady and measurable fashion in the past nine years. The City's bond rating has improved over the past few

years and recently was upgraded again, which bodes well for the future. However, the City is required by local law to make an annual contribution of over 40 million dollars each year to the City's pension fund. It has done so for the past eight years and has been able to do so without a significant increase in local taxes, once property reevaluation was implemented. Were this contribution available to meet community development and housing needs, the task of accomplishing identified objectives and goals would be significantly easier. Given the continued fragile state of the economy and the projected widening gap between city revenue and spending, it appears that both property taxes will need to increase and spending decrease in order to balance the budget.

Other barriers are also directly related to the fiscal constraints of the City. Departments have been downsized in order to meet reduced budgets. With reduced staff, City departments are challenged to meet the needs and demands of a City of Waterbury's size. Efforts are underway to rebuild City departments slowly and in line with available annual funding. As the City rebuilds, departments will be strengthened and larger investments will be able to be made in projects and activities that will fulfill the City's overall vision. This will take time and require steady, wise and measured growth.

A barrier that every community is experiencing is the distressed economy and the deepening trough of the worst recession since the Great Depression. Waterbury continues to experience double digit unemployment and the job creation anticipated with the stimulus funds has yet to be effectively realized. With the state budget in a large deficit situation and even more cuts in state spending expected, Connecticut cities will have to tighten their belts even more in the future. City budgets will have to make up for state spending cuts or cut back even more significantly in their programs. There will be even less discretionary spending. Vital and important programs may end up innocent victims of an economy in recession when ironically those programs may be the most needed.

**3. h. Identify whether major goals are on target and discuss reasons for those that are not on target.**

Major CDBG/ESG /HOME goals are on target. Most importantly, the City met and exceeded the 1.5 performance ratio during CD Year 36 further evidence that the efforts it is taking to keep its projects on schedule is working and the program funds are being spent in a timely manner. Specific projects behind schedule have been identified above, most notably those that are larger City projects and require other actions beyond the CDBG funded portion of the work (including remediation of the sites with respect to the PAL and Pearl Street Park) The delay which the City has encountered with the expenditure of its CDBG-R funds designated for the supermarket redevelopment on Cooke Street is unfortunate and the City was reluctant to terminate its agreement with the developer due to the need for the project and the employment that it would generate for a low income neighborhood.

**3. i. Identify any adjustments or improvements to strategies and activities that might meet your needs more effectively.**

The allocation of \$ 250,000.00 of CDBG monies to create a program for owner occupied properties consisting of 1 – 4 units in targeted neighborhoods and elderly and disabled homeowners throughout the City allowed for the redesign of the HOME Program to fund larger projects. Funds will be targeted to the North End, South End

and Brooklyn Neighborhoods and targeted populations such as the elderly, very low income individuals and families, homeless and supportive housing. With efforts being concentrated, a greater impact will be made in the targeted neighborhoods and residents of the City.

Throughout the year, WDC staff met with Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs), non-profit housing groups and the Waterbury Housing Authority interested in partnering in projects that would address the needs of the City listed above. From these meetings five large projects were identified and will be submitting applications in the next program year.

## **Lead-based Paint**

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to evaluate and reduce lead-based paint hazards.

Program Year 3 CAPER Lead-based Paint response:

The Preventive Health and Health Services (PHHS) Block Grant continued to fund the City's Childhood Lead Poisoning Surveillance Program (CLPPP). This City's CLPPP provided prevention, health education, screening and case management services to the children of Waterbury. This coordinated and comprehensive child and environmental case management program reduced the risk of lead poisoning to the children throughout the City, ages 6 months through 6 years of age. These services included lead poisoning education, outreach, tracking all blood lead levels (BLL), follow up to providers and parents when BLL are overdue, epidemiological and environmental investigation when interventions do not reduce BLL and relocation of child and family when medically necessary. The HOME program requires lead hazards to be addressed in projects disturbing a painted surface in a property built prior to 1978.

Case management included:

- Risk Assessment conducted for BLL >10 ug/dL
- Education material sent to families with children identified with BLL of 10ug/dL-19ug/dL
- Individualized case management services provided to families with BLL of 10ug/dL-19ug/dL
- 1/1/2010 >15ug/dL epidemiological investigation Environmental Case Management.
- Effective 1/1/11 the action level may be lowered to > 10 ug/dl which will make the City consistent with the CDC levels.

(Lead Inspector):

- Risk Assessment conducted for BLL > 10ug/dL
- Environmental investigations provided when BLL are >20ug/dL
- Enforcement of Connecticut State Statutes
- Identified environmental lead levels
- Obtained environmental lead levels
- Obtained environmental samples
- Surveillance of blood lead levels:
- Lead Poisoning data base included
- Demographic information
- Confirmed laboratory BLL

- Mailing lists to community agencies

**PLANNED REVISIONS, ADDITIONS IN SERVICES:**

**Lead Hazard Control Program funded by HUD:**

Waterbury Healthy Homes, formerly known as Eliminates Lead Hazards (W.E.L.H), was awarded by HUD in April of 2009 for \$3,000,000 for lead hazard control and intervention. Healthy Homes provides financial assistance to eligible landlords and homeowners to identify and control lead-based paint hazards. The scope of work varied with each individual property. Window replacement, exterior siding and paint stabilization were the most common methods of treatment. Upon completion of each property, clearance testing is conducted to ensure compliancy has been maintained and appropriate clean-up has been performed. In addition, the program provides community outreach and education regarding lead hazards that is specifically designed for children at the elementary school level.

In September of 2010, Healthy Homes received new grant award of \$2,475,000 by HUD which will not only allow Healthy Homes to continue to provide financial assistance to Waterbury residents to remedy lead hazards; but also allow Healthy Homes to provide Healthy Homes Intervention assessment in the next three years. The purpose of this funding is to reduce significant health and safety hazards in the home done in conjunction with lead hazard control activities.

During this current grant performance period, Healthy Homes has completed 173 units that received lead hazard reduction. In addition, 78 units are currently under construction and should be cleared by April of 2012. These units will be added to the registry of lead safe housing in the City of Waterbury.

**Lead Care Capillary Screening:**

This capillary lead screening device provides immediate identification of those children possibly poisoned with lead. This device has allowed the case managers to provide lead screening at preschool programs, health fairs, community organizations such as the YMCA, public library and the Health Department.

**Mobile Health Van:**

The mobile health van was purchased by the City of Waterbury and was utilized for Neighborhood Activities such as Lead Prevention Education and Capillary Screening.

**Lead Safe Homes:**

Although the funding for Lead Safe Homes was eliminated, the program continued to operate throughout the City of Waterbury. Case Managers, the Environmental Case Manager, Sanitarians, Health Educator and the Outreach Coordinator provided door to door education with buckets containing TSP, sponges, clean rags, gloves, and lead prevention education.

**LIST OF OTHER PROGRAMS RUN BY APPLICANT SERVING THIS POPULATION:**

The City of Waterbury, Department of Public Health provided the following to children:

- *Childhood Immunizations*
- *Housing Inspections*

- *Woman Infant Children*
- *Urban Asthma Program*
- *Putting on the Airm*
- *Waterbury Eliminates Lead Hazards*
- *Healthy Choices.*
- *Pregnant Women- Positive Parenting.*
- *HCWC*
- *Lead Safe Homes*
- *IAP*
- *PPD Screenings*
- *Identification and Eliminate Lead Hazards*
- *School Nursing Services to all Public, Parochial and Private Schools in Waterbury*

### **TARGET POPULATION, NUMBER OF CLIENTS TO BE SERVED, AND BREAKDOWN BY RACE, AGE, AND SEX**

#### **Target Population:**

The target population included all children between the ages of 6 months-6 years residing in the City. According to the Childhood Lead Poisoning in Connecticut, CY 2004 Surveillance Report, by the CT DPH, 9785 children reside in the City of Waterbury. Currently there is no documented breakdown for this population by race, age, or sex.

#### **Geographic Area Served by the Program:**

Waterbury is an industrial city of 107,271 persons, occupying 28.9 square miles. Plagued by declining industry, high unemployment, and a shrinking tax base, it is understandable that there is a profusion of low-income residents. In addition, 55.2% of the City's housing stock built before 1950 is substandard and largely rental (46,000 units). The Lead Department has specifically targeted low-income neighborhoods, such as the WOW neighborhood (Walnut, Orange, and Walsh Streets).

#### **Program Strategies Selected:**

The CLPPP staff continues to monitor results of screenings/confirmatory tests of children residing in Waterbury and follow CDC guidelines regarding medical and environmental management. CLPPP is committed to providing education to the community through outreach, partnering local agencies and media campaign tailored to the various ethnic groups existing in Waterbury. CLPPP will continue to focus on Case Management, particularly home visits, risk assessments and investigations for BLLs 10ug/dL – 14ug/dL. A team approach inclusive of health care providers, parents, outside agencies and property owners, will be maintained to ensure appropriate management of services.

The Environmental Case Manager performs environmental investigations on all confirmed cases of elevated blood levels equal to or greater than 15ug/dL. In addition to these investigations, comprehensive risk assessments are provided when BLLs fall within the range of 10ug/dL – 19ug/dL. A database of all subject properties has been created and maintained by staff. Upon completion of an investigation, the Environmental Case Manager complies with the Connecticut State Statutes and Regulations and proceeds accordingly. As a routine investigation, the Environmental Case Manager utilizes the XRF machine to accurately record the levels of lead found on a property. The Environmental Case

Manager provides guidance throughout the abatement to ensure lead safe practices are followed. A final clearance inspection is completed and the property is updated on the database as lead safe.

**Description of Need for Services:**

Of the 9,785 children under the age of 6, only 4,422 (45.2%) children were screened for lead poisoning. The Lead Department has been trying to increase the number of children screened through several avenues: increased contact and collaboration with private pediatricians and pediatric clinics and attendance at health fairs and community organizations, and neighborhood centers. The Lead Department recognizes a large population of transient families living in Waterbury. Although the Lead Department has recently purchased a capillary blood lead screening device, it will be unable to identify and screen a large portion of those children not screened or not enrolled into the public school system. The Lead Department will be able to identify and screen those children enrolled into either pre-kindergarten or kindergarten, due to the Health Department mandate that all children enrolled in their first year of school enter with a documented blood lead level. All 38 of the school nurses working in the public, private, and parochial schools are employed through the Health Department. This collaborative relationship between the School Nurses and the staff of the Lead Department increases the number of documented blood lead levels throughout the City, i.e. Waterbury Healthy Homes.

Healthy Homes has been actively working with the existing Lead Poisoning Prevention Program and the Environmental Division of the Waterbury Health Department. The Lead Program frequently refers property owners to Healthy Homes for further assistance with lead treatment. In a collaborative effort, Healthy Homes and the Lead Program provide lead screenings free of charge to children residing in Waterbury. Screenings are available at many locations throughout the City.

The staff of Healthy Homes is keenly aware of the importance of establishing working relationships with community-based agencies within the City. The success of this program relies heavily on the support of partnering agencies and their continued vested interest in our communities. Healthy Homes strives to maintain close community interaction. Public service announcements, attending local community fairs, faith based events and home-owner association meetings are just a few venues used to promote the program and to ensure residents are aware that lead treatment and financial assistance are available.

Healthy Homes has crafted a community education program specifically designed for children at the elementary school level. A lesson plan was created to accompany the storyboard presentation. Storyboard is a six-foot wide, four paneled diorama with six pre-recorded messages in English/Spanish that coincide with each colorful banner. Students are introduced to an African-American inner-city family of four and their dog Dusty, along with two female, minority, health-care representatives, Dr. Gray and Nurse Rodriguez. This diverse representation is a crucial piece of the positive reception the lead poisoning prevention lesson receives for the Waterbury school children, as the majority of students are members of minority groups and meet low socio-economic status. The lesson is accessible to students visually, and in content, as Dusty the dog is a life-size Siberian husky with whom the children are encouraged to interact. This is a hands-on, interactive demonstration that teaches children the importance of hand

washing and the fact that that lead dust can be anywhere. It is the central piece of this multi-media, lead awareness prevention lesson. Teachers are given information in English/Spanish to distribute to parents. The letter outlines program services, the dangers of lead poisoning and contact information. *From October 1st through September 30<sup>th</sup>, approximately 131 health educational events were held and 4,196 individuals have viewed this presentation.*

Training for Lead Safe Work Practices will continue to be offered periodically to any resident who would like to know more about lead hazards and how to safely eliminate it from their home or property. Healthy Homes encourages local residents who have an interest in lead safe practices to attend the HUD approved training and continue to become licensed in lead safe work practices. In addition to this seven hour training class, Healthy Homes provides more extensive training classes for those interested in becoming certified lead safe contractors and supervisors. Upon completion of this class, participants are eligible to apply to the State of Connecticut for their license.

The HOME program continues to make properties built prior to 1978 lead safe, as it is a requirement of HOME, this year the HOME program has made 21 units lead safe.

## HOUSING

### Housing Needs

\*Please also refer to the Housing Needs Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Describe Actions taken during the last year to foster and maintain affordable housing.

Program Year 3 CAPER Housing Needs response:

During the 2010-2011 NHSW continued to work with the City to foster and maintain affordable housing for area residents. NHS provided foreclosure prevention counseling, reverse mortgage counseling and homebuyer education to City residents. The total number of Waterbury residents they served during the year was 533; of which approximately 60%, 320, were seeking foreclosure intervention assistance. They also helped 2 Waterbury households receive SMARTMOVE/Workforce Housing down payment assistance.

### Specific Housing Objectives

1. Evaluate progress in meeting specific objective of providing affordable housing, including the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income renter and owner households comparing actual accomplishments with proposed goals during the reporting period.
2. Evaluate progress in providing affordable housing that meets the Section 215 definition of affordable housing for rental and owner households comparing actual accomplishments with proposed goals during the reporting period.



3. Describe efforts to address "worst-case" housing needs and housing needs of persons with disabilities.

Program Year 3 CAPER Specific Housing Objectives response:

**1. Evaluate progress in meeting specific objective of providing affordable housing, including the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income renter and owner households comparing actual accomplishments with proposed goals during the reporting period.**

In 2010-2011, two rental units assisted under HOME are occupied by one extremely low-income (0-30% of median) household and one unit by very low income (51 – 60% of median income) household. Of the owner occupied units assisted, two households fell in the 0 -30% range and eight in the 31 - 50% range of median income, three in the 51 – 60% of median family income and 6 in the 61 – 80% of median family income.

In addition, NHSW has addressed through counseling many issues/concerns related to housing and affordable housing in specific (See Question 1 (a), subsection e)

**2. Evaluate progress in providing affordable housing that meets the Section 215 definition of affordable housing for rental and owner households comparing actual accomplishments with proposed goals during the reporting period.**

See above.

**3. Describe efforts to address "worst-case" housing needs and housing needs of persons with disabilities.**

Worst case housing needs and housing needs of the disabled are being addressed through funding and projects generated by the Continuum of Care and through the Waterbury Housing Authority. CREDO is also providing 7 homeless individuals with supportive housing. Due to the ever worsening economy, the former tent city which the City razed in December 2008 has re-emerged and is now home to an estimated 28 new individuals and families, many of whom also suffer from a variety of physical and mental ailments. Local public service organizations and social workers from the state Department of Mental Health and Addiction continue to access a variety of state, federal and private funds in order to assist them and find them permanent housing.

The announcement of an additional 25 Veterans Affairs Supported Housing (VASH) Vouchers for the homeless veterans in need of case management services with special targeting to the chronically homeless veterans is good news to help alleviate some of those living in the woods. These will supplement the previous allocation of 35 VASH vouchers reported in last year's CAPER.

As previously noted both the City and WDC are actively involved in the next phase of the Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness, the implementation phase. The Housing and Community Planning Director co-chairs the Ten Year Plan Housing Committee, along with the Executive Director of NHS. The Housing Committee was active during the program year and instrumental in forging new partnerships and collaborations between social services providers and local developers. The Committee is also

meeting with local developers interested in creating additional units of permanent supportive housing.

## **Barriers to Affordable Housing**

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to eliminate barriers to affordable housing.

Program Year 3 CAPER Barriers to Affordable Housing response:

NHS of Waterbury (NHSW) saw its overall numbers remain steady with a slight decrease in Waterbury clients for the fiscal year 2010-2011. NHS of Waterbury has completed the approval process and will break ground on a ten unit affordable rental housing project on North Main Street using a mix of HOME and HTCC funds through WDC, CHFA and DECD. The groundbreaking is anticipated to be in the Spring of 2012.

NHSW offers a range of financial and homebuyer education, homeownership assistance, and foreclosure intervention, including reverse mortgage counseling. As the financial crisis continues, foreclosure assistance continues to be in high demand. With low interest rates and declining home values homebuyer education has seen increased participation from area residents. NHS continues to administer several down payment assistance programs. They provide financial education classes in partnership with Workforce Inc. They continue to work with Marrakech to provide monthly financial education to disadvantaged Waterbury youth, and have begun working with H-Networking and other local Hispanic groups to reach this underserved minority.

The total number of Waterbury residents assisted during the period October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011 was 533. Of this approximately 60%, 320 were seeking foreclosure intervention assistance. The remaining clients participated in a combination of pre-purchase counseling and education, homeownership and financial education. NHSW continues to provide down payment assistance through several programs targeting Waterbury area residents. During the last year NHS helped 2 Waterbury households receive SMARTMOVE/Workforce Housing down-payment assistance.

## **HOME/ American Dream Down Payment Initiative (ADDI)**

1. Assessment of Relationship of HOME Funds to Goals and Objectives
  - a. Evaluate progress made toward meeting goals for providing affordable housing using HOME funds, including the number and types of households served.
2. HOME Match Report
  - a. Use HOME Match Report HUD-40107-A to report on match contributions for the period covered by the Consolidated Plan program year.
3. HOME MBE and WBE Report
  - a. Use Part III of HUD Form 40107 to report contracts and subcontracts with Minority Business Enterprises (MBEs) and Women's Business Enterprises (WBEs).

4. Assessments

- a. Detail results of on-site inspections of rental housing.
- b. Describe the HOME jurisdiction’s affirmative marketing actions.
- c. Describe outreach to minority and women owned businesses.

Program Year 3 CAPER HOME/ADDI response:

1. Assessment of Relationship of HOME Funds to Goals and Objectives

- a. Evaluate progress made toward meeting goals for providing affordable housing using HOME funds, including the number and types of households served.

The Consolidated Plan identified the need for the expansion of affordable rental units, the improvement of existing rental and owner occupied units and increase the opportunities for very low and low income households to become and remain homeowners through home purchase financing. Pre and post-purchase counseling and mortgage foreclosure assistance were also identified as priorities. The number rental units rehabilitated fell short of last year’s goal of 161 units largely due to a rehabilitation project of 151 units of elderly housing not moving forward. The goal for the number of owner occupied homes rehabilitated was 28 units; the actual number of units was 19. The Year 3 goal for increasing the opportunities for very low and low income households to become and remain homeowners was 0 but should have been 2, actual households that received assistance this year was 0.

As part of the redesign of the HOME Program, the WDC worked on the development of larger projects by working with CHDOs and non-profits interested in the development of rental projects that will create and rehabilitate properties into safe, decent and affordable housing for low income individuals and families including units for the homeless. These projects will use a combination of funding sources which will allow the City to create more units of affordable housing units than the current program.

As mentioned under Goal # 2: To Achieve Decent, Safe and Affordable Housing In Waterbury the subprime lending issue, foreclosure crisis, Waterbury’s high unemployment rate, and the economy were still large factors in the inability to expend the balance of ADDI funds during Year 3. As previously stated, WDC will work closely with NHSW to continue its outreach to help locate potential qualified first time homebuyers.

Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury’s (NHSW) goal was to provide housing/foreclosure counseling to 500 individuals, the actual number of people served was 533. NHSW assisted 2 Waterbury Households in receiving SMARTMOVE/Workforce Housing down payment assistance. They also held post purchase counseling for landlords of both owner occupied and investor properties. Out of the 28 individuals that attended classes during Program Year 3, 95% of them were for owner occupied properties.

Priority Housing Activities  
Year 3 Goals & Actual Units Assisted

Priority Need	Year 3 Goal	Actual
---------------	-------------	--------

HOME		
Production of new rental units	0	0
Rehabilitation of existing rental units	161	2
Rehabilitation of existing owner units	28	19
Homeownership assistance	0	0

The Consolidated Plan identifies the need for the improvement of existing rental and owner occupied housing and the need to assist households at all income levels falling between 0 - 80% of median family income and below. HOME applications were processed on a first come first served basis. The following table compares the Year 3 goals by income level with actual households assisted.

Priority Housing Needs  
Year 3 Goals & Actual Households Assisted

Priority Need	Year 3 Goal	Actual
<b>Renters</b>		
0 – 30%	21	1
31 – 50%	12	0
51 – 80%	3	1
<b>Owners</b>		
0 – 30%	3	2
31 – 50%	6	8
51 – 80%	6	9

2. HOME Match Report

- a. Use HOME Match Report HUD-40107-A to report on match contributions for the period covered by the Consolidated Plan program year.

See attached HOME Match Report HUD-40107-A.

3. HOME MBE and WBE Report

- a. Use Part III of HUD Form 40107 to report contracts and subcontracts with Minority Business Enterprises (MBEs) and Women’s Business Enterprises (WBEs).

See attached HUD Form 40107.

4. Assessments

- a. Detail results of on-site inspections of rental housing.

In previous years our ongoing Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspections of rental properties were conducted by an outside firm. During Spring 2011 our Construction Specialist began conducting these inspections. To make the inspections more cost effective it was decided it would be best to have a WDC staff member complete the inspections. In August Michael Gilmore, WDC’s Fair Housing/Neighborhood Re-Investment Manager participated in an online HQS course and became a certified HQS inspector; he began performing inspections this October. Nancy Allen our Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist is assisting with the scheduling of inspections and the correspondence. As of September 30, 2011, 12 inspections were conducted which resulted in 10 units passing and two failing. Since the end of the program year 4 more inspections and 2 re-inspections have been completed which resulted in 3 passes and 4 fails which are scheduled for re-inspection in December. When a unit

fails an inspection, the owner is given twenty-four hours for an item that is considered an emergency and thirty days if it is a non-emergency. There are a total of 42 units (19 projects) to be inspected during Program Year 4.

b. Describe the HOME jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions.

HOME-funded projects follow HUD's Affirmative Marketing regulations. WDC HOME staff requires owners of five or more unit properties to submit an Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan (HUD-935.2). An Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan was prepared. The City's Fair Housing Officer continues to be a member of the Fair Housing Association of Connecticut. He also developed a rapport with the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities. A Fair Housing section was added to the WDC website, advertisements were placed in the Waterbury Republican-American, El Canillita (Spanish) newspapers and on Spanish Radio. The Fair Housing Officer also made a Fair Housing presentation to the Greater Waterbury Board of Realtors.

c. Describe outreach to minority and women owned businesses.

The WDC follows the City's procurement procedures and has an open bidding process for HOME funded projects. The City/WDC encourages minority and women-owned businesses to bid on projects. As part of procurement, WDC staff personally contacts a list of women and minority-owned businesses to make them aware of upcoming projects and encourages them to submit bids upon advertisement of said project in the local newspaper. HOME staff coordinated efforts with the Business Growth Group of WDC who held minority outreach forums.

## HOMELESS

### Homeless Needs

\*Please also refer to the Homeless Needs Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Identify actions taken to address needs of homeless persons.
2. Identify actions to help homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living.
3. Identify new Federal resources obtained from Homeless SuperNOFA.

Program Year 3 CAPER Homeless Needs response:

#### **1. Identify actions taken to address needs of homeless persons.**

The Waterbury Continuum of Care encompasses a wide array of organizations and individuals who work collaboratively to plan, coordinate, and provide for the delivery of services and housing to people who are homeless in the City of Waterbury; bringing together over sixty service providers, advocates, government officials, churches, private citizens, homeless or previously homeless persons, landlords, and developers focused on planning and implementing linkages throughout the City's housing and homeless support system. COC members participate in other Regional and State initiatives relating to homelessness to ensure that Waterbury is represented widely in regard to homelessness issues. The COC acts as the lead entity for actions relating to homelessness. Meetings are held quarterly at the United

Way in Waterbury. The overall mission of the COC is to help the community develop the capacity to envision, organize, and plan comprehensive and long-term solutions to end homelessness. The COC helps homeless families and individuals to obtain safe and affordable housing, and prevent their return to homelessness.

One of the major undertakings in 2011 was the intersection of Continuum of Care work and the work of the Implementation teams for the Waterbury Ten year Plan to end homelessness. This included aligning Subcommittee work of both groups and adding report outs to the full Continuum regarding the progress of the implementation of the Ten Year Plan. This effort includes the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual Progress Report on the activities and strategies implemented in support of the Ten Year Plan. A presentation was made to the Ten Year Plan Leadership Committee which included outcomes achieved, barriers faced, and 12 month objectives for the upcoming program year.

On January 27, 2011, the City of Waterbury and the Continuum participated in the state-wide homeless count. The count was overseen by the Connecticut Coalition to End Homelessness and was locally coordinated by the Western Connecticut Mental Health Network. This year's effort included the tracking of both the sheltered and unsheltered population. Waterbury's participation in the count yielded valuable information regarding the current numbers of homeless persons living on the streets and in the shelters, giving the City and COC an updated base-line for identifying the needs of the homeless population in Waterbury. This also provides the Continuum with a more accurate needs assessment when planning what funding to apply for and what segments of the population should be targeted with those funds.

Another of the Continuum's efforts was the convening of the 4th Annual Project Homeless Connect Event for the City of Waterbury. This event took place at the Armory in Waterbury on October 21st. This was spearheaded by the Continuum's ad-hoc Homeless Connect Committee and it included support from local donors, city and state government officials, hospitals, social service agencies, private health care providers, business sector, local university, and volunteer support. Without the support of the entire community the event could not have been as successful as it turned out. The following is a breakdown of the services provided:

- 356 total persons registered
- 3 Mammograms
- 36 Social Security Numbers/Birth Certificate
- 70 Haircuts
- 63 Eye Screenings
- 31 Flu Shots
- 188 Medical Triage/BP & BMI; Blood Sugar Screenings/ & Foot Evaluations
- 18 Dental Screening and 18 Dental Cleanings
- 240 Winter Coats Distributed
- 230 Books Distributed
- 414 Baggies of instant meals/drinks distributed
- 298 Hygiene Bags/Feminine Hygiene Products
- 102 pairs of shoes

The Continuum and its members have remained active in the implementation of the HMIS (Homeless Management Information System). Through the 2007 SuperNOFA the CT Coalition to End Homelessness received funds to provide a local administrator to oversee the implementation of HMIS in the city of Waterbury. Nutmeg Consulting

is the subcontractor and continues to staff a part-time consultant to coordinate trainings, convene meetings, and educate site technical coordinators on the reports available through the HMIS system. The data quality for the Waterbury community has increased to 98% as of October 2011.

Conferences held by the Connecticut Coalition to End Homelessness (CCEH) in September of 2009 were widely attended and provided essential trainings in the most current evidence based methodologies in responding to the issues surrounding homelessness; including helping homeless persons obtain entitlements, connecting resources, and legislative advocacy.

The Society of Support permanent supportive housing project continued to provide permanent housing in the form of 21 units for individuals and families. This project is a collaboration with St. Vincent DePaul as the lead agency in partnership with CT Outreach West and New Opportunities, Inc. The Freedom Walk project also a supportive housing project provides 25 units of permanent housing for homeless individuals and families with 12 of the units provided through Mutual Housing Association's Willow Street Development. This project is a partnership with New Opportunities, Inc. as the administering agency, with support provided through the Salvation Army, Waterbury Hospital Health Access Program, and Northwest Regional Workforce Investment Board. Mutual Housing Association provides housing and administrative support through 12 units on Willow Street. Credo, Inc. is a permanent supportive housing partnership which included the rehabilitation of a local property on Thomaston Ave. The project serves 7 chronically homeless individuals with support services provided by a local contracted social service provider.

The Continuum put forth for additional HUD funding in the 2011 SuperNOFA to create 8 new units of permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals using Shelter Plus Care certificates. Funding worth a total of \$120,128 is to be utilized as housing assistance for homeless individuals in Waterbury. If awarded the housing assistance will be administered through the Western CT Mental health Network. Additionally, renewal projects were applied for Pilots I and II, Beyond Shelter, Society of Support, Freedom Walk, Credo, Inc., Waterbury SHP 1, and local HMIS Administration.

The United Way of Greater Waterbury continued to provide funding support in the amount of \$30,000 to support a part-time Continuum of Care Coordinator position as well as consultant efforts in regards to the HUD SuperNOFA and the support of the implementation of the 10 year plan/CoC Collaborative work.

## **2. Identify actions to help homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living.**

The Continuum actively engages the access and coordination of the available resources to homeless individuals and families. The COC/TYP Services Committee helps the service providers to coordinate the utilization of supportive resources to maintain the stability of homeless persons in permanent housing. This activity is also supported through the local screening committee that acts to collaboratively identify and direct the available resources to those in need. The screening committee is comprised of the Homeless Outreach teams, permanent supportive housing providers, shelter staff, and Western Connecticut Mental Health network. The screening committee meets regularly to coordinate and approve the placement of homeless persons into permanent housing. The committee also acts to identify

needs of the homeless persons and recommends appropriate referrals based on the persons needs to the case manager assigned to them. Referrals may include: substance abuse treatment programs, employment outreach and training programs, individual and family counseling. This coordination plays out as daily action on the part of the service system; with the Homeless Outreach Team, the shelter staff, and the supportive housing case managers and administration remaining in constant communication. The Case Managers work with landlords and the Housing Authority to ensure that the homeless persons have a smooth transition into permanent housing and independent living. Once housed, the case managers remain engaged with the client to help them maintain stability and to maximize their independence.

All supportive housing is permanent, independent and affordable. The case management provided is on-site and offers a wide-range of supports to the homeless person, including employment services.

### **3. Identify new Federal resources obtained from Homeless SuperNOFA.**

New federal resources applied for through the Continuum in the 2012 round of SuperNOFA funding include:

\$120,198 was applied for by the Western CT Mental Health Network for the provision of 6 units of supportive housing.

Total Amount funded \$120,198 (approval pending)

### **Specific Homeless Prevention Elements**

1. Identify actions taken to prevent homelessness.

Program Year 3 CAPER Specific Housing Prevention Elements response:

Without being redundant, "addressing the needs of homeless persons" (question one) is all-inclusive and covers many of the actions taken in the past year that also prevent homelessness.

In the past year the following agencies/programs have addressed "basic needs" of individuals in danger of becoming homeless: the Salvation Army Emergency Assistance Program, the New Opportunities CT Energy Assistance Program, WCMHN temporary rent, utilities and basic needs for SAGA clients, the Northeast Utilities Payment Incentive Program for Low-income Families in arrears, the Yankee Gas Matching Payment Program for Families in arrears, the United Way Emergency Food Resource Fund, Greater Waterbury Interfaith Ministries and the DSS Cash Assistance Program. Rental and housing assistance to those at risk include: the New Opportunities Eviction Prevention Program, Connecticut Legal Services for education on tenant rights and responsibilities, the CT Legal Rights HOME Project, the Beyond Shelter Case Management Services, and the Waterbury Housing Authority Consumer Protection Education. Employment counseling and assistance have been provided by the Northwest Region Workforce Investment Board, the CT Department of Labor, CT WORKS, and the CT Bureau of Rehabilitation Services. Benefits are provided by: Morris Foundation Case Management for SSI, DSS-Medical benefits, Legal Aid-SSI benefits and the CT Legal Rights H.O.M.E. Project. The COC and the Northwest



Regional Workforce Investment Board have partnered to increase access to employment supports and job training for families and individuals who are experiencing homelessness.

### **Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG)**

1. Identify actions to address emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless individuals and families (including significant subpopulations such as those living on the streets).
2. Assessment of Relationship of ESG Funds to Goals and Objectives
  - a. Evaluate progress made in using ESG funds to address homeless and homeless prevention needs, goals, and specific objectives established in the Consolidated Plan.
  - b. Detail how ESG projects are related to implementation of comprehensive homeless planning strategy, including the number and types of individuals and persons in households served with ESG funds.
3. Matching Resources
  - a. Provide specific sources and amounts of new funding used to meet match as required by 42 USC 11375(a)(1), including cash resources, grants, and staff salaries, as well as in-kind contributions such as the value of a building or lease, donated materials, or volunteer time.
4. State Method of Distribution
  - a. States must describe their method of distribution and how it rated and selected its local government agencies and private nonprofit organizations acting as subrecipients.
5. Activity and Beneficiary Data
  - a. Completion of attached Emergency Shelter Grant Program Performance Chart or other reports showing ESGP expenditures by type of activity. Also describe any problems in collecting, reporting, and evaluating the reliability of this information.
  - b. Homeless Discharge Coordination
    - i. As part of the government developing and implementing a homeless discharge coordination policy, ESG homeless prevention funds may be used to assist very-low income individuals and families at risk of becoming homeless after being released from publicly funded institutions such as health care facilities, foster care or other youth facilities, or corrections institutions or programs.
  - c. Explain how your government is instituting a homeless discharge coordination policy, and how ESG homeless prevention funds are being used in this effort.

Program Year 3 CAPER ESG response:

Due to the lack of funding for services and housing, there is a shortage of services to affirmatively address the crisis of homelessness throughout the City. Within the City, there are limited emergency shelters, no transitional housing facilities, and few permanent housing options for the homeless. This past year, which saw the continuation of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression has been extremely difficult for those providing shelter and supportive services to the most vulnerable citizens. The announcement of an additional 25 Veterans Affairs Supported Housing (VASH) Vouchers for the homeless veterans in need of case

management services with special targeting to the chronically homeless veterans is good news to help alleviate some of those living in the woods.

The City received \$931,128 in Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing (HPRP) funds as part of the ARRA funding. These funds were allocated to a collaborative of the Connecticut Coalition to End Homelessness; Connecticut Legal Services; The Salvation Army and St. Vincent DePaul Mission of Waterbury. The funds are designed to assist those at risk of homelessness and prevent eviction through the provision of rent arrearages; security deposits; and utility deposits. The funds are also designed to assist those recently homeless (not the chronically homeless) with the resources needed to be rapidly re-housed. To date, 114 households containing 286 people have received homelessness prevention services and 41 households containing 78 people have received homeless assistance services. Approximately 47% (\$345,980) of the HPRP funds have been expended and the City is confident that it will meet the statutory 60% expenditure by July 2011.

The City of Waterbury has helped address emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of the homeless by continuing to use ESG funding to fund operating expenses of local shelters. ESG funds provided shelter, daily expense payments, provided for medical care cost coverage and counseled homeless and/or near homeless concerning unemployment and other benefit related modes of assistance. ESG-funded agencies also provided emergency relative assistance to the near homeless in the form of rental assistance; however, such assistance is limited and often does not cover the cost of permanent housing in the current market. Overnight beds were at times used to capacity this past year. Length of stay varied from overnight to over several months. Many of these people were dependent upon assistance benefits, and an increasing number have lost their jobs. These people were considered to be at risk of homelessness due to their precarious situations.

Waterbury's St. Vincent DePaul Mission Shelter is the largest shelter in the State of Connecticut with 126 beds. With so many more homeless people - mainly families with children - the Shelter recently increased its capacity by adding 25 cots. During the 2010-2011 program year the Shelter serviced 989 different individuals; 32,688 bed nights were used, an increase of 8,137 over last year.

Cots are set up in the men and women's dining rooms after the dinner hour. The winter capacity is 150. However, the number of physically and addicted handicapped people is limited by the number of lower bunks available on a given night. The bedrooms for families are normally full (50 beds) taking into account the statistical make-up of the family (age, gender). Single Females have been moved to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor dormitory with all 26 beds in use. Cots are used for overflow women as needed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor dining room. The 50 beds for adult males are normally full and cots are set up in the first floor dining room for the overflow of men. It was not necessary to set up additional cots in the summer of 2010.

The COC continues to apply for additional funding to create more permanent supportive housing. Using the Housing First model, the Continuum hopes to provide immediate access to affordable, safe housing for those in need. However, the lack of service funding by the State, and the limited funds available through the SuperNOFA make this a lengthy and difficult process that is not meeting the needs of the homeless population that is currently living on the streets and shelters right now. Furthermore, changes to the definition of homeless by HUD is limiting access to permanent supportive housing, making it more difficult to gain access to the few

housing options that are out there. This is creating a situation where the system is funneling the homeless into the Shelters, in order to prove eligibility of need for the homeless to gain access to housing. A system designed in this way does not allow for prevention of homelessness, but in fact creates more homelessness.

6. Assessment of Relationship of ESG Funds to Goals and Objectives
  - a. Evaluate progress made in using ESG funds to address homeless and homeless prevention needs, goals, and specific objectives established in the Consolidated Plan.
  - b. Detail how ESG projects are related to implementation of comprehensive homeless planning strategy, including the number and types of individuals and persons in households served with ESG funds.
7. Matching Resources
  - a. Provide specific sources and amounts of new funding used to meet match as required by 42 USC 11375(a)(1), including cash resources, grants, and staff salaries, as well as in-kind contributions such as the value of a building or lease, donated materials, or volunteer time.

2-3. The City of Waterbury's Homeless Strategy for meeting its goals and objectives is a partnership between the City and its service providers. Based upon the expertise of the service providers and the Continuum of Care (COC), the City has established a mechanism to address the needs of the homeless population. The goal is that all homeless persons of Waterbury have safe, decent and affordable housing. In Question # 1 (above) the 2010-2011 agencies and amounts funded by ESG for 2010-2011 were identified.

**The Salvation Army** (\$8,900) used their ESG funds for administrative and operating expenses at their family shelter. The Salvation Army operated its shelter 7 days/week, 24 hours/day. The Salvation Army allocation was matched with Other Federal Funds of \$21,617.00, Local Government Funds of \$288,804.00, and \$39,337.00 in Donations.

**Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury** (\$13,400) used their ESG funds for operating costs at their shelter, which provides a safe place for physically and/or psychologically abused women and children. There were also support services, support groups, self-esteem groups, a staffed hot line, counseling by phone, information and referrals and volunteer training sessions. The Safe Haven allocation was matched with \$50,000 in Other Federal funds, \$153,500 in Local Government funds, \$85,000 in Private Funds, and \$30,500 in Donations.

**The St. Vincent DePaul Society** (\$72,722) grant was used for operating costs for the operation of the homeless shelter. The St. Vincent DePaul ESG grant was matched with Private Funding of \$22,500, \$42,000 in Donations and other Funding of \$25,000.

All of the agencies listed above helped the City address its priority needs for this population by expanding existing programs of assessment and outreach targeted to serve homeless families, individuals and persons with special needs, and providing transitional housing.

The COC also worked with other housing agencies to help provide this population with permanent housing and worked closely with area hospitals to make sure all the

needs for medical attention (emotional, physical or routine) were addressed to promote a true continuum of care.

- 8. State Method of Distribution
  - a. States must describe their method of distribution and how it rated and selected its local government agencies and private nonprofit organizations acting as subrecipients.  
Not applicable.

- 9. Activity and Beneficiary Data
  - a. Completion of attached Emergency Shelter Grant Program Performance Chart or other reports showing ESGP expenditures by type of activity. Also describe any problems in collecting, reporting, and evaluating the reliability of this information.

All expenditures for the ESG program, by type of activity are listed in the IDIS report PR 19 and PR 20. There is no problem in collecting, reporting or evaluating the reliability of this information, since each funded agency submitted all requested information in a timely and comprehensive fashion and WDC staff maintains a good working relationship with all funded agencies.

- b. Homeless Discharge Coordination
  - i. As part of the government developing and implementing a homeless discharge coordination policy, ESG homeless prevention funds may be used to assist very-low income individuals and families at risk of becoming homeless after being released from publicly funded institutions such as health care facilities, foster care or other youth facilities, or corrections institutions or programs.
  - c. Explain how your government is instituting a homeless discharge coordination policy, and how ESG homeless prevention funds are being used in this effort.

ESG response:

5. b-c. The City is funding the care of the homeless put out of its shelters, because the state does not have an adequate discharge policy. ESG funds are not used in instituting a homeless discharge policy. Below is the COC Discharge Planning Policy Chart.

### COC Discharge Planning Policy Chart

For each category of publicly funded institution or system of care in your COC, one box is checked to indicate the level of development of discharge planning policy. The chart below describes the discharge planning policy for each category, or the status of development.

Publicly Funded Institution(s) or System(s) of Care in COC Geographic Area	None	Initial Discussion	Protocol in Development	Formal Protocol Finalized	Formal Protocol Implemented
Foster Care	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Health Care	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mental Health	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Corrections	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Foster Care:**

A Chafee Plan has been written by the State of Connecticut to outline the state's plan for implementing the Foster Care Independence Act of 1999 (FCIA), or John H. Chafee Independence Program. A primary purpose of the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program is to provide financial, housing, counseling, employment, education, and other appropriate support and services to former foster care recipients between 18 and 21 years of age to complement their own efforts to achieve self-sufficiency and to assure that program participants recognize and accept their personal responsibility for preparing for and then making the transition from adolescence to adulthood.

The treatment planning process in Connecticut's foster care programs begins with the Independent Living Plan and Conference that provides the roadmap for independent living service delivery, and ends with the Transitional Living Plan and Conference which serves as the discharge, or transition from care, plan. The state of Connecticut has built an Independent Living Program that offers young people a continuum of independent living services along with specialized case management to ensure their transition from substitute care to a productive community life.

The continuum transitions youth through the life skills education and training, supervised transitional and practice living, to their own community housing. All the time, being assigned to a Regional Adolescent Services Unit and Adolescent Specialist experiences in adolescent assessment, treatment and independent living services. Part of the department's housing continuum includes a Community Housing Assistance Program, which provides youth with a subsidy to cover living expenses such as rent, food, utilities, telephone, transportation, and clothing. Youth are required to complete the department's life skills program, be employed and enrolled in an educational or vocational program, and contribute a portion of their income toward expenses and a savings account.

**Health Care:**

**Discharge Planning Process:** If at the time of the initial assessment, a determination is made that the patient has issues (i.e., the patient can not return home or will be unable to care for himself/herself independently in the home setting), the nursing staff and/or the Departments of Case Management and Social Work will provide assistance in planning for continuity of care, as appropriate.

Those patients who seem unable to return home, or who were admitted to the hospital from a facility are referred to the Social Work Department. The Social Work Department assists patients and families in completing and processing applications for an extended care facility, hospice placement, or rehabilitation placement, as well as evaluating financial and psychological needs.

Those patients who seem able to return home, but who will require HOME or community services such as nursing, physical therapy, HOME health aide, equipment, etc., will be assisted by the Department of Case Management and by nursing staff.

**Mental Health:**

The Department of Mental Health (now the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services) promulgated Policy #33 "Individualized Treatment" and this policy was implemented on March 12, 1993. DMHAS acknowledges it has already developed and implemented a policy required as a condition of receipt of McKinney Funds. In summary, the policy specifies that "each patient treated in a Department of Mental Health facility shall have a specialized treatment plan suited to his or her disorder...which shall include a discharge plan for appropriate aftercare of the patient. Treatment in an inpatient facility must be viewed as a foundation for continued treatment in the community to which the individual is being discharged. The treatment team or clinician responsible for the inpatient care should plan the aftercare services needed by the patient, in conjunction with the community case manager who is responsible to ensure service linkage in the community. This collaborative planning process should commence at the point of the inpatient admission and should identify all of the services and service providers in the local community support system whose efforts will assist the individual in maintaining him/herself in the community in the least restrictive environment possible. Continuity of care is of primary importance. .... Every attempt shall be made to verify discharge housing arrangements. Under no circumstances shall an emergency shelter be considered appropriate housing disposition, and patients shall not be directly discharged by the inpatient facility to an emergency shelter. No patient shall be discharged from a DMH facility without documented evidence that discharge and aftercare plans have been an integral part of the treatment plan.... (with) documentation indicating that the patient and the community based case manager have been actively involved in the discharge planning process.

**Corrections:\***

The Connecticut Department of Correction's re-entry model focuses on provision of services that facilitate the transition between incarceration and successful community adjustment, an initiative that spans the period from initial incarceration to community placement. The Department has initiated an Offender Accountability Plan for each inmate, providing a program outline and expectations during the entire term of incarceration. A standardized discharge plan is completed with inmates at the end of sentence, addressing issues including housing, identification and community resource needs.

The agency funds two eligibility specialists in the Department of Social Services to help obtain benefits for appropriate inmates prior to end of sentence. The Department's Transitional Services Program provides information and a guide for services following release from incarceration. In conjunction with the Department of Labor, a Job Center assists offenders with resumes, job skills and employment searches.

The Department has significantly increased staffing and the number of halfway house beds for parole and community services, and contracts for a wide variety of residential and non-residential services in the community. The Department also funds three Court Support Services Division's (CSSD) Jail Re-interview positions, which create alternative release plans for offenders unable to post bond. Between agency protocol and programs, contracted services and assistance from multiple other state agencies, the Department of Correction is working to increase successful community reintegration for offenders, thereby reducing recidivism and increasing public safety.

**\*Please note that "corrections" category refers to local jails and state or federal prisons.**

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

### Community Development

\*Please also refer to the Community Development Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Assessment of Relationship of CDBG Funds to Goals and Objectives
  - a. Assess use of CDBG funds in relation to the priorities, needs, goals, and specific objectives in the Consolidated Plan, particularly the highest priority activities.
  - b. Evaluate progress made toward meeting goals for providing affordable housing using CDBG funds, including the number and types of households served.
  - c. Indicate the extent to which CDBG funds were used for activities that benefited extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons.
2. Changes in Program Objectives
  - a. Identify the nature of and the reasons for any changes in program objectives and how the jurisdiction would change its program as a result of its experiences.
3. Assessment of Efforts in Carrying Out Planned Actions
  - a. Indicate how grantee pursued all resources indicated in the Consolidated Plan.
  - b. Indicate how grantee provided certifications of consistency in a fair and impartial manner.
  - c. Indicate how grantee did not hinder Consolidated Plan implementation by action or willful inaction.
4. For Funds Not Used for National Objectives
  - a. Indicate how use of CDBG funds did not meet national objectives.
  - b. Indicate how did not comply with overall benefit certification.
5. Anti-displacement and Relocation – for activities that involve acquisition, rehabilitation or demolition of occupied real property
  - a. Describe steps actually taken to minimize the amount of displacement resulting from the CDBG-assisted activities.
  - b. Describe steps taken to identify households, businesses, farms or nonprofit organizations who occupied properties subject to the Uniform Relocation Act or Section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, and whether or not they were displaced, and the nature of their needs and preferences.
  - c. Describe steps taken to ensure the timely issuance of information notices to displaced households, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations.
6. Low/Mod Job Activities – for economic development activities undertaken where jobs were made available but not taken by low- or moderate-income persons
  - a. Describe actions taken by grantee and businesses to ensure first consideration was or will be given to low/mod persons.

- b. List by job title of all the permanent jobs created/retained and those that were made available to low/mod persons.
  - c. If any of jobs claimed as being available to low/mod persons require special skill, work experience, or education, provide a description of steps being taken or that will be taken to provide such skills, experience, or education.
7. Low/Mod Limited Clientele Activities – for activities not falling within one of the categories of presumed limited clientele low and moderate income benefit
  - a. Describe how the nature, location, or other information demonstrates the activities benefit a limited clientele at least 51% of whom are low- and moderate-income.
8. Program income received
  - a. Detail the amount of program income reported that was returned to each individual revolving fund, e.g., housing rehabilitation, economic development, or other type of revolving fund.
  - b. Detail the amount repaid on each float-funded activity.
  - c. Detail all other loan repayments broken down by the categories of housing rehabilitation, economic development, or other.
  - d. Detail the amount of income received from the sale of property by parcel.
9. Prior period adjustments – where reimbursement was made this reporting period for expenditures (made in previous reporting periods) that have been disallowed, provide the following information:
  - a. The activity name and number as shown in IDIS;
  - b. The program year(s) in which the expenditure(s) for the disallowed activity(ies) was reported;
  - c. The amount returned to line-of-credit or program account; and
  - d. Total amount to be reimbursed and the time period over which the reimbursement is to be made, if the reimbursement is made with multi-year payments.
10. Loans and other receivables
  - a. List the principal balance for each float-funded activity outstanding as of the end of the reporting period and the date(s) by which the funds are expected to be received.
  - b. List the total number of other loans outstanding and the principal balance owed as of the end of the reporting period.
  - c. List separately the total number of outstanding loans that are deferred or forgivable, the principal balance owed as of the end of the reporting period, and the terms of the deferral or forgiveness.
  - d. Detail the total number and amount of loans made with CDBG funds that have gone into default and for which the balance was forgiven or written off during the reporting period.
  - e. Provide a List of the parcels of property owned by the grantee or its subrecipients that have been acquired or improved using CDBG funds and that are available for sale as of the end of the reporting period.
11. Lump sum agreements
  - a. Provide the name of the financial institution.
  - b. Provide the date the funds were deposited.
  - c. Provide the date the use of funds commenced.



- d. Provide the percentage of funds disbursed within 180 days of deposit in the institution.
12. Housing Rehabilitation – for each type of rehabilitation program for which projects/units were reported as completed during the program year
    - a. Identify the type of program and number of projects/units completed for each program.
    - b. Provide the total CDBG funds involved in the program.
    - c. Detail other public and private funds involved in the project.
  13. Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies – for grantees that have HUD-approved neighborhood revitalization strategies
    - a. Describe progress against benchmarks for the program year. For grantees with Federally-designated EZs or ECs that received HUD approval for a neighborhood revitalization strategy, reports that are required as part of the EZ/EC process shall suffice for purposes of reporting progress.

Program Year 3 CAPER Community Development response:

1. a-c. These questions have been addressed in a comprehensive fashion under “General Questions 1a-c” of this document. The 2009-2010 Annual Action Plan prioritizes the use of Federal funds consistent with the City’s adopted Consolidated Plan. All CDBG Action Plan priorities were designed to **principally** serve very low, low and moderate income residents by either benefiting low-moderate income clients or serving a low-moderate income area. The only project line item that is not calculated in meeting the CDBG 70% low-moderate income benefit are Demolition which has been justified on a Slum and Blight Spot Basis. In the past year, 83.81% of expended CDBG funds were used in meeting the city’s low-moderate income benefit requirement. CDBG funds were used for limited housing needs, (Emergency Relocation, Housing Rehabilitation-Engineering Assistance to HOME); Economic Development (CBDO Assistance and Commercial Rehabilitation); homelessness and special needs populations and Community Development. Community Development encompasses Neighborhood Development (infrastructure improvements, fire station, neighborhood sidewalk, street resurfacing, public facilities, non-commercial rehabilitation etc.) and public and community services which fund a variety of social service agencies and nonprofits, all of whom primarily benefit low and moderate income persons.

2. Changes in Program Objectives
  - a. Identify the nature of and the reasons for any changes in program objectives and how the jurisdiction would change its program as a result of its experiences.

Through technical assistance received through HUD by the Training and Development Associates, Inc., the City made the decision to redesign its HOME Program. It was recommended the program be changed due to the amount of funding, staff size and the demands of the current program and needs of the City. It was determined the program would be more effective if funds were targeted to the North End, South End and Brooklyn neighborhoods and targeted populations.

This year the staff at WDC began the process of change the program from assisting owner occupied and investor projects of all sizes throughout the City to larger projects consisting of 5 or more units in targeted neighborhoods or projects services

a targeted population. Although the program has created decent, safe and affordable housing for both owner occupied and rental projects the redesign of the HOME Program will allow the City to make a more significant impact on the housing needs of the City.

3. Assessment of Efforts in Carrying Out Planned Actions

- a. Indicate how grantee pursued all resources indicated in the Consolidated Plan.
- b. Indicate how grantee provided certifications of consistency in a fair and impartial manner.
- c. Indicate how grantee did not hinder Consolidated Plan implementation by action or willful inaction.

3. a. The City pursued a wide variety of local, state, federal and private resources in the past year to carry out its short-term and long-term goals and objectives relating to community development. Resources included not only funding, but support services contributed by area private and nonprofit entities. For an accurate depiction of the wide variety of financial resources used by the City, see the attached "City of Waterbury 2009-2010 Grants Received," and the "City of Waterbury 2009-2010 Education Grants". Resources should also include services provided by volunteer organizations in the City, whether civic, sports, or neighborhood-based.

3. b. The City provided all certifications in a fair and impartial manner for such organizations as the Continuum of Care and the Waterbury Housing Authority.

3. c. The grantee did neither favor nor discriminate against any proposals, activities, or entities involved in the planning or implementation of the goals and objectives of the Consolidated Plan.

4. a-b. All CDBG funds met national objectives and the City complied with the overall benefit certification.

5. a-c. The City of Waterbury does not use CDBG funds for anti-displacement or relocation for activities that involve acquisition, rehabilitation or demolition of occupied real property. Funds address only vacant, abandoned buildings/ lots.

6. a-c. The City does not use CDBG funds for low-mod job activities.

7. Activities are verified through income benefit forms to ensure that at least 51% of the clientele are low and moderate income.

- a. Detail the amount of income received from the sale of property by parcel.  
No property was sold during this program year.

9. There were no prior period adjustments made during this program year.

10. c-e. Not applicable.

11. a-d. Not applicable.

12. a-c. The City did not fund rehabilitation programs with CDBG during this program year.

13. a. Waterbury does not have Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy areas.

## Antipoverty Strategy

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to reduce the number of persons living below the poverty level.

Program Year 3 CAPER Antipoverty Strategy response:

In the past year the City funded through CDBG a variety of social service agencies that deliver supportive programs and services to low and moderate income individuals. These services and programs often address the many root causes of poverty: low levels of education, lack of skills/training for today's jobs, the need for job re-training, substance abuse, unemployment, addiction, etc. The ability to afford housing is a side effect of poverty or low-income. Housing assistance provided by the City through its HOME program and through NSP-1 have already been discussed in this document. The City also works closely with and partners with Northwest Regional Workforce Development to address the issue of unemployment and job retraining. The City recognizes the importance of a living wage and enforces its local Good Jobs Ordinance that requires a good faith effort to hire a percentage of local workers and train them on publicly funded projects. The Waterbury Housing Authority continues to administer the City's supportive housing services.

## NON-HOMELESS SPECIAL NEEDS

### Non-homeless Special Needs

\*Please also refer to the Non-homeless Special Needs Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Identify actions taken to address special needs of persons that are not homeless but require supportive housing, (including persons with HIV/AIDS and their families).

Program Year 3 CAPER Non-homeless Special Needs response:

The City took action to address special needs of persons that are not homeless, but require supportive housing by continuing to fund the following agencies: the Stay Well Health Clinic, the Waterbury Senior Shuttle, Safe Haven, the Morris Foundation, the Salvation Army, St. Vincent DePaul, Greater Waterbury Interfaith Ministries etc. The Waterbury Health Department (WHD) refers people with HIV/AIDS to New Opportunities, Inc., Independence Northwest of Naugatuck, Liberty Community Services of New Haven, and the Birmingham Group of Ansonia, all of which administer HOPWA funds. The WHD also refers clients to CT. AIDS Residence Coalition (CARC) for supportive housing assistance.

The WHD Ryan White Part B program offers case management services to people living with HIV/AIDS. Case managers conduct assessments to determine client eligibility for financial assistance. Clients must meet criteria of 300% of the Federal Poverty Level. During this period the Ryan White Part B Emergency Assistance Funds have assisted 143 clients with 1,893 visits with HIV/AIDS and their families. Funds were distributed to Connecticut Light & Power (CL&P) and Yankee Gas, so

their services would not be interrupted. Also, rental payments for arrears are provided in order to stop an eviction.

Through the Health Department's case management services, several clients were referred to Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA) to receive housing vouchers. Case managers assisted clients by contacting landlords and addressing inadequate living conditions. Several clients also received referrals to outside agencies for assistance with rental payments. Any unresolved issues were referred out to appropriate agencies that will further assist clients

## Specific HOPWA Objectives

\*Please also refer to the HOPWA Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Overall Assessment of Relationship of HOPWA Funds to Goals and Objectives  
Grantees should demonstrate through the CAPER and related IDIS reports the progress they are making at accomplishing identified goals and objectives with HOPWA funding. Grantees should demonstrate:
  - a. That progress is being made toward meeting the HOPWA goal for providing affordable housing using HOPWA funds and other resources for persons with HIV/AIDS and their families through a comprehensive community plan;
  - b. That community-wide HIV/AIDS housing strategies are meeting HUD's national goal of increasing the availability of decent, safe, and affordable housing for low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS;
  - c. That community partnerships between State and local governments and community-based non-profits are creating models and innovative strategies to serve the housing and related supportive service needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families;
  - d. That through community-wide strategies Federal, State, local, and other resources are matched with HOPWA funding to create comprehensive housing strategies;
  - e. That community strategies produce and support actual units of housing for persons living with HIV/AIDS; and finally,
  - f. That community strategies identify and supply related supportive services in conjunction with housing to ensure the needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families are met.
2. This should be accomplished by providing an executive summary (1-5 pages) that includes:
  - a. Grantee Narrative
    - i. Grantee and Community Overview
      - (1) A brief description of your organization, the area of service, the name of each project sponsor and a broad overview of the range/type of housing activities and related services
      - (2) How grant management oversight of project sponsor activities is conducted and how project sponsors are selected
      - (3) A description of the local jurisdiction, its need, and the estimated number of persons living with HIV/AIDS
      - (4) A brief description of the planning and public consultations involved in the use of HOPWA funds including reference to any appropriate planning document or advisory body

- (5) What other resources were used in conjunction with HOPWA funded activities, including cash resources and in-kind contributions, such as the value of services or materials provided by volunteers or by other individuals or organizations
  - (6) Collaborative efforts with related programs including coordination and planning with clients, advocates, Ryan White CARE Act planning bodies, AIDS Drug Assistance Programs, homeless assistance programs, or other efforts that assist persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families.
- ii. Project Accomplishment Overview
    - (1) A brief summary of all housing activities broken down by three types: emergency or short-term rent, mortgage or utility payments to prevent homelessness; rental assistance; facility based housing, including development cost, operating cost for those facilities and community residences
    - (2) The number of units of housing which have been created through acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction since 1993 with any HOPWA funds
    - (3) A brief description of any unique supportive service or other service delivery models or efforts
    - (4) Any other accomplishments recognized in your community due to the use of HOPWA funds, including any projects in developmental stages that are not operational.
  - iii. Barriers or Trends Overview
    - (1) Describe any barriers encountered, actions in response to barriers, and recommendations for program improvement
    - (2) Trends you expect your community to face in meeting the needs of persons with HIV/AIDS, and
    - (3) Any other information you feel may be important as you look at providing services to persons with HIV/AIDS in the next 5-10 years
  - b. Accomplishment Data
    - i. Completion of CAPER Performance Chart 1 of Actual Performance in the provision of housing (Table II-1 to be submitted with CAPER).
    - ii. Completion of CAPER Performance Chart 2 of Comparison to Planned Housing Actions (Table II-2 to be submitted with CAPER).

Program Year 3 CAPER Specific HOPWA Objectives response:

The City of Waterbury does not receive HOPWA funding.

## OTHER NARRATIVE

Include any CAPER information that was not covered by narratives in any other section.

Program Year 3 CAPER Other Narrative response: