



First Program Year CAPER

The CPMP First 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 1 CAPER Executive Summary response:

The goal of the City of Waterbury's First 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 (PY 34 the period from 10/1/08 to 9/30/09), 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 and the First year Annual 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.

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 First 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:

- \$2,241,978 New CDBG Funds
- \$ 322,500 Reprogrammed Prior Years Funds
- \$ 137,963 CDBG Program Income

- \$2,702,441 Total CDBG

- \$ 983,351 New HOME Funds
- \$ 19,934 HOME Program Income

- \$ 958,285 Total HOME

- \$ 99,746 New ESG Funds

In response to the ever worsening economic recession, 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 also administered by WDC:

- Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) 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 2008-2009 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) and WDC's website (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 2008-2009 year and includes program accomplishments and financial data. 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 monthly meetings, holds public hearings on the Annual Plan, reviews proposals/applications, makes recommendations, and provides valuable input to the staff who administer 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. This past year, with the influx of the Recovery Act Funds, the CAC was heavily involved in the development of the programs designed to meet the requirements of the new programs.

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, 2008-September 30, 2009.

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 1 CAPER General Questions response:

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.**

1. a-c.

The City of Waterbury and the WDC continued its progress in meeting the goals and objectives set forth in its recent Five-Year Consolidated Plan (2008-2013),

specifically the first 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 the 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 and First Year Annual Action 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 PY 34 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 PY 34, a total of \$150,000 was allocated for the **Acquisition of Brownfield Sites**; in addition a total of \$47, 862 in carry over funds was also available for this project. A total of \$1,870 was spent on legal fees? No sites were acquired during 2008-2009. The City has been working on the Mattatuck Manufacturing Remediation Project (also known as the Mattaco site) for a number of years. The site located at 1981 East main Street contains 8 acres and proved to be too costly for the first developer selected to demolish the structure, remediate it and return it to a productive reuse. After a lengthy court battle, the WDC owns the site; has secured funding from the State Department of Economic and Community Development and remediation has begun. Additional funds for the remediation have been requested from the Valley Council of Governments due to the need to install a soil vapor extraction system on site. A developer was solicited through a Request for Qualifications and he has proposed a mixed use commercial development to include: a funeral home; community center and banquet facility.

It is anticipated that this project will move forward with the use of these CDBG funds. 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 PY 34 for a total of \$200,000; in addition a carry over of \$88,361 was also available to eliminate these slum and blighted properties. A total of \$5,742 was drawn in the program year for the pre-demolition asbestos expenses related to the demolition of 110 Cherry Street (CT 3504.00 .3). The delay in spending the CDBG funds was due to the use of the Federal funds from a Neighborhood Initiative Grant for demolition activities in the amount of \$115,900 which allowed the City to demolish two structures located in the WOW Neighborhood (Walnut, Orange and Walsh): 63 High Street (CT 3504.4) and 37 Catherine Street (CT 3504.2); a structure located in the Crownbrook Neighborhood at 10 Bronson Street (CT 3502.3) and to clear debris from a vacant lot in the Brooklyn Neighborhood at Draher Street (CT 3517.1). The City anticipates that most of the CDBG funds in this category will be expended prior to year's end due to the proliferation of fires which have occurred recently and the worsening condition of some of its housing stock. 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.

The **Commercial Rehabilitation Program** funded in FY 2005 for \$150,000 and in FY 2006 for \$155,732 saw a great deal of activity and momentum in PY 34. The entire Commercial Façade Program was overhauled and redesigned in order to be more user-friendly and appeal to the public. This program had been developed in association with Main Street Waterbury and is considered a neighborhood façade program in that it serves the downtown neighborhood of Census Tract 3501. The expenditure of only \$3,705 for design services does not give a true picture of the progress which the City made in getting this program underway. Seven applicants were granted \$42,000 each for façade improvements to their buildings. Two of the grantees have gone to contract and work is underway and the remaining five are in various stages of specification design and contract writing. The seven project locations and status at the program year's end are:

Address	Stage
68 Bank Street	Under Construction
42 Bank Street	Under Construction
64 Bank Street	Contract compilation stage
142 Grand Street	Contract awaiting execution by Mayor
60 Bank Street	Contract awaiting execution by Mayor
73 Bank Street	Working on final specifications
471 West Main Street	Contract awaiting execution by Mayor

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.

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. This year the St. Margaret's/Willow Plaza NRZ applied for funding 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. Once the lots are purchased the NRZ plans to increase the parking area for the center and secure the entire site with fencing in an effort to increase security of the 3 year old facility. Future phases of the project call for a patio, playscape and community garden. The application was received by the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and unanimously approved. A contract will be crafted in the next few months so the NRZ can begin this project. Neighborhood facilities received a high priority with a five year total of 5 facilities and an annual goal of 1.

Infrastructure improvements in neighborhoods received major attention in the City's PY 34 Annual Action plan, as one might expect in an older urban City with deteriorated roads, crumbling sidewalks and aging public facilities stressed to the limit.

Fire Station Improvements started with a carry over balance of \$570,801 and an allocation of \$175,000 in Program year 34 (2008-2009). The City is leveraging \$270,000 in City funds to the project as leverage against the CDBG investment. Baldwin Street Fire House, #4 (Census Tract 3505.00-1). A total of \$557,173 in CDBG funds was spent: \$18,173 for architectural/engineering services and \$539,000 for construction.

Phase 1 of the Baldwin Street Fire House renovations which included exterior and interior renovations is complete except for punch list items. This Fire House is an historic building so all exterior renovations plans were sent to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for review and approval. The roof and tin cornice were repaired and an exterior stair tower which was designed in keeping with the building's historic brick design was constructed. The interior renovations consisted of apparatus bay repairs including a necessary venting system for the fire equipment, converting storage space to additional bunk rooms, completely renovating and expanding a bathroom, adding additional locker space, closing off the fire pole chutes, uncovering previously blocked windows for natural light and repairing interior stair wells. A portion of the repairs at this fire house were due to Fire Code violations which needed to be addressed to avoid condemnation by the Fire Marshal. A second phase of improvements is scheduled for Program Year 35 which will address further Fire Code violations and complete all renovations needed at this historic fire house.

In addition to the Baldwin Street Station, the North Main Fire House, #1 (Census Tract 3510.00-3), originally included in the previous year's application for improvements, had a new roof installed for the cost of \$114,950. The roof was necessary due to substantial leaking onto fire apparatus and the station's information systems technology hardware. 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 continued to be a priority for funding during the PY 34 program year as indicated by the total allocation of \$472,761. During the year, the Washington Park Improvements Project previously reported on in last year's CAPER was substantially completed. A total of expenditure of \$1,095 was

additional design services. The construction retainage is expected to be released by year's end.

Fulton Park, located in Census Tract (CT 3508.00-4) was allocated PY 34 program funds for the reconstruction of the tennis courts. These courts are badly in need of improvements due to cracked and uneven playing surface. This is the City's prime tennis location where the public high schools play their matches. New netting and fencing will also be installed. The fencing is an important safety feature as the tennis courts are right next to the Fulton Park baseball/softball diamond. Once the tennis courts are complete the City's tennis program will be expanded to make optimal use of the CDBG investment. This project has been designed, put out to bid and the contract has been executed in the amount of \$127,615. Work is scheduled to commence in November 2009.

North End Recreation Center, located in Census Tract (CT 3501.00-1) was allocated funds in PY 34 for the improvements of two outdoor basketball courts, conversion of four unused and outdated tennis courts to additional basketball courts, reconstruction of unsafe stairs, installation of a new playscape and additional site work to the outdoor portion of the Recreation Center. The City's outdoor basketball program which includes night time basketball for City residents is primarily located at this facility. This project has been designed, put out to bid and the contract has been executed for \$338,093. Work is scheduled to commence in November 2009. Parks and/or recreation facilities received a high priority for in the five year plan with a total goal of 10 and an annual goal of 4.

Street Improvements were given a medium to high priority in the five year plan and no specific streets were identified, but rather would be included in future years allocations as part of the overall neighborhood improvements. In PY 34 the retainage of \$25,000 was released to Tilcon. A complete list of the streets improved was contained in last year's CAPER. The complete project was funded with \$500,000 in CDBG funds; \$500,000 in State LOCIP and \$2,291,925 in City bond funds for a total project cost of \$3,291,925.

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. In PY 34 the remaining retainage for the previous year's sidewalk project was released in the amount of \$19,119. A listing of the sidewalks completed was included in last year's CAPER, a total of 7,240 LF around the future Duggan School, a \$34.6 Million renovation and expansion project. The total allocation in PY 34 for neighborhood sidewalks was \$394,000 and the projects were again targeted in the Brooklyn Neighborhood (CT 3517.2)

Additional funding was awarded to the City's Public Works Department for more sidewalks to be reconstructed in the Brooklyn neighborhood for this past program year. The sidewalks have been selected, the project designed and put out to bid and the contract has been awarded for \$393,825. The work is expected to start in November 2009. The new sidewalks to be constructed are on Congress Avenue and Washington Avenue including the reconstruction of a City Stairs which are currently in unsafe conditions. A portion of Bank Street sidewalks under the Route 8 highway will also be reconstructed. This Bank Street section will link the Brooklyn

neighborhood sidewalks to the central business district downtown. The contract was bid out with a price per linear foot and the exact number of feet will be reported next year once work is complete.

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 PY 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 will provide fresh vegetables and fish to needy city residents and local food pantry/soup kitchens. The 20' x 25' year round greenhouse will be built at 75 Hill Street (CT 3510.00-2). The greenhouse will be installed on the first lot roughly 50 by 100. The contractor has given Brass City Harvest a price to install gravel along the perimeter of it and to do a curtain drain system around it to catch the potential run off from the two adjacent upper lots. The Leever foundation is giving them funds in order to install a small playscape, garden and reading area at the farther lot and the middle lot will contain the raised boxes/beds where the vegetables, flowers and herbs will be grown. The area will get new fencing and trees will be trimmed. The greenhouse will also contain an aquaponics area where fish will be grown for consumption as well as a small sitting area.

Brass City Harvest is a relatively new non-profit and provides services to those chronically unemployed. These clients are also paid a small stipend to work the gardens. Neighborhood youth as well as the kids from the Police Athletic league also work on the community gardens.

With the additional funds remaining from the CDBG allocation, Brass City Harvest will make improvements to its Burton Street community garden including the installation of security fencing to protect the area from vandals and animals.

At the Fulton Street Park, the additional CDBG funds will be used for running four electric poles up to the enclosed community garden areas and bringing power to the small block house. This will accomplish two goals, light the area and provide a power source for water supply in order to water the gardens. The area has 70 raised beds/boxes which can only be worked during daylight and where water pressure is not sufficient to irrigate the beds.

Interim Assistance, a project whereby the City secured and boarded up abandoned, vacant buildings on a spot slum/blight basis, thus making the buildings safer for the public and helping to prevent their use for illegal activities received an allocation of \$25,000 in PY 34. A total of \$14,685 was expended to board up 24 structures. In their review of the City's PY 35 Annual Action Plan which also included this activity, HUD determined this activity ineligible as the activity of boarding up vacant abandoned properties is not specified in the regulations and, in and of itself, is not eligible. The activity could be considered eligible if further activity was undertaken, for example, the property was demolished or rehabilitated. Since no further action was taken on these 24 properties, the City has asked HUD to allow it to reclassify the \$14,685 expended to the eligible PY 34 Fire Station Improvements and allocate it to the City's share of funds expended. HUD is reviewing the City's request. As such, the City will also reallocate the remaining balance of \$10,315 to

an eligible activity in accordance with its citizen participation plan. The City will fund this activity out of its general funds and reserves the right to revisit this program for funding under CDBG as part of a larger strategy to address the housing needs of the neighborhoods.

The following **Public Services** were funded in PY 34 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.

ASPIRA of Connecticut, Inc. – Youth Leadership Development & APEX , Crosby, Kennedy and West Side Middle Schools: \$7,000. Program aims to increase the high school graduation rate of Puerto Rican/Latino/minority students and promote post-secondary education. Funds were used for general administration, salaries and programmatic costs. A total of 80 students benefitted.

Wellpath (formerly)Child Guidance Clinic, 70 Pine St.: \$10,000. Provides city-wide counseling for youth, including initial and periodic evaluations, family therapy and psychotherapy crisis intervention. Funds were used for clinical and support staff providing services to low/mod families. A total of 1,422 people benefitted.

Children's Community School, 31 Wolcott St.: \$10,000. Provided city-wide individualized learning plans for children K-5 with a certified teacher. Funds were used to support the five after school programs by providing stipends for the supervising teacher, insurance, supplies and administrative costs. A total of 55 children benefitted.

Family Services of Greater Waterbury, Inc.-34 Murray St.: \$8,000. To support an intake coordinator position that serves 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 248 people benefitted.

Greater Waterbury Interfaith Ministries, Inc. ,515 South Main St.: \$25,000. 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 1,755 people benefitted.

La Casa Bienvenida ,135 East Liberty St.: \$15,000 Services provided include nutrition, arts and crafts, education, and transportation services to Hispanic elderly. Funds will be used for administration, staff salaries, insurance and operating costs. A total of 101 people benefitted.

Literacy Volunteers, Silas Bronson Library, 267 Grand St.: \$5,500. 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 175 people benefitted.

Mattatuck Historical Society, 144 West Main St.: \$9,000. This program provided children with safe environment after school assisting homework and tutoring, and with new experiences through storytelling, drama, writing and dance. Funds were used for salaries, visiting artist fees, artists, and supplies. A total of 27 people benefitted.

Mattatuck Senior Center, 117 Southmayd Rd.: \$11,000. 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 84 people benefitted.

Morris Foundation , 402 East Main St.: \$11,000. Provided outpatient services including assessment and treatment for individuals with substance abuse, mental health disorders. Funds were used for staff salaries. A total of 4,035 people benefitted.

Mt. Olive Senior Center, 86 Pearl St: \$15,000. 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 131 seniors benefitted.

Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury (NHS), 139 Prospect Street. \$10,000 Services provided included delinquency and foreclosure prevention assistance; first time homebuyer education and financial literacy classes. A total of 599 people benefitted.

Police Activity League of Waterbury, Inc. – 58 Griggs St.: \$25,000. Promotes partnerships between City youth, law enforcement, and the community through educational, athletic, and recreational programs. Funds were used for utilities, payroll and insurance costs. A total of 1,950 youth benefitted.

Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury, Inc., 29 Central Ave.: \$11,000. Services provided include counseling, education, advocacy, and referrals to City-wide victims of physical or severe psychological abuse. Funds were used for utilities and insurance. A total of 637 victims benefitted.

St. Margaret/Willow-Plaza NRZ Assoc. Inc., 60 Elmwood Ave.: \$15,000. Provides youth after-school programs and senior citizen programs. Funds were used for staff salaries. A total of 167 people benefitted.

Staywell Health Care Inc. – 80 Phoenix Ave.: \$8,000. Provides high quality dental services to the low/mod population of the city. Funds were used for staff salaries. A total of 10,709 people benefitted.

Waterbury Day Nursery, 74 Buckingham St.: \$6,000. Provides a day care program including nutrition, education and entertainment. Funds were used to pay salaries. A total of 53 children benefitted.

Waterbury Senior Shuttle ,WDC, 24 Leavenworth St.: \$110,000. City of Waterbury sponsored activity, which provides senior citizens with on-demand response transportation. Funds were used for operating costs of the livery service. A total of 364 seniors benefitted.

Waterbury Youth Service System, 95 North Main St.: \$10,000. Provides a truancy prevention program primarily to students in elementary and middle school. Funds were used for salaries. A total of 53 youth benefitted.

Wellpath, Inc., 70 Pine St.: \$10,000. Provides outpatient program for behavioral and mental health services targeting the low income and Hispanic population. A total of 1,422 people benefitted.

WOW-NRZ Association, Inc.: 308 Walnut St.: \$14,796. Provides youth after-school programs, resident life skill programs and senior programs. Funds were used for building operating expenses, heat, sewer, and utilities. A total of 249 residents benefitted.

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

The City promotes safe, affordable housing primarily through the use of its "**HOME**" funds. In 2008-2009 the City received \$ 938,351.00 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 \$ 1,522,825.22 in carry over HOME funds and \$ 19,933.86 in HOME Investment Trust Fund program income during the 2008 – 2009 program year.

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. Of the 43 units listed in the table below, 26 of the units that were originally listed in the existing unit category in the Consolidated Plan were moved to the production of new rental unit's category. In the area of owner housing, improvement to the quality of the existing affordable housing stock through rehabilitation financing assistance, increase opportunities for very low and low income households to become and remain homeowners through home purchase or rehabilitation financing assistance and provide pre and post-purchase housing counseling and mortgage foreclosure assistance. The Year 1 goal for increasing the opportunities for very low and low income households to become and remain homeowners was 5, actual households that received assistance was 0. Due to the subprime lending issue, foreclosure crisis, Waterbury's high unemployment rate, along with the economy were large factors in the decision not to fund downpayment assistance during Year 1. The balance of ADDI funds were not expended for the same reasons listed above.

**Priority Housing Activities
Year 1 Goals & Actual Units Assisted**

Priority Need	Year 1 Goal	Actual
HOME		
Production of new rental units	6	26
Rehabilitation of existing units	43	10
Rehabilitation of existing owner units	16	10
Homeownership assistance	5	0

The Year 1 goal for providing housing/foreclosure counseling was 250 people actual served was 599. The total number of Waterbury residents assisted by Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury, Inc. during the period October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2009 was 599. Of this approximately 90%, 539 were seeking foreclosure intervention assistance. NHSW partnered with the WDC to provide first time homebuyer education to 23 participants in the NSP Program. The remaining clients participated in a combination of pre-purchase counseling, reverse mortgage counseling, and financial education. NHSW continues to provide down payment assistance through several programs targeting Waterbury area residents. During the last year we helped 5 Waterbury households receive SMARTMOVE/Workforce Housing down-payment assistance.

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. NHSW continues to administer several down payment assistance programs. NHSW provides financial education classes in partnership with Workforce, Inc. NHSW is also working with the Jewish Federation to provide financial education and foreclosure assistance to the Waterbury Orthodox Jewish community. In September 2009, NHSW established a partnership with Waterbury Youth Services to provide hands on homeownership training to NHSW clients.

Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury continues to pursue the development of clusters of now-vacant buildings in areas of Waterbury that would have the greatest impact on neighborhoods once rehabilitated. In 2008-2009, NHSW submitted an application for the construction of six new units in the North End of Waterbury using a lot they own. This is in the same neighborhood where a new pre-k through eighth grade school is scheduled to open in 2012.

During the 2008 – 2009 program year, NHSW began the substantial rehabilitation of a three unit house under the State Surplus Property Program that will provide a homeownership and two rental units for residents at or below 80% of area median. NHSW is in the pre-development phase to build ten units of affordable rental housing using a mix of HOME and other funding sources.

“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. During 2008-2009, no funds were expended from this account as all units in planning did move forward as viable projects and funding of services was project-based.

HOME ADDI funds were were still available to increase the number of people able to purchase single-family homes through the provision of down-payment assistance. No numeric goals were set, although it was stated that ADDI funds were to be administered by Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS).

In July of 2006, Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury, Inc. entered into contract for the administration of ADDI funds. Since starting the program, NHSW has provided ADDI home down payment assistance of \$10,000 to ten households. In 2008-2009, no households were assisted with ADDI funds. As mentioned above the subprime lending issue, foreclosure crisis, Waterbury's high unemployment rate and

the economy were large factors in the inability to distribute these funds. NHS has expressed a continued interest in moving forward with down payment assistance programs in the future and hopes to continue helping additional households.

Emergency Relocation Assistance had an allocation for the 2008-2009 program year of \$250,000. Program income of \$137,963 was also added to this line item for a total allocation of \$400,754. Total expenses were \$185,493 with a remaining balance of \$216,261. 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 35 families were assisted with these funds representing 122 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, the City leveraged \$32,238 towards this activity. Those funds aided an additional 29 households comprised of 91 individuals.

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. In the 2008-2009 program year, the **Community Based Development Organization (CBDO), In-The-Making** received \$25,786 in CDBG funding to empower, educate, train, employ, service and advocate for the low-income community of the Waterbury. The agency works in conjunction with area businesses to provide job training and hands-on job skills to women for employment. In-The-Making served 92 clients in the past program year. HUD funds invested in In-The-Making leverages \$310,000 in other public and private funds.

Throughout the past year, the City of Waterbury and the WDC continued to work on an ongoing basis with the Northwest Regional Workforce Investment Board to support job training and/or retraining. Once again, during the 2008 summer, a joint project was implemented, whereby state grant funds were used to hire over 200 local youth, primarily from disadvantaged neighborhoods in low-moderate income census tracts, to clean their city streets, sidewalks and blighted area. Older youth acted as supervisors and the project was once again managed by WDC.

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 ever worsening recession over the past program year saw the end of the subprime mortgage business, which for many low and moderate income persons was the only avenue available for them to achieve homeownership. The resulting crash of the housing market and the escalating numbers of foreclosures resulted in the City receiving 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 gap financing and 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)).

To date assistance has been provided for the purchase and/or renovation of 30 housing units. These units are being brought up to code while taking into account the NSP goals of higher energy efficiency standards and greater curb appeal in an effort to stabilize the property values of the neighborhoods the units are located in. While the myriad of Federal and State rules make NSP a difficult program to navigate it has been relatively successful thus far. As an example of our tiered approach, 9 units are being assisted in the Brooklyn neighborhood where the City is building a new K-8 neighborhood school. Brooklyn is a tipping point neighborhood that is expected to be revitalized through its designation as a locally target neighborhood in the Five Year Plan along with the help of programs such as the NSP.

The following/attached spreadsheets show the units currently underway, the current values of the properties and the anticipated increased values once the rehabilitation work is completed. A total of \$415,652 has been leveraged with the NSP funds of \$2,529,500 for a total investment in these 27 units of \$2,945,152.

Name	Address	# of Units	As-is Appraisal	As-complete Appraisal
M3 Properties	65 North Leonard	3	100,000.00	175,000.00
Michaud Properties	1009-1011 South Main St	3	44,000.00	140,000.00
John Salvatore	135 Congress	3	42,500.00	195,000.00

City of Waterbury, Connecticut

Primo Enterprises	1657 South Main St	5	56,000.00	250,000.00
Kristie Kelly	224 Frost Road	1	75,000.00	161,000.00
Fernando Branco	35 Lawrence Street	3	42,000.00	180,000.00
David Pires	750 Baldwin St	2	28,000.00	125,000.00
Victor Diaz	184 Cooke St	3	68,000.00	175,000.00
344 Farmington Ave LLC	344 Farmington Ave	3	70,000.00	200,000.00
Veronica Morales	292 Homestead Ave	1	95,000.00	170,000.00

Name	Address	Neighborhood	Purchase Assistance	Rehabilitation Assistance	Total Amount of Assistance (not to exceed)	Non NSP funds *	Total Project Funds **
M3 Properties	65 North Leonard	Brooklyn	36,000.00	139,000.00	175,000.00	54,000.00	229,000.00
Michaud Properties	1009-1011 South Main St	South End	0.00	250,000.00	250,000.00	35,000.00	285,000.00
John Salvatore	135 Congress	Brooklyn	0.00	300,000.00	300,000.00	42,000.00	342,000.00
Primo Enterprises	1657 South Main St	South End	0.00	315,000.00	315,000.00	55,440.00	370,440.00
Kristie Kelly	224 Frost Road	Fairlawn	26,500.00	160,000.00	186,500.00	36,500.00	223,000.00
Fernando Branco	35 Lawrence Street	Brooklyn	0.00	300,000.00	300,000.00	37,000.00	337,000.00
David Pires	750 Baldwin St	South End	0.00	195,000.00	195,000.00	27,720.00	222,720.00
Victor Diaz	184 Cooke St	North End	26,928.00	308,072.00	335,000.00	40,392.00	375,392.00
344 Farmington Ave LLC	344 Farmington Ave	Overlook	21,200.00	253,800.00	275,000.00	31,800.00	306,800.00
Veronica Morales	292 Homestead Ave	Fairlawn	37,200.00	160,800.00	198,000.00	55,800.00	253,800.00

* = Amount of funding provided by the buyer for purchase
 ** = Total project funds not including possible change orders

The fear today is that more foreclosures are on the horizon as a result of significant unemployment rates, Waterbury has the second highest rate of unemployment in the State behind Hartford at 14.4%, Waterbury's is 13.6%. This threatens the stability of those with fixed rate mortgages, previously thought of as secure and the continued down turn in the economy will only make the situation worse. The tightened credit market now requires a minimum investment of 3% equity when looking to FHA or CHFA for mortgage assistance leaving out many who might have qualified previously.

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 PY 34 had additional funds for the project through other sources.

Leveraging of HUD Funds

CDBG

Demolition:

Funds Expended: \$5,742
Leveraged Funds: \$115,900 (Federal Neighborhood Initiative Grant)

Interim Assistance: ** Project deemed ineligible, funds to be reallocated

Public Facility Improvements-School System ** Project balance to be reprogrammed

Funds Expended: \$0.00
Leveraged Funds; \$0.00

Fire Station Improvements:

Funds Expended: \$672,123
Leveraged Funds: \$270,000 (City Funds)

Neighborhood Park Improvements:

Funds Expended: \$1,095
Leveraged Funds: \$153,706

Street Resurfacing/Reconstruction:

Funds Expended: \$25,000
Funds Leveraged: \$2,816,926

Community Based Development Organization

Funds Expended: \$25,786
Funds Leveraged: \$310,000 (Public and Private Funds)

Neighborhood Sidewalks

Funds Expended: \$19,119
Funds Leveraged: \$77,200 (City Funds)

Emergency Relocation

Funds Expended: \$186,251
Funds Leveraged: \$32,238

Acquisition

Funds Expended: \$1,870
Funds Leveraged: \$0.00

Non-Commercial Rehabilitation ** project funds of \$323,756 to be reprogrammed via substantial amendment

Funds Expended: \$0.00
Funds Leveraged: \$0.00

Housing Rehabilitation-Engineering

Funds Expended: \$0.00
Funds Leveraged: \$0.00

Public Facility-Handicap Accessibility ** project balance to be reprogrammed

Funds Expended: \$0.00
Funds Leveraged: \$0.00

Public Services:

Aspira of CT

Funds Expended: \$7,000
Funds Leveraged: \$43,000

Children's Community School

Funds Expended: \$10,000
Funds Leveraged: \$960,311

Family Services of Greater Waterbury Inc.

Funds Expended: \$8,000
Funds Leveraged: \$223,173

Greater Waterbury Interfaith Ministries

Funds Expended: \$25,000
Funds Leveraged: \$250,869

La Casa Bienvenida

Funds Expended: \$15,000
Funds Leveraged: \$125,781

Literacy Volunteers

Funds Expended: \$5,500
Funds Leveraged: \$127,757

Mattatuck Historical Society After-School Program

Funds Expended: \$9,000
Funds Leveraged: \$2,189

Mattatuck Senior Center

Funds Expended: \$8,551
Funds Leveraged: \$31,885

Morris Foundation

Funds Expended: \$11,000
Funds Leveraged: \$1,774,230

Mt. Olive Senior Center

Funds Expended: \$15,000

Funds Leveraged: \$30,459

NHS of Waterbury, Inc

Funds Expended: \$10,000

Funds Leveraged: \$281,118

Police Activity League of Waterbury

Funds Expended: \$25,000

Funds Leveraged: \$1,150,398

Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury

Funds Expended: \$11,000

Funds Leveraged: \$391,000

St. Margaret/Willow Plaza NRZ Assoc.

Funds Expended: \$15,000

Funds Leveraged: \$53,500

Staywell Health Care

Funds Expended: \$8,000

Funds Leveraged: \$108,771

Waterbury Day Nursery

Funds Expended: \$6,000

Funds Leveraged: \$684,000

Waterbury Senior Shuttle

Funds Expended: \$94,936

Funds Leveraged: \$28,438

Waterbury Youth Services

Funds Expended: \$10,000

Funds Leveraged: \$72,711

Wellpath, Inc. (formerly Child Guidance)

Funds Expended: \$10,000

Funds Leveraged: \$693,061

WOW-NRZ Association, inc. Community Learning Center

Funds Expended: \$0.00

Funds Leveraged: \$30,000

Total Public Service Funds Expended: \$303,987

Total non-CDBG Funds Leveraged: \$7,062,651

ESG Funds

Family Services Association of Waterbury **

HUD declared these children do not meet the definition of homeless as they are wards of the State. WDC will repay the funds expended (\$2,376) and reprogram the balance to its eligible ESG grantees.

Morris Foundation

Funds Expended: \$3,891
Funds Leveraged: \$683,834

Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury

Funds Expended: \$5,502
Funds Leveraged: \$1,235,998

Salvation Army

Funds Expended: \$10,367
Fund Leveraged: \$306,350

St. Vincent DePaul Society

Funds Expended: \$64,987
Funds Leveraged: \$776,063

Total ESG funds Expended: \$84,747
Total non-ESG funds Leveraged: \$2,924,510

HOME Funds

Total HOME funds Expended: \$ 1,522,825.22
Total non-HOME Funds Leveraged: \$ 67,700.00

5c. Required Matches

The Morris Foundation allocation was matched and leveraged with other federal funds of \$73,404, local government funds of \$582,006, and private funds of \$28,424.

The Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury allocation was matched and leveraged with \$653,000.00 in other federal funds, \$394,000 of private donations \$188,998 of other donations and fees.

The St. Vincent DePaul allocation was matched and leveraged with other federal funds of \$22,200, local government funds of \$426,300, and private and other funds of \$327,563.

The Salvation Army allocation was matched and leveraged with other federal funds of \$23,452, \$251,165 in local government funds, \$5,000 in private funds and \$26,733 in United Way funds.

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

A 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.

The City of Waterbury's New School Construction Project has made significant progress in the past program year. The project will result in the creation of three 800 student, K-8 schools in low/moderate income census tracts. The three sites are Duggan School in the Brooklyn neighborhood, the Gilmartin School in the Gilmartin neighborhood and the Robinson/North Main Street School in the NEWPAC neighborhood of the North End.

The Duggan School project is a renovation / expansion of an existing vacant school. The City began abatement and demolition of 13 acquired residential properties in October of 2008. The properties have since been demolished and the site graded to accommodate an expansion to the historic structure. The school has been abated and gutted, foundations have been poured, and structural steel is rising to form the additional classroom space. Duggan will reopen in the fall of 2011, and once again be the centerpiece of the Brooklyn Neighborhood.

The target approach of CDBG funds for sidewalk reconstruction in the Brooklyn neighborhood has been met with unanimous approval of the residents. The project has led to the replacement / repair of existing sidewalks, curbing and crosswalks leading to the school site. The final construction activity at Duggan will result in new sidewalks around the perimeter of the school completing an overhaul of the neighborhoods sidewalks.

The Gilmartin School Project is targeted for completion in September of 2010. The former Gilmartin School was abated in November of 2008 and completely demolished in March of 2009. The project team is aggressively creating a state of the art school for the children in the Gilmartin neighborhood.

The Robinson/North Main Street site is in the final stages of Phase III environmental assessments. During the spring of 2009 all properties were acquired that will comprise the future school site. Demolition of existing structures is anticipated to being in January of 2010 with the School opening in September of 2012.

The CAC has begun discussions about continuing this targeting strategy around the new schools and exploring additional housing and non-housing community development needs with future allocations of CDBG and HOME funds.

2. Describe the manner in which the recipient would change its program as a result of its experiences.

During the 2008-2009 program year covered by this CAPER, there were a number of changes made by the WDC staff as a result of its previous year's experience. WDC staff consolidated the number of monitoring site visits made to subrecipients from two to one visit. This allowed for more time to be spent on project implementation. While additional time has been spent on providing technical assistance to subrecipients which has resulted in better reporting; it is still apparent that some subrecipients have trouble with the reports and accurately reporting on the numbers of clients served and ethnicity. A review will be held semi-annually to ensure that all are in compliance. WDC staff will also continue to monitor its subrecipients to provide more personalized technical assistance if necessary due to staff changes.

During the program year, the need to amend its Citizen Participation Plan became apparent in order to differentiate between a minor amendment and a substantial amendment and WDC staff set about to get this done. The process began during the period covered by this CAPER and concluded on November 23, 2009 with the unanimous approval of the proposed changes by the Board of Aldermen.

Amendments to the Consolidated/Annual Action Plans now include:

- Changes in the goal, priority or activity of the Plans;
- Carrying out an activity using funds from any program covered by the Consolidated Plans (including program income) but that was not included in the Annual Action Plan;
- Changes to the purpose, scope, location or beneficiaries of an activity included in the Annual Action Plan.

Substantial Amendments to the Consolidated/Annual Action Plans now include:

- A change in the use of grant funds from one eligible activity to another;
- The elimination of an activity originally described in the Annual Action Plan;
- The addition of an activity not originally described in the Annual Action Plan;
- Changes to the term of either a Consolidated Plan or Annual Action Plan;
- Major reprogramming of funds (a reprogramming of funds of more than 5% of the grant allocation or \$100,000 whichever is greater).

The Citizen Participation Plan was also changed to correct a technical section relative to the end of the Program year and the submission of the CAPER and to include the addition of Stimulus and Recovery Act Funds.

Other program experiences that have triggered change and will continue to trigger change relate to the City approval process required for HOME and CDBG contracts. While progress was made on this during the summer of 2008, this needs to be an ongoing process in order to continue to streamline and fast track the process. If contracts are unable to be signed within thirty days then it triggers the need for new tax clearances by the City and, depending upon the workload of the tax staff and the time of year, additional delays are encountered. WDC must continue to keep the turnaround time on these contracts to a minimum.

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.

3a. Summary of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

In 2007-2008 the City of Waterbury updated its Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI). The previous document had been prepared in 1996. The updated document aimed at analyzing demographic trends, inclusive of 2000 Census Tract data and other statistics impacting housing choice; reviewing actions taken related to impediments identified in the 1996 document; and, identifying additional impediments and proposing steps to address identified impediments.

In the Updated August 2008 AI, three new impediments were identified:

1. *Lack of a Locally Designated Fair Housing Officer*

The AI pointed out that although individual agencies and organizations have staff persons responsible for administering fair housing regulations pertaining to particular programs, that a person with general fair housing choice concern unrelated to a specific program might have no contact person or clearly established procedure to address the issue. A secondary impediment resulting from the lack of a Fair Housing Officer is an inefficient system for keeping agencies, property owners and residents aware of changes in fair housing laws and regulations. As the AI stated, there is no central clearinghouse for this information, a training function or a source for answers to questions.

2. *There is no Fair Housing Affirmative Marketing Plan to Inform the Public about Fair Housing Laws and Procedures*

This impediment relates to the lack of a Fair Housing Officer as discussed above. According to the AI, the City has no organized program or plan for affirmatively marketing fair housing choice. As a result, information is generally made available on either a housing program/organization basis or in response to a specific complaint about housing discrimination.

3. *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.*

As the AI pointed out, the full impact of the crisis (as of August, 2008) on homeowners and renters in Waterbury has yet to be determined,; nevertheless national studies have shown that the rate of foreclosure is disproportionately high in neighborhoods with high poverty . These same neighborhoods are also associated with renter-occupied housing. In Connecticut non-white households represent 67.8% of the population of high poverty, high renter neighborhoods. The AI concludes therefore that the rate of foreclosures will adversely affect housing choice and it can be assumed that the issue of fair housing choice will also be affected. The unemployment rate for Waterbury for September was 13.5 percent the highest it's been in ten years.

3b. Actions taken to Address Impediments

The updated AI was completed in August 2008 and the City took immediate steps to address the identified 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.

1. "Public Action Step" Recommendations

a. Recommendation: Designation of a Fair Housing Officer

Action Taken: The City has appointed Mr. Michael Gilmore as The City's Fair Housing Officer.

The City acted immediately upon this identified impediment and appointed Mr. Michael Gilmore to this position. The preliminary responsibilities of the position have been drafted as follows:

Waterbury Fair Housing Officer
Duties and Responsibilities

In August 2008, the City of Waterbury prepared an *Updated Analysis of Impediments To Fair Housing Choice (AI)* and an *Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan (AFHMP)*. As a result of the preparation of these documents, it was determined that the City should appoint a Fair Housing Officer in order to improve the administration of federal and state fair housing laws in Waterbury. It was further determined that the duties of the Fair Housing Officer shall include the following:

1. The Fair Housing Officer shall be the person with whom persons who believe they have experienced discrimination in violation of fair housing laws can contact for assistance to file a claim of discrimination.
2. The Fair Housing Officer shall organize and implement a public informational program concerning the protected classes and rights under fair housing laws. This shall include the distribution and posting of descriptive material on fair housing laws and rights as well as how to contact the Fair Housing Officer.
3. The Fair Housing Officer shall assist in the scheduling and participate in public forums and training sessions on fair housing law. These forums and training sessions should be offered in cooperation with organizations such as Board of Realtors, social service agencies and community based organizations. At least one such session shall be held annually.
4. The Fair Housing Officer shall monitor advertising of available housing to assure that fair housing laws are being addressed.
5. The Fair Housing Officer shall review affirmative marketing plans prepared by organizations receiving federal financial assistance through the CDBG and HOME programs.
6. The Fair Housing Officer shall review all progress reports submitted by

Federal financial assistance recipients for programs administered by the Waterbury Development Corporation in order to monitor compliance with the affirmative marketing plan filed for each project receiving such assistance.

7. The Fair Housing Officer shall monitor the number and nature of the fair housing complaints received on an annual basis and prepare a summary report. When appropriate, the report shall recommend actions to be taken to address the causes of such complaints.

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

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

- Developed a rapport with Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities
- Created a Fair Housing Binder for public view
- Maintain a Fair Housing file with activities/promotions/complaints
- Fair Housing posters placed throughout WDC office
- Fair Housing Ad in The Waterbury Republican-American newspaper
- Print ad in El Canillita (Spanish) Newspaper
- Fair Housing ad on Spanish Radio
- Utilized Spanish translator when needed
- Scheduled a Fair Housing presentation to The Greater Waterbury Board of Realtors For November 2009
- Became a member of The Fair Housing Association of Connecticut
- Added a Fair Housing Section to the WDC website with a link to a Public service announcement
- Attended The 30th Annual Fair Housing Conference sponsored by The Fair Housing Association of Connecticut
- Attended the satellite broadcast at the Hartford Field Office
- Provided HUD with a mid-year synopsis on Fair Housing activities

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
- Met with potential NSP investors and spoke with them about Fair Housing
- 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: Appointment of a Fair Housing Officer

- Monitor The Waterbury Republican-American newspaper apartments for rent/sale on a weekly basis

- Provide listing of affordable housing units to Emergency Relocation tenants. Successfully relocated One Hundred and twenty two tenants representing thirty five households to a decent, safe and affordable unit
- Attend Housing Court on a weekly basis and worked with the Housing Prosecutor and Housing Specialist on landlord tenant issues in which an average of 15 cases per week are heard/resolved
- Helped a woman with a disability and her family obtain a housing voucher
- Act and respond to an average of five 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
- Refer unemployed to Workforce Connection
- Make referrals to Connecticut Legal Services

2. Public/Private Partnership Step Recommendations

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

Action Taken: City Presently Reviews Public-Private Initiatives Partner With Connecticut Legal Services Appointment of a Housing Manager

In August WDC Appointed Diane C. Toolan as Housing and Community Planning Unit Manager. WDC continues to collaborate with the Office of the City Planner on public-private programs that have land-use and/or zoning implications. 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 rescission 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**

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. The recommendation was that Waterbury put together a task force of governmental agencies, nonprofits and financial institutions to prepare a plan to address the foreclosure situation. Staff from WDC and the Office of the Mayor held regular meetings and were approved by DECD and HUD and have begun to disburse NSP funds. WDC and the City have partnered with Webster Bank to provide potential home buyers with affordable fixed-rate mortgage products and The Waterbury Housing Fund for potential investors of multi-units. The Fair Housing Officer maintains a list of all foreclosed properties in Waterbury which is updated weekly from the Town Clerk's Office with list of lis pendens and impending foreclosure filings. This database is made available to the public upon request.

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.

4. Describe Other Actions in Strategic Plan or Action Plan taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs.

Obstacles to meeting underserved needs have been and continue to be primarily financial in nature. The City lacks the funds to make all the needed infrastructure repairs, housing investments, park renovations or public facility investments it would like and/or needs to make. The City depends upon a variety of state and federal grants to meet its many needs, particularly since approximately 40 million dollars of the City's annual budget is devoted to funding the City's Pension Fund.

The City has balanced its budget for eight consecutive years and is financially sound, after being subject to a state Oversight Board for five years. The City takes a judicious approach to its spending and weighs its needs very carefully. The City is engaged in a variety of City school construction projects funded through state bond funds and local bonding. It is renovating its historic City Hall through local bonding. It is addressing its need for consolidating its transportation services and has completed its Environmental Assessment/ Environmental Impact Evaluation of The Waterbury Transportation Center, an intermodal transportation center. It has received a large 15 million dollar grant to address the remediation of a brownfield in the Waterville neighborhood and has received additional state brownfield funds to

remediate a brownfield on Cherry Street. In addition, the City has received a grant from the Neighborhood I Park renovations are being addressed primarily through state and Federal grants.

In the past year the City has realized the need to focus more of its attention on housing issues. It is currently discussing the investment of additional annual budget funds to Loyola Development, an organization devoted to the revitalization of a South End neighborhood. The City and WDC have both been vocal in their understanding of the need to support local housing nonprofits such as NHS both in their efforts to strengthen their technical capacity and also in their efforts to move housing projects forward. In the past year, the City has updated its AI and AFHMP. The City has funded both efforts. The City has also partnered with COC and has been meeting with the COC about preparing a Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness. The United Way has decided to spearhead the project with the City serving a supporting role.

The City has been sensitive to the needs of its seniors. The City led efforts to commission a study funded through the Connecticut Community Foundation and United Way to analyze the needs of the City's seniors and recommend the type of facilities and locations where those needs would best be met in the future. That study is still pending.

The City has been looking to provide better services to its neighborhoods. The City set up the COGAPS program to bring a variety of social services directly to neighborhoods.

The City and the WDC have also sought a grant from an environmental fund of the United Way to support a routing study for a public greenway along the Naugatuck River. This linear park/greenway would serve a variety of needs: economic development, public recreation and alternative transportation. It would involve some brownfield remediation and would also require investments in open space. The City received the grant and the study has gone out to bid. The City has also secured 4 million dollars in federal funds for the first phase of greenway construction. Additional land has been donated to the City for this greenway.

The City is committed to making Waterbury a viable and sustainable City. Although the does not have the luxury of having large amounts of discretionary spending, it seeks to forge public-private partnerships, work productively with community and civic organizations and seek private, state and federal funding on a wide variety of City projects/initiatives.

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 Morris Foundation allocation was matched and leveraged with other federal funds of \$73,404, local government funds of \$582,006, and private funds of \$28,424.

The Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury allocation was matched and leveraged with \$653,000.00 in other federal funds, \$394,000 of private donations \$188,998 of other donations and fees.

The St. Vincent DePaul allocation was matched and leveraged with other federal funds of \$22,200, local government funds of \$426,300, and private and other funds of \$327,563.

The Salvation Army allocation was matched and leveraged with other federal funds of \$23,452, \$251,165 in local government funds, \$5,000 in private funds and \$26,733 in United Way funds.

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 1 CAPER Managing the Process response:

For fiscal year 2008-2009, all HUD regulations were followed to ensure that each activity that was funded had the potential to be completed. The 2008-2009 Annual Action Plan was the first Plan in the City's new Five Year Consolidated Plan (2008-2013). The process was the second 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 3/ 14/08

Public Forum: Neighborhood Development and Public Services 3/26/08

Public Forum: Housing and Economic Development 3/31/08

Public Hearing No. 1 Needs Assessment for Consolidated/Annual Plans before CAC 4/1/08

Applications Available for CDBG/ESG 4/23/08

CAC Monthly Meeting 4/24/08

Technical Assistance Workshop: Application Preparation 4/30/08

Technical Assistance: Application Preparation 5/7/08

Application Submission Deadline 5/14/08

Application Review and Evaluation Period by CAC 5/14/08 – 6/23/08

CAC Monthly Meeting: First Review and Evaluation of Applications 5/22/08

CAC Meeting: Review and Evaluation of Applications 6/11/08

CAC Meeting: Review and Evaluation of Applications 6/12/08

CAC Meeting: Discussion of Draft Consolidated Plan 6/19/08

CAC Meeting: Vote to Approve Annual Funding Allocations and Consolidated Plan 6/23/08

Public Commentary Period for Consolidated/Annual Plans 7/1/08 – 7/30/08

Public Hearing No. 2: Public Hearing on Consolidated/Annual Plan 7/15/08

CAC Meeting to Vote for Recommendation of Consolidated /Annual Plans 7/31/08

Board of Aldermen Meeting/Vote to Adopt Consolidated/Annual Plans 8/11/08

Consolidated Plan Due at HUD 8/15/08

Notification to Applicants 8/ 15/08 – 8/ 19/08

Mandatory Orientation and Technical Assistance for CDBG/ESG Awardees 8/26/08

While this process technically occurred during the time period covered by last year's CAPER, it was not reported on which is why it is included here.

The 2008-2009 program year commenced on October 1, 2008. The WDC had held a technical assistance meeting at the end of August 2008 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 two monitoring visits 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 visited the subrecipients numerous times to 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 1 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 Thursday, December 3, 2009. The public was invited to comment for 15-day period that started Friday, December 4, 2009 at 8:00 a.m. and concluded Friday, December 18, 2009 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)
PROGRAM YEAR 34 2008-2009

The Waterbury Development Corporation (WDC), on behalf of the City of Waterbury, has completed the Program Year 34 2008-2009 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 December 3, 2009 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.waterburyct.org and www.wdconline.org. Written/oral comments will be considered until 5:00 p.m. on December 18, 2009. The CAPER will be submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on or about December 22, 2009, the actual deadline to HUD is December 29, 2009. Citizens should contact:

The Waterbury Development Corporation
ATTN: Diane C. Toolan
Housing and Community Planning Director
24 Leavenworth Street, Waterbury, CT 06702
(203)346-2607 Ext. 115

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 1 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 part of last year's planning process for the Ten Year Plan, The City pledged to fund from City resources the new position of Housing and Community Planning Director for the WDC. This position was advertised in July 2009 and in August 2009, Diane C. Toolan, a professional with over thirty (30) years of housing, community and economic development experience in both the private and public sectors was selected for the position. Ms. Toolan served as the Director of Community and Economic Development for the Town of Stratford for 15 years (1992-2007). WDC staff and the Mayor's office sit on the Continuum of Care and this past year they have been meeting with the Continuum of Care (COC) to develop the Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness. The Plan was completed and unveiled to the public during the United Way's Annual Meeting held on October 21, 2009. Ms. Toolan was named as a Co-convener of the Housing Committee charged with creating 250 units of permanent housing in ten years. The Mayor's Office also stays informed through meetings of COC needs and grant applications through meetings with the COC. Staff from the Mayor's Office sit on several ad hoc planning groups associated with a wide variety of community concerns, issues, and projects, i.e. education, public services, recreation, land use and open space.

The Mayor's Office and WDC meet regularly with Main Street Waterbury, Waterbury Neighborhood Housing Services and the newly formed Loyola Development 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

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 counsel. The City of Waterbury Risk Manager reviewed insurance requirements for the agencies

Subrecipients 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 August 2009 to guide subrecipients through program requirements, reporting requirements and the monitoring program. Reporting requirements included the completion of monthly Daily Benefit Activity Reports (DBARs), quarterly reports and a Close-Out Report.

Monitoring was conducted during February, March and April of 2009 and a schedule was developed for each of the CDBG and ESG subrecipients in order to accommodate their workload and staff needs as well as those of WDC. Unlike the previous year, WDC consolidated its two on-site visits to one visit in addition to a desk review. Factors that would qualify a subrecipient as high risk were identified and additional visits were made to organizations that were high risk. Desk monitoring was an in-house review of each subrecipients file, including the application and contract, the completion of required reporting, the timeliness and quality of reporting, the

submission of vouchers/bills for eligible activities. Desk review results were performed in January-early February 2009. Desk reviews were sent to all subrecipients.

The on-site visits occurred in February–April of 2009. The subrecipients received an advance checklist of what would be covered at each on-site visit. Desk review performance was discussed at the on-site interviews. WDC staff confirmed the visits by mail, held an entrance conference at the beginning of each visit and an exit review of tentative conclusions at the end of the visit. A formal letter was sent to each subrecipient within 30 days of the visit detailing any findings or concerns. The first on-site visit was generally a site visit, a view of programs while in session and personal question and answer session with technical assistance as to financials, reporting etc.

Throughout the year, subrecipients 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 monitored City–based projects. WDC staff used City procurement for bidding. City procurement encompassed City procurement regulations and WDC staff also ensured that HUD bidding regulations were followed. WDC staff prepared contracts, guided contracts through the WDC board and the City Board of Aldermen, conducted wage interviews, visited project sites, conducted meetings with City department staff on project progress, 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. HOME funded rental properties require that income and rents be monitored on an annual basis. Rental property owners were required to fill out and submit the HOME Rental Project Compliance Reports (Form 6-D) Owners were also provided with the most current income and rent limits along with utility allowances annually. Projects that were under construction or rehabilitated were monitored throughout project construction/rehabilitation. Payments were only processed after the required paperwork was received and an inspection of the work was conducted at the site with the homeowner and contractor. Permits, certificates of approval, and certificates of occupancy are obtained when required by the City Building Department. All parties, including the WDC Housing/Neighborhood Specialist, were required to sign off on a payment request before being processed. Daystar Housing Inspections, LLC. performed on-site monitoring of our rental properties. Inspections are being completed for all HOME assisted rental properties currently under their affordability period.

As a result of the on- going monitoring requirements, WDC is looking to fill the newly created position of monitoring and evaluation specialist by the end of 2009. This position will implement 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 will also provide 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 subrecipients. Many of the programs that were funded with CDBG/ESG have been funded in the past and WDC staff are familiar with the programs and their principal staff. However, monitoring allows staff to track changes in programs, understand any problems programs might be experiencing in the present or will be experiencing in the future, and get to know new staff.

Participants in the HOME program have gained a greater understanding of their responsibilities. Through on-site monitoring, property owners have a better understanding of their responsibilities. Properties that had noncompliance issues were required to address them; therefore, the property was a suitable environment. If property owners had problems with compliance, WDC staff worked with property owners to resolve compliance issues.

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.

Program Year 1 CAPER Monitoring response:

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

The HOME program has continued to help alleviate blight on a spot basis and improve the general appearance of a street in a blighted area, particularly when the individual property was extremely rundown. It has, in some cases, started spin-offs of neighborhood improvements, as adjacent property owners start to become interested in repairing and maintaining their properties. The renovations have also

created safe, affordable housing for the tenants or property owners, without which they might still be living in substandard housing. Of the projects completed this year, one of them provides supportive housing to previously chronically homeless individuals. Another project provides housing for individuals that have been homeless and have either mental health or substance abuse issues. HOME funds have continued to create more lead-safe housing units and to address code-related issues. The HOME program will have a greater impact in the future as changes are made to target HOME funds towards specific geographic areas where in combination with CDBG and other leveraged resources, a greater visual statement and yielding of private investment will be realized.

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 otherwise have not 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, investor-owned 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 has provided individuals and families with the opportunity to own their own home. Without this assistance, it may not have been possible for these individuals to be homeowners.

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 One-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 City is presently revising its land use laws and re-drawing its zoning map. The 10-Year Plan to End Homeless is now completed and the implementation and steering committees will begin meeting in January 2010.

The City has started to actively support housing nonprofits, with its own dollars apart from CDBG, that it sees have great potential to revitalize neighborhoods. To that end, it has allocated \$200,000 for the Loyola Development Corporation in order for them to hire an executive director and move the St. Anne's Village Revitalization Concept to implementation. City leaders are realizing the need to invest in housing activities along with the need to try to attract new housing nonprofits to the area and/or give technical or financial assistance to those in Waterbury so that they can build their capacity. The City also funded the newly created position of Housing and Community Planning Director for the WDC. The position will oversee the Neighborhood Reinvestment Group Unit of the WDC and be responsible for the housing policy. The City will keep its options open with respect to the role of Section 108 loans and whether or not the City should venture into this arena.

The City is aggressively building its "tool box" of financial incentives that it can offer to businesses in order to encourage them to stay in Waterbury, move to Waterbury or grow in Waterbury. The expansion of the Enterprise Zone to encompass all of Census Tract 3501.00 was a significant accomplishment this year. To complement those efforts, the City funded through CDBG, commercial rehabilitation program and downtown façade, awning and sign program in CD YR 35.

Brownfield remediation continues as a major focus in Waterbury both in terms of revitalizing the City's neighborhoods and as a means to offer clean, safe property to businesses and industries hoping to grow or move here. Waterbury has been a leader in state Brownfield's legislation and has recently secured one of the largest Federal grants of funds (15 million) to clean up a Waterville neighborhood. It also secured another \$1,448,750 from the Neighborhood Initiative Program in order to continue to improve the conditions of its distressed and blighted areas and stimulate investment. The City intends to conduct environmental assessments on selected sites; do selective demolition and promote commercial development with these funds.

If one were to look at projects completed during the 2007-2008 year, one would therefore say that each and every one met its objective and played a part in taking one more step towards fulfilling the defined goal. Although there were some projects that have been slow in getting off the ground, most are on their way in the right direction. School facilities, community centers and parks were improved, roads and sidewalks in blighted neighborhoods constructed, blighted buildings demolished, unsafe neighborhood buildings boarded up and secured, homes rehabilitated, shelters and social service agencies supported. These have all met with support and appreciation from residents and neighborhoods and have been a success. However, equally as important during the last year is the City's progress in re-evaluating its attitudes, practices and direction in terms of where it wants to go and how it can best get there in the future.

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

HOME funds were primarily dedicated to the rehabilitation of existing housing stock, with one new construction of a 7-unit townhouse building. HOME funds helped families and investors create and maintain safe and decent affordable housing by financially assisting and educating the property owners in the rehabilitation of their buildings.

As previously mentioned, the implementation of ADDI has made it possible for low-moderate income families to afford the purchase of their homes. Rehabilitation also created more energy efficient units that helped lower utility bills for both homeowners and renters of HOME-assisted units. HOME funds have also helped create more lead-safe units in a city with housing stock that consists of a large number of units built before 1978. Lead and code issues are a priority of the HOME program. For some properties, HOME funds helped prevent the further deterioration of a building, which allowed the unit(s) to remain safe, decent and affordable. In other 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 stay in their own home. ADDI provided 4 homebuyers down payment assistance.

HOME dollars funded the rehabilitation of 46 units. Of these units 11 were owner occupied units and 35 were rental units. All of the rental units assisted are occupied by tenants falling in the 0 – 30% of median income category. The owner occupied units assisted 4 households falling in the 0 – 30% range of median income, 1 in the 30 – 50% range of median income, 3 in the 50 – 60% range of median income and 3 in the 60 – 80% range of median income.

In addition to the smaller rehabilitations completed during the 2008 – 2009 program year, there are 3 larger projects that deserve further mention. One of the projects included a partnership with one of our Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO), CREDO Housing Development Corporation, Inc., the Waterbury Continuum of Care and Greater Waterbury Interfaith Ministries (GWIM). The project created 7 units of affordable supportive housing for the chronically homeless. CREDO received a Supportive Housing grant which provides operating funds and support services to the project. It currently houses and provides supportive services to 7 previously homeless very, very low income individuals.

One of our investor rehabilitation projects made 10 affordable units available to homeless individuals with mental or substance abuse problems. All of these tenants are very, very low income (30% of Median Income). The owner has partnered with the Greater Waterbury Mental Health Authority who provides supportive services along with a local non-profit Brass City Harvest.

Another investor rehabilitation of a 9 unit building provides larger apartments which include 8 three bedroom units and 1 two bedroom unit. This project currently provides 7 large and 2 small very, very low income families (30% of Median Income) housing.

All of the projects listed above provide off street parking and are on the City's bus line.

CDBG dollars have improved the quality of life in many of the City's low-moderate income residents by funding a variety of neighborhood improvements and supporting a number of greatly-needed social service programs and agencies, as previously discussed. Many of the projects have greatly improved the quality of life in the neighborhoods through the creation of better infrastructure and opportunities for recreation and improved community facilities. The general appearance of neighborhoods has been improved (often tied to decreased criminal activity) with the acquisition/ demolition of blighted buildings, the boarding up of vacant properties, and the cleaning of litter on streets, sidewalks and vacant lots. Neighborhood residents have been assisted through emergency relocation dollars as well as funds invested in the many social service programs that provide for their special needs as well as to their daily, basic individual or family needs (transportation, recreation child care, literacy, health concerns, etc.). These programs, in turn, have increased residents' chances to obtain meaningful employment, thus enabling them to better support themselves and their families. CDBG funds also supported In-The-Making, a CBDO providing that empowers, trains and employs low-moderate income individuals.

3. d. Indicate any activities falling behind schedule.

The City met its timeliness standard this year and, in fact achieved a 1.33 ratio. The commercial façade program was behind schedule in terms of its original projections and as a result of substantial revisions to the program, however, a total of seven applications were approved and two are under contract and the remaining five are in various stages of contract review.

The non-commercial rehabilitation of the basement undercroft of St. Anne's Church for use by area nonprofits will not go forward as the project is no longer feasible due to the amount of work which would be required to retrofit the space. The funds will be reprogrammed via a substantial amendment and the CAC has begun discussion with the Loyola Development Corporation on the use of these funds to support their revitalization plan. It is anticipated that this process will begin in January 2010.

For the HOME Program, there are nine projects that have fallen behind schedule due to the City process and one due to weather and a contractor issue. The Grace Development Corporation of Waterbury, Inc.'s development of 41 new congregate housing has fallen behind schedule due to State budgeting issues. Grace is currently seeking other funding sources in case the State funding isn't obtained.

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

Activities and strategies have made a significant impact on identified needs in that each activity has answered a piece of the need, although there is still a long way to go in each of our identified focus areas that have been defined by our needs. Rehabilitation of older housing stock is still a formidable task and will be met by HOME appropriations in upcoming years. To move more quickly to meet housing needs in terms of housing rehabilitation, the City needs to attract more housing non-profits to our City, thereby easing the load of the public sector through investments in the private sector. The City also needs to address the lack of capacity/ability of local housing nonprofits to address rehabilitation needs at this time. The City looks forward to a newly-reorganized Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury to

contribute to easing this burden as it builds its capacity. It is a great provider of a variety of homeowner and mortgage foreclosure counseling services. Hopefully, it will move forward in to the realm of housing rehabilitation in a significant way. The City also looks forward to the successful organization and growth of the new Loyola Development. The Corporation has just hired an executive director that the City and WDC will work closely with in order to implement their revitalization strategy, which will have a major impact on the South End neighborhood of Waterbury.

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.

In terms of HOME, the ongoing improvement of the program helped address the needs of the applicants in a more timely and efficient manner.

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. A general indicator of HOME success is the continued high public interest in the program with a waiting list for future HOME funds. Another indicator is 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 eight 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 seven 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.

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 the 1.5 performance ratio during PY 34 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. The reprogramming of the ESG funds allocated to Family Services of Waterbury Inc. will be done in January 2009. These funds will be given to the eligible ESG subgrantees.

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

There are no major adjustments to strategies or objectives, other than those already discussed. A comprehensive evaluation of strategies and activities has taken place during the Five-Year Consolidated Plan process. This process addressed improving the HOME program so that it would better meet our needs more effectively through the creation of targeted neighborhoods. This would allow the City to focus on larger projects not the single unit smaller rehabilitation projects it currently undertakes with HOME funds. The refocusing of the HOME Program would require the City to create a residential rehabilitation program under the CDBG Program in order to continue to meet the housing needs of its owner occupants.

Lead-based Paint

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

Program Year 1 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
- >20ug/dL epidemiological investigation Environmental Case Management.
Effective 1/1/10 This action level will 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 Eliminates Lead Hazards (W.E.L.H) was funded 11/2005 for \$3,000,000. This program provides financial assistance to landlords and homeowners to treat lead hazards. In addition, the program provides community outreach and education regarding lead hazards. In April of 2009, the program was re-funded by HUD for another \$3,000,000 which will allow WELH to continue to provide financial assistance to Waterbury residents to remedy lead hazards and exposures in their homes for the next three years.

Currently, W.E.L.H. **has completed 253 units that received** lead hazard reduction. These units will be added to the **registry** of lead safe housing in the City of Waterbury. 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. With the new grant, WELH has estimated they will do another 210 units.

Lead Care Capillary Screening:

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 ELIMINATES LEAD HAZARDS (W.E.L.H.)

W.E.L.H. is currently staffed with a director, health educator, construction coordinator, compliance officer, and an administrative assistant. W.E.L.H. 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 W.E.L.H. for further assistance with lead treatment. In a collaborative effort, W.E.L.H. 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 W.E.L.H. 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. W.E.L.H. 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.

W.E.L.H. 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. ***To date, approximately 14,000 elementary school children in approximately 23 public and parochial schools 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. W.E.L.H. 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, W.E.L.H. 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, to date the HOME program has made 27 units lead safe. Of the 27 units, 9 of the units lead work were funded through W.E.L.H. Because of the HOME program's lead requirement, the property owner applied and received funding to make the property 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 1 CAPER Housing Needs response:

During the 2008-2009 there were a number of actions taken by the City to foster and maintain affordable housing. 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 599; of which 90%, 539 were seeking foreclosure prevention assistance. NHS also partnered with WDC to provide first time homebuyer education to 23 participants in the NSP Program. They also helped 5 Waterbury households receive SMARTMOVE/Workforce Housing downpayment 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 1 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 2008-2009, 35 rental units assisted under HOME were extremely low-income (0-30%) of median. The owner occupied units assisted 4 households falling in the 0 - 30% range; 1 in the 30 -50% range of median income; 3 in the 50-60% range and 3 in the 60-80% range of median income.

In addition, NHS 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 35 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 35 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.

Public Housing Strategy

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to improve public housing and resident initiatives.

Program Year 1 CAPER Public Housing Strategy response:

In the last year, the Waterbury housing Authority (WHA) has completed roof, windows and siding replacement at Pearl Lake Road Apts. (39 units) (CT 6-5) and roof and siding replacements at Springbrook Road Apts.(56 units) (CT6-6) for a total project cost of \$591,584.25. New cluster mailboxes were installed at Oak Terrace Apts.(54 units) (CT 6-4); Pearl Lake Road Apts. (CT6-5) and Springbrook Road Apts. (CT 6-6) for a total cost of \$24,832. Unit stair replacement at Berkley Heights (254 units) (CT 6-1) is substantially complete except for punch list items and the total cost of that improvement is \$570,000.

Barriers to Affordable Housing

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

Program Year 1 CAPER Barriers to Affordable Housing response:

NHS of Waterbury (NHSW) had a very productive year in fiscal year 2008/09. They began the substantial rehabilitation of a three unit house under the State Surplus Property Program that will provide a homeownership and two rental units for residents at or below 80% of area median. NHS is in the pre development phase to build ten units of affordable rental housing using a mix of HOME and other funding sources.

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. NHS continues to administer several down payment assistance programs. They provide financial education classes in partnership with Workforce Inc. They are working with the Jewish Federation to provide financial education and foreclosure assistance to the Waterbury Orthodox Jewish community. In September 2009, NHS established a partnership with Waterbury Youth Services to provide hands on homeownership training to NHSW clients. From October 2008 – September 30, 2009 NHSW received approximately 4,000 inquiries from individuals with housing related inquiries, of which 2016 were specifically foreclosure related. NHS provided comprehensive foreclosure intervention that served approximately 700 households. In addition, they provided reverse mortgage counseling to 762 seniors and first time homebuyer education to 363 clients.

The total number of Waterbury residents assisted during the period October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2009 was 599. Of this approximately 90%, 539 were seeking foreclosure intervention assistance. NHS partnered with WDC to provide first time homebuyer education to 23 participants in the NSP Program. The remaining clients participated in a combination of pre-purchase counseling, reverse mortgage counseling, and financial education. NHSW continues to provide down payment assistance through several programs targeting Waterbury area residents. During the last year they helped 5 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 1 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 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. Of the 43 units listed in the table below, 26 of the units that were originally listed in the existing unit category in the Consolidated Plan were moved to the production of new rental unit’s category. In the area of owner housing, improvement to the quality of the existing affordable housing stock through rehabilitation financing assistance, increase opportunities for very low and low income households to become and remain homeowners through home purchase or rehabilitation financing assistance and provide pre and post-purchase housing counseling and mortgage foreclosure assistance. The Year 1 goal for increasing the opportunities for very low and low income households to become and remain homeowners was 5, actual households that received assistance was 0. Due to the subprime lending issue, foreclosure crisis, Waterbury’s high unemployment rate, and the economy were large factors in the decision not to fund downpayment assistance during Year 1. The balance of ADDI funds were not expended for the same reasons listed above.

Priority Housing Activities
Year 1 Goals & Actual Units Assisted

Priority Need	Year 1 Goal	Actual
HOME		
Production of new rental units	6	26
Rehabilitation of existing units	43	10
Rehabilitation of existing owner units	16	10
Homeownership assistance	5	0

The Consolidated Plan identifies the need for the improvement of existing rental and owner occupied units and the need to assist households at all income levels. The HOME applications are currently processed on a first come first served basis therefore the households assisted are determined by the applications received. The following table compares the Year 1 goals by income level with actual households assisted.

Priority Housing Needs
Year 1 Goals & Actual Households Assisted

Priority Need	Year 1 Goal	Actual
Renters		
0 – 30%	21	35
31 – 50%	13	0
51 – 80%	4	0
Owners		
0 – 30%	3	4
31 – 50%	7	1
51 – 80%	7	6

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.**

Daystar Housing Inspections, LLC. Performs Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspections of HOME funded rental housing. Daystar inspected 12 units of housing. On-site monitoring is an ongoing process. Properties will be monitored according to HUD regulations.

- 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).

- 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. WDC staff also met in person with minority and women-owned

businesses on a regular basis. HOME staff coordinate efforts with the Business Growth Group of WDC who hold minority outreach forums. HOME staff also outreached to the Greater Waterbury Black Business Association who in turn works with Waterbury Opportunities Industrialization, Inc. (WOIC). WOIC's list of contractors are then given notice of projects. WDC also works through the Chamber of Commerce Women's Business Development Center to reach out to women-owned businesses.

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 1 CAPER Homeless Needs response:

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

1. a. 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 on the 1st Thursday of every month 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. The COC operates to create networking opportunities for all members; raise awareness of local, state and national initiatives and opportunities focused on homelessness; and establish a seamless planning process that connects all housing and support services around the goals of determining the causes and alleviation of homelessness for all of Waterbury's citizens. The Continuum

has active subcommittees (Steering Committee, the HMIS/ Homeless Count Committee, the Access and Participation in Mainstream Resources Committee, the Public Relations and Education and Membership Committee, and the Independent Ranking and Review Committee) that meet monthly or bi-monthly to plan and implement actions and strategies that support the overall mission and short-term and long-term goals set by each committee and the Steering Committee of the Continuum as a whole.

Throughout 2008-2009 the COC met monthly and continued its outreach into the private sector by inviting additional mainstream service providers and local advocates to join the Continuum, thus strengthening the Continuum's resources.

A major initiative undertaken by the Waterbury Continuum of Care in 2009 was the collaborative community implementation of the Waterbury Ten Year Plan to end Homelessness. The City of Waterbury and the United Way of Greater Waterbury served as the Co-Chairs of the Leadership Group for the Ten Year Plan development. A press conference to kick off the development of the Ten Year Plan was held in March of 2009. A Ten Year Plan Steering Committee was convened which was Chaired by the Co-Chair of the Waterbury CoC, a city of Waterbury representative, and a United Way representative. The development of the plan included the creation of Five Subcommittees: Housing, Prevention, Services, Employment and Income, and Communications. Each of the Subcommittees included representation from all sectors (private, faith based, non-profit, city, and federal government), CoC member agencies, and homeless/formerly homeless individuals. High Impact strategies and action steps were developed by each of the subcommittees. The following are the 5 Strategic Priorities outlined in the Plan: Priority #1 – Create 250 units of permanent supportive housing in the Waterbury region over the next 10 year; Priority #2 – Create a sustainable flexible assistance fund to provide short term financial assistance for individuals/families at risk of homelessness; Priority #3 – Develop a respite model to provide transitional medical/behavioral health services; Priority #4 – reduce fragmentation of employment and income services and increase linkages among employment, training, and education resources; Priority #5 – communicate the goals, action steps, and benefit of the implementation of the Ten Year Plan to stakeholders and all community audiences. The plan was released to the public at an October press conference. Currently the structure and design for implementation teams to be convened in collaboration with the existing Continuum of Care committee structure. Implementation teams will begin meeting in January of 2010.

In January of 2009, 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 Center for Human Development/CT Outreach West. 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 2nd Annual Project Homeless Connect Event for the City of Waterbury. This event took place at the Armory in Waterbury on October 23rd. This was spearheaded by the Continuum's Access to Mainstream Resources 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:

- 323 total persons registered
- 95 volunteers engaged (2 times the amount from last year)
- 11 Veterans Benefits/Employment Services
- 12 Applications for Food Stamp/HUSKY/Medicare
- 200 Bus Tokens Distributed
- 5 ID's issued
- 84 Haircuts
- 70 Eye Screenings
- 50 Flu Shots
- 73 Medical Triage/BP & BMI; Blood Sugar Screenings/ & Foot Evaluations
- 20 Dental Screening and 10 Dental Cleanings
- 207 Winter Coats Distributed
- 250 Books Distributed
- 250 Baggies of instant meals/drinks distributed
- 150 Baggies of Snacks distributed
- 781 Individual/Family Photos printed
- 84 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 96% as of October 2009. During the upcoming year the next phase of the project includes developing more comprehensive community level data, and compliance visits to each of the agencies entering HMIS data. A bi-monthly HMIS administrator's meeting continues to take place with each of the agencies providing representation.

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 Greater Waterbury Interfaith Ministries. The construction was completed in April of 2009 and the building is currently at capacity.

The Continuum put forth for additional HUD funding in the 2009 SuperNOFA to create 2 new units of permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals using Shelter Plus Care certificates. Funding worth a total of \$120,780 is to be utilized as housing assistance for homeless individuals in Waterbury. If awarded the housing assistance will be administered through the Waterbury Housing Authority with supportive services provided by Western CT Mental health Network. Additionally, renewal projects were applied for Pilots I and II, Beyond Shelter, Society of Support, Freedom Walk, Credo, Inc., 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 10 year planning process. The COC Coordinator will support Continuum efforts in regards to increasing membership and capacity as well as supporting the groups' goals and objectives.

The City of Waterbury was also able to participate in a pilot internship project between the CT Coalition to End Homelessness and the University of Connecticut. An intern has been placed at New Opportunities, Inc. to support the development of a local consumer group of homeless/formerly homeless individuals and the implementation of the Ten Year Plan action steps.

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's Access and Participation in Mainstream Resources Committee helps the service providers to coordinate the utilization of supportive resources to maintain the stability of homeless persons in permanent housing. This is accomplished 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.

There were two HOME funded projects that assisted the homeless during the 2008 – 2009 Program year. One of the HOME funded projects included a partnership with one of our Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO), CREDO Housing Development Corporation, Inc., the Waterbury Continuum of Care and Greater Waterbury Interfaith Ministries (GWIM). The project created 7 units of affordable supportive housing for the chronically homeless. CREDO received a Supportive Housing grant which provides operating funds and support services to the project. It currently houses and provides supportive services to 7 previously homeless very, very low income individuals. The was also an investor rehabilitation project which made 10 affordable units available to homeless individuals with mental or substance abuse problems. All of these tenants are very, very low income (30% of Median Income). The owner has partnered with the Greater Waterbury Mental Health Authority who provides supportive services along with a local non-profit Brass City Harvest.

3. Identify new Federal resources obtained from Homeless SuperNOFA.

New federal resources awarded to the Continuum in the 2008 round of SuperNOFA funding include:

\$120,780 was granted to Waterbury housing Authority with support services provided by Chrysalis, Inc. for the provision of 3 Shelter Plus Care vouchers.

Total Amount funded: \$120,780

Specific Homeless Prevention Elements

1. Identify actions taken to prevent homelessness.

CAPER Specific Housing Prevention Elements response:

1. 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, the DSS Security Deposit Guarantee 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. Additionally, Discharge protocols for the Department of Corrections, Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, and Department of Children and Families were part of a panel discussion that took place over the course of 2 of the monthly Continuum of Care meetings.

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).

1. 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 worse economic crisis since the Great Depression has been extremely difficult for those providing shelter and supportive services to the most vulnerable citizens. The previous efforts to remove the "Tent City" were temporary at best and reports of upwards of 35 individuals and families living in the woods due to lack of affordable housing and in some instances, by choice for those chronically homeless, continues to strain the limited resources of the agencies. Outreach coordinators local public service agencies work to document these numbers and outreach to individuals to address both emergency and permanent housing. The announcement of 35 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 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 dependant 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.

In 2008-2009, the demand for beds at shelters increased dramatically. Waterbury's St. Vincent DePaul Shelter is the largest shelter in the state. In the last year, the demand for beds at this one shelter has increased by 30%. At this point in time, there is an average of 111 people staying each night at St. Vincent DePaul's. In August 2009, the Shelter added an extra 25 cots to their already existing 126 bed. Not all beds and cots can be used because there are separate sleeping areas due to gender, and the breakdowns by gender are not always in exact relation to the physical breakdown of beds by gender. An indication of rising numbers seeking shelter over fall-winter 2009 is that fact that the numbers for December, 2009 have not decreased. Typically, relatives take in their own relatives that are homeless during the month of December, thus driving down the number of beds used at shelters. This has not happened in December 2009. In fact, St. Vincent DePaul's is using 55-60 more beds in December 2009 than in December 2008.

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.

Through its Emergency Shelter Grants in 2008-2009, the City funded Family Services Association of Waterbury Inc. \$14,999 for the staffing of Chapman House, an emergency sanctuary for children ages three to twelve, who have been removed from their home due to abuse or severe neglect.** The City also granted the Morris Foundation \$3,891 for utilities and food at the Therapeutic Shelter. Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury received \$5,502 for operating costs for their shelter, which provides a safe place for physically and/or psychologically abused women and their children. The Salvation Army received \$10,367 for administrative and operating expenses for the Family Shelter. Finally, St. Vincent DePaul received \$64,987 for the operation of their homeless shelter and other supportive services to aid the homeless.

**During HUD's monitoring of the ESG Program in the Spring of 2009, it was determined that the project was ineligible because the children did not meet the definition of homeless as they were wards of the State. This project was included for funding in the public services portion of the CDBG funds for PY 35. The City will repay the \$2,376 spent on the project prior to HUD's determination and will reprogram the funds to another eligible ESG subgrantee.

The City looks to the Continuum of Care to provide the lead on homelessness-related issues. A member of the Mayor's Office and the WDC sit on the Continuum of Care.

The COC applies for funding with the City's support to meet the needs of the City's homeless population

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.

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 2008-2009 agencies and amounts funded by ESG for 2008-2009 were identified.

Family Services of Waterbury, Inc. (\$14,999) ** as previously noted was declared ineligible by HUD as the children who become wards of the State upon entering the program do not meet the definition of homeless. These funds will be reallocated to eligible ESG subgrantees.

The Morris Foundation (\$3,891) ESG funds were used for utilities and the purchase of food at the Therapeutic Shelter. In 2008-2009, the Foundation Served 318 people which included 242 White (61 of which were Hispanic), 70 Black/African/American, 3 Asian, 2 American Indian/Alaskan native, and 1 Other Multi-Racial. The Shelter provided 4,133 meals and 2,501 bed days over the course of the year. The Morris Foundation allocation was matched with new Federal funds of \$73,404 (FEMA and DMHAS), local/state government funds totaling \$582,006 (DMHAS, Department of Correction and state Judicial Branch), \$28,424 in private donations and \$296,767 in fees.

The Salvation Army (\$10,367) used their ESG funds for administrative and operating expenses at their family shelter. In 2008-2009, the total number of persons served was 197 which included 79 White (includes 31 Hispanic), 59 were Black/ African American, and 7 Native Hawaiian (includes 7 Hispanic) and 17 American Indian/Alaskan Native (includes 17 Hispanic) and 35 Other Multi-Racial (includes 22 Hispanic). A total of 66 families received shelter services. The Salvation Army operated its shelter 7 days/week, 24 hours/day. Like other shelters, the Salvation army is experiencing increasing demands for beds, From July 1-September 30, 2009 the Shelter turned away 162 families due to lack of

available beds. Year to Date, the Shelter has turned away 1,455 individuals in 461 families. In the 2008-2009 year, 43 families received permanent housing after leaving the Shelter. The Salvation Army allocation was matched with other federal funds of \$23,452 (FEMA), local government funds of \$251,165 (Department of Social Services), United Way funds of \$26,733 and donations of \$5,000.

Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury (\$5,502) 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. Safe Haven served 637 individuals, which included 440 White (including 193 Hispanic), 124 Black/African American (including 1 Hispanic), 8 Asian, 2 American Indian/Alaskan Native, 2 Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander and 61 Other/Multi-Racial (including 31 Hispanic) persons. The Safe Haven grant was matched by contributions. The Safe Haven allocation was matched with \$653,000 in other Federal funds (includes FEMA), \$394,000 in private funds (including United Way), \$94,000 in donations, and \$188,998 in other Thrift Shop revenues

The St. Vincent DePaul Society (\$64,987.00) grant was used for operating costs for the operation of the homeless shelter. The St. Vincent DePaul Mission Homeless Shelter served 954 individuals which included 498 White (includes 132 Hispanic), 409 Black/African American (includes 110 Hispanic), 2 Asian, 2 American Indian/Alaskan Native and 42 Other Multi-Racial persons. Of the 954 persons 118 were children. The shelter also services 31 single female families and 2 two-parent families. 95% of the homeless population is unemployed and 77% did not graduate from high school. Only 23% attended college. . The major reasons for people residing at this shelter is eviction, release from jail or drug addiction, with 80% exhibiting different degrees of mental illness.

In terms of judging its success, the Shelter looks to see that clients attain alternative housing and/or accesses social and/or treatment services. Alternative housing included, but was not limited to transitional housing, residential treatment programs, and supportive and permanent housing. In 2007-2008, 35% of single clients and 75% of family clients accessed another housing setting. Social services included domestic violence abuse counseling; family counseling; educational, employment, and financial counseling; childcare; and security deposit and rental assistance programs. During 2007-2008, at least 81% of single clients and 92% of family clients accessed social service programs.

The St. Vincent DePaul ESG grant was matched with private funding of \$277,813 and other government and foundation funds of \$493,250.

All of these 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 t make sure all

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

- 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.
Not applicable.
- 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.

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.

Program Year 1 CAPER 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.

A forum was held at the February, and March Continuum of Care meetings which confirm the discharge protocol used by DCF and strengthen the relationship between DCF and the Continuum member agencies.

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.

A forum was held at the February, and March Continuum of Care meetings which confirm the discharge protocol used by Waterbury and St. Mary's Hospital and strengthen the relationship between Waterbury and St. Mary's Hospital and the Continuum member agencies.

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.

A forum was held at the February, and March Continuum of Care meetings which confirm the discharge protocol used by DMHAS and strengthen the relationship between DMHAS and the Continuum member agencies.

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 Charlene Perkins Center provides comprehensive re-entry programming for female offenders, with services provided by agency staff, multiple state agencies, contracted programs and community volunteers.

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.

A forum was held at the February, and March Continuum of Care meetings which confirm the discharge protocol used by DOC and strengthen the relationship between DOC and the Continuum member agencies.

***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 1 CAPER Community Development response:

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

1. a-c. These questions have been addressed in a comprehensive fashion under "General Questions 1a-c" of this document. The 2008-2009 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 two project line items that are not calculated in meeting the CDBG 70% low-moderate income benefit are Acquisition and Demolition which have been justified on a Slum and Blight Spot Basis and Interim Assistance. In the past year, 84% 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.

The City did not change its program objectives for Program Year 34 which was the first year of its Five Year Consolidated Plan (2008-2013).

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 2008-2009 Grants Received," and the "City of Waterbury 2008-2009 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. 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.**

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

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. 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.

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

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

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

8. a. In the HOME Program a total of \$19,934 in Program Income was received: \$11,204 for a loan repayment and \$8,730 for a deferred loan payoff.

b. Detail the amount repaid on each float-funded activity.

The City has no float funded activity.

c. Detail all other loan repayments broken down by the categories of housing rehabilitation, economic development, or other.

The City received \$47,676 as the balance of NHS Reserve; \$36,686 from loan repayments and \$41,600 in relocation liens.

d. Detail the amount of income received from the sale of property by parcel.

The City received \$10,000 as the proceeds from the sale of 186 Willow Street; a property it had taken under eminent domain.

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

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.

9a. IDIS # 2019 Family Services of Greater Waterbury and IDIS # 2025 Interim Assistance.

9b. PY 34 2008-2009

9c. Has not been done yet. Waiting for HUD's answer on reclassifying Interim Assistance expenditure of \$14,685 to the eligible activity Fire Station Improvements.

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.

10. a. The City does not use CDBG funds for float-funded activities

b. List the total number of other loans outstanding and the principal balance owed as of the end of the reporting period.

10. b. The total number of loans outstanding is 34 with a principal balance of \$538,381.

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.

10. c-e. Not applicable.

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.

11. a-d. Not applicable.

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.

12. a-c. The City does not fund rehabilitation programs with CDBG

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.

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 1 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 to 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 ADDI 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 1 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 eight clients 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 1 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 1 CAPER Other Narrative response: