Second Program Year CAPER

The CPMP Second 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 second year.

Program Year 2 CAPER Executive Summary response:

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

In order to accomplish this with the use of HUD funds in the past program year (CD YEAR 35 the period from 10/1/09 to 9/30/10), the City of Waterbury looked to create a suitable living environment, provide decent, affordable housing, and create economic opportunities for Waterbury's low-moderate income residents. In order to achieve this, the following priority goals were established:

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

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

DRAFT

(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 Second 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:

- $ 2,282,284.00 New CDBG Funds
- $ 114,765.94 Reprogrammed Prior Years Funds
- $ 134,591.26 CDBG Program Income

- $2,531,641.20 Total CDBG

- $ 1,048,678.00 New HOME Funds
- $ 31,389.72 HOME Program Income

- $ 1,080,067.72 Total HOME

- $ 99,820.00 New ESG Funds
- $ 14,999.00 Reprogrammed Funds

- $ 114,819 Total ESG

The total expenditure in CD Year 35 for each funding source was:

- $ 2,285,807.60 CDBG Funds
- $ 639,195.56 HOME Funds
- $ 114,819.00 ESG Funds

- $ 3,039,822.16 Total Expended

DRAFT

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

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

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

Needs assessment data, goals and objectives, and specific methods for distributing these program allocations are located in the City of Waterbury 2009-2010 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 2009-2010 year and includes program accomplishments and financial data. During this program year, a total of 83.81% of its Community Development Block Grant funds was expended on activities and projects which primarily benefit low and moderate income persons. HUD mandates that the City of Waterbury provide specific technical information for all programs funded by the Consolidated Plan. This is also provided in the on-line computer system Integrated Disbursement and Information System, (IDIS). The CAPER, like the Action Plan, is provided to the community to encourage citizen participation. The CAPER integrates IDIS technical information with narrative information to describe the City's Consolidated Plan and funded programs, how they meet priorities established in the Consolidated Plan, and how successful implementation includes active community participation.

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

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

DRAFT

summary of the City's progress in addressing its goals, objectives and priorities during the reporting period October 1, 2009-September 30, 2010.

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

Program Year 2 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 second year of the Plan which this CAPER covers. The Five Year Plan established the following priority goals for the City as follows:
• To bring about a suitable living environment (i.e., revitalize distressed areas of Waterbury); priority was given to activities that involve rehabilitation, adaptive reuse, expansion of commercial opportunities and improvement of public infrastructure, facilities and services.
• To achieve decent, safe and affordable housing, priority was given to projects that involve rehabilitation or infill. Mixed income projects were encouraged.
• To expand economic opportunity, priority was given to making homeownership affordable and projects that create jobs for low and moderate income persons or in targeted neighborhoods.
• Projects that leverage funds (i.e., have other sources of funding) were encouraged.
• Projects and activities that enhanced Waterbury's disinvested neighborhoods were a priority.

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

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

The City allocated a large share of its HUD funds during CD Year 35 to community redevelopment programs as part of a holistic approach to enhancing the living

DRAFT

environment within the City. The programs are broad in scope but serve to generate vital, healthy and safe neighborhoods.

As an older industrial City, Waterbury is home to more than 40 Brownfield sites; the vestiges of a once proud, dynamic manufacturing base. In CD Year 34, a total of $150,000 was allocated for the **Acquisition of Brownfield Sites**; in addition a total of $45,991.75 in carry over funds was also available for this project. No funds were expended during the program year and no sites were acquired. Due to the City's success in securing funds from the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection and the federal Environmental Protection Agency, the immediate need for these funds has changed. The $150,000 was reprogrammed as part of the recent CD Year 36 Annual Action Plan. The older carryover funds will be reprogrammed as part of the upcoming CD Year 37 process, if there is no need for these funds.

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.

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

Clearance and Demolition of blighted and vacant/abandoned buildings was funded in CD Year 35 for a total of $200,000; in addition a carryover of $282,618.66 was also available to eliminate these slum and blighted properties. A high priority was placed on this activity which cited the need throughout the City for selective demolition and clearance to remove the worst offenders that have outlived their useful life. A total five year goal of 20 sites was noted. During CD Year 35, the following 4 CDBG funded projects were completed:

- 24 East Liberty Street - $ 58,700.00
- 322 Orange Street - $ 22,500.00
- 245 Bishop Street - $ 79,959.33
- 223 Hill Street - $ 36,000.00

The **Commercial Rehabilitation Program aka Downtown Façade Program (CT 3501.00)** was awarded an additional $126,198.60 in CD Year 35. 3 projects have been completed, 1 is underway, 2 are finalizing their bidding specifications and 1 has been terminated (see chart below). It has become evident that the complexity of the projects undertaken, due to age of the buildings and likelihood of the buildings contributing factors to the downtown historic district, require a single architect to work with the WDC. A request for qualifications was advertised and subsequently awarded to BL Companies for architectural and construction administration services for the Commercial Rehabilitation Program aka Downtown Façade Program, **The Downtown Signage and Awning Program**, which was funded with $10,000.00

DRAFT

and **The Brooklyn Neighborhood Façade Program**, which was funded with $100,000.00**.** BL Companies will assist WDC in redesigning the Downtown Facade Program and creating the new Downtown Signage and Awning Program and the new Brooklyn Neighborhood Façade Program.

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

Address	**Stage**
68 Bank Street	Complete
42 Bank Street	Complete
64 Bank Street	Specifications compilation stage
142 Grand Street	Terminated
60 Bank Street	Complete
73 Bank Street	Specifications compilation stage
471 West Main Street	Construction underway

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.

Once **The Downtown Signage and Awning Program** is designed with the assistance of BL Companies it is intended to assist 5 downtown businesses with improvements to their exterior appearance without the major investment of a full blown façade improvement project.

When **The Brooklyn Neighborhood Façade Program** is designed it will be implemented in the Brooklyn Neighborhood (CT 3517.2) first in keeping with the targeting effort undertaken in the City. The program is intended to assist 3 buildings with improvements to their exterior facades. It is anticipated that these projects will get underway in 2011.

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. The application was received by the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and unanimously approved. St. Margaret's/Willow Plaza NRZ has acquired one of the adjacent lots by City Auction with Non-Federal Funds. Due to auction rules the original owner has 6 months to redeem the property. On November 27, 2010, the redemption period expired and the NRZ plans to use the lot to expand its parking are clear to begin. Next steps are to go out to bid for the engineering services to design the parking and once designed, the construction portion will be put out to bid. It is anticipated that this project will begin in early spring, 2011.

Fire Station Improvements started with a carryover balance of $64,579.50 and an allocation of $350,000 in CD Year 35 (2009-2010). The funds are being used for the final phase of the Baldwin Street Fire House, (Census Tract 3505.00-1). A total of

DRAFT

$5,120.00 in CDBG funds was spent on architectural/engineering services. The plans, which require approval by SHPO, are being completed by BL Companies and will be put out to bid soon. This final phase consists of correcting additional fire code violations, renovating bathroom and kitchen facilities and site improvements to the rear parking lot. Fire stations/equipment received a high priority in the five year plan with a five year goal of 13 and an annual goal of 2.

Neighborhood Park Improvements started with a carryover balance of $510,807.96 and there were no additional funds allocated in CD Year 35. During the program year, the Washington Park Improvements Project previously reported in last year's CAPER was completed. The remaining balance of architects fees in the amount of $809.49 was paid and the final payment and release of retainage to the contractor for $28,603.23 was paid on November 30, 2009.

During the program year, the contract for Fulton Park began in November 2009. Fulton Park, located in Census Tract (CT 3508.00-4) is the City's prime tennis location where the public high schools play their matches. The courts were completely reconstructed with new asphalt, posts, netting and fencing installed around the courts. 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.

North End Recreation Center, located in Census Tract (CT 3501.00-1) was allocated funds in CD Year 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 is substantially complete. The contract in the amount of $338,093 was executed and work began in November 2009. A total of $317,903.17 has been expended and the balance of $20,189.79 represents the retainage scheduled to be released in the spring of 2011. Parks and/or recreation facilities received a high priority in the five year plan with a total goal of 10 and an annual goal of 4.

Sidewalk Improvements were given a high priority in the five year plan with a five year goal of 20,000 linear feet of new sidewalks and an annual goal of 3,800 linear feet. That translates into approximately 4 to 6 blocks of typical Waterbury residential streets. CD Year 35 started with a carryover balance of $466,934.37 and an allocation of $200,000. An additional $114,725.94 was re-allocated by way of a Substantial Amendment to the CD Year 34 Annual Action Plan. The reallocation of the remaining funds in the Emergency Relocation line item to the Public Improvement-Neighborhood Sidewalks line item was approved in June 2010 These funds were reallocated so that the funds would be available sooner to assist those areas most in immediate need, including the area around the Gilmartin School which opened in September 2010.

During the program year, the projects were again targeted in the Brooklyn Neighborhood (CT 3517.2). The new sidewalks were constructed on Congress Avenue and Washington Avenue including the construction of a knee wall to address unsafe conditions in front of 380 Congress Avenue. A portion of Bank Street sidewalks under the Route 8 highway were also reconstructed. This Bank Street

DRAFT

section links the Brooklyn neighborhood sidewalks to the central business district downtown. The sidewalks are substantially complete with only retainage remaining which will be released upon the City Engineering Departments final review of the work. In total 4,755 linear feet of sidewalks were reconstructed including 4,375 linear feet of curbing and the reconstruction of 27 catch basins.

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

Brass City Harvest is a relatively new non-profit and provides services to those chronically unemployed. These clients receive a lump sum stipend as a financial incentive to remain engaged in the program. Clients participate in projects that include downtown beautification, creation of community gardens whose produce will be donated to local neighborhood groups, soup kitchens and food pantries, greenhouse/nursery work, and landscaping. Neighborhood youth as well as the kids from the Police Athletic league also work on the community gardens. This site transformed these three formally blighted lots into a neighborhood facility with space for community gatherings.

The contract was executed but had to go out to bid a second time when the contractor was unable to complete the work. A total of $91,992.15 has been expended and the balance of $18,007.85 will be used for additional improvements and includes the retainage.

As noted in last year's CAPER, Brass City Harvest intended on using additional funds remaining from the CDBG allocation improvements to Fulton Street Park, however due to the delay caused by the change in contractor as well as an increase in the cost to complete the greenhouse, the Fulton Park improvements were no longer possible. Brass City Harvest elected to submit an application for the Fulton project in CD Year 36.

The Greater Waterbury YMCA was funded $187,286,000 in CD Year 35 for a Neighborhood Facility project (CT 3501.00). The outside playscape, which is used primarily for YMCA youth programs in addition to neighboring Girls Inc., was in need of replacement. This playscape is also available to the public during non YMCA program hours. The YMCA's architect drew up the plans for the existing playground to be removed and replaced with age appropriate equipment. A new safety, rubber ground surface was also to be installed. The new playground is located in the same area as the current playground.

These specifications were put out to bid through the City's Purchasing Department and awarded to the lowest responsible bidder. The project had just gotten underway

DRAFT

at the close of the program year and is anticipated to be complete by the spring, 2011.

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, with a balance of $10,640.95 from CD Year 34 and the allocation of $30,000 in CD Year 35, was reprogrammed as part of the CD Year 36 Annual Action Plan.

In their review of the City's CD Year 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. As a result, 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 CD Year 35 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, Westside, North End Middle Schools and Kennedy High School: $3,000. 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 23 students benefitted.

Catholic Charities, 56 Church St.:$7,000. Funds were used for salaries, benefits, building facilities and program supplies that provide city-wide case management services for families and children to include food stamps and early childhood workshops. A total of 1,013 people benefitted.

Connecticut Legal Services, 62 Washington St. 4th floor, Middletown, CT: $15,000. CDBG funds supported salaries for the provision of legal services to low-moderate income residents with attention to fair housing issues. A total of 21 people benefitted.

Family Services of Greater Waterbury, Inc., 34 Murray St.: $13,500. Funds were used to support salary, benefits and building expenses that serve the behavioral health program which provides a wide range of therapeutic interventions related to mental health issues, personal situations, parental situations, substance abuse or family violence. A total of 272 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 1,711 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 were used for administration, staff salaries, insurance and operating costs. A total of 77 people benefitted.

DRAFT

Literacy Volunteers, Silas Bronson Library, 267 Grand St.: $7,500. 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 275 people benefitted.

Mattatuck Historical Society, 144 West Main St.: $5,000. 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 25 people benefitted.

Mattatuck Senior Center, 117 Southmayd Rd.: $9,000. 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 91 people benefitted.

Morris Foundation, 402 East Main St.: $11,000. This program provided outpatient services including assessment and treatment for individuals with substance abuse and mental health disorders. Funds were used for staff salaries. A total of 6,141 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 142 seniors benefitted.

Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury, Inc., 161 North Main Street: $15,000. Services provided included delinquency and foreclosure prevention assistance; first time homebuyer education and financial literacy classes. Funds were used for salaries, utilities and insurance costs. During the program year their offices moved from Prospect Street to North Main Street. A total of 610 people benefitted.

Police Activity League of Waterbury, Inc., 58 Griggs St.:$28,046.60. This program promotes partnerships among City youth, law enforcement and the community through educational, athletic and recreational activities. Funds were used for utilities, payroll and insurance costs. A total of 1,585 youth benefitted.

Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury, Inc., 29 Central Ave.: $12,444. Services provided include counseling, education, advocacy, and referrals to victims and their children of physical or severe psychological abuse. Funds were used for utilities and insurance. A total of 409 persons benefitted.

St. Margaret/ Willow-Plaza NRZ Assoc. Inc., 60 Elmwood Ave.: $15,000. Provided youth after-school programs and senior citizen programs. Funds were used for staff salaries. A total of 312 people benefitted.

Staywell Health Care Inc., 80 Phoenix Ave.: $8,000. Provided high quality dental services to the City's low-moderate income population. Funds were used for staff salaries. A total of 8,240 people benefitted.

Waterbury Day Nursery, 74 Buckingham St.: $5,000. Provided a day care program including nutrition, education and entertainment. Funds were used to pay salaries. A total of 65 children benefitted.

DRAFT

Waterbury Senior Shuttle, WDC, 24 Leavenworth St.: $100,852. City of Waterbury sponsored activity, which provided senior citizens with on-demand response transportation. Funds were used for operating costs of the livery service. A total of 364 seniors benefitted.

Waterbury Youth Service System, 95 North Main St.: $10,000. Provided a truancy prevention program primarily to students in elementary and middle school. Funds were used for salaries. A total of 243 youth benefitted.

Wellpath, 70 Pine St.: $10,000. Provided city-wide counseling for youth, including initial and periodic evaluations, family therapy and psychotherapy crisis intervention. Funds were used for clinical and support staff . A total of 1,558 people benefitted.

WOW-NRZ Association, Inc., 308 Walnut St.: $12,000. Provided 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 309 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 2009-2010 the City received $ 1,048,678.00 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 $ 607,805.84 in carry over HOME funds and $ 31,389.72 in HOME Investment Trust Fund program income during the 2009 – 2010 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. In the area of owner housing, the need for improvement to the quality of the existing affordable housing stock through rehabilitation financing assistance; increased opportunities for very low and low income households to become and remain homeowners through home purchase or rehabilitation financing assistance; and the provision of pre and post-purchase housing counseling and mortgage foreclosure assistance were identified as the top priorities for owner occupied housing. The Year 2 goal for increasing the opportunities for very low and low income households to become and remain homeowners was 0, actual households that received assistance was 0. The subprime lending issue, foreclosure crisis, Waterbury's high unemployment rate, and the economy were large factors in the decision not to put additional monies toward downpayment assistance during Year 2. The balance of ADDI funds were not expended for the same reasons listed above.

Priority Housing Activities
Year 2 Goals & Actual Units Assisted

Priority Need	Year 2 Goal	Actual
HOME		
Production of new rental units	35	17

DRAFT

Rehabilitation of existing units	50	7
Rehabilitation of existing owner units	15	8
Homeownership assistance	0	0

The goal for providing housing/foreclosure counseling was 250 people. The total number of Waterbury residents assisted by Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury, Inc. during the period October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010 was 610. Of this approximately 90%, 549 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 they helped 3 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.

NHSW 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. They are in talks with a local bank interested in partnering with them to handle some of their foreclosed portfolio. They have met with WDC and potential local developers to actively pursue this and to determine the feasibility of such a venture. Their successful completion of the substantial rehabilitation of a three-unit, multi-family house on 1020 West Main Street and its sale to an income eligible homebuyer was further evidence of their commitment to neighborhood revitalization.

In 2009-2010, NHSW re-submitted an application for the construction of six new units in the North End of Waterbury using a lot they own. They increased the number of units from six to ten citing the need for larger bedroom sized units. This is in the same neighborhood where a new pre-k through eighth grade school is scheduled to open in 2012.

Housing Rehabilitation-Engineering is a CDBG-funded activity that provides engineering services for HOME and/or CDBG rehabilitation projects. Such services would include inspection activities, the determination of project eligibility and the review of projects. The balance available is $ 47,150.00. Housing rehabilitation was identified as a high priority in the Consolidated Plan. No funds were expended from this account during 2009 - 2010.

HOME ADDI funds were still available to increase the number of people able to purchase single-family homes through the provision of down-payment assistance.

DRAFT

The balance of ADDI funds is enough to assist two first time homebuyers. Last year's CAPER should have reflected a numeric goal of assisting two first time homebuyers. Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury (NHSW) continues to administer the ADDI Program.

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 2009-2010, 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. In an effort to expend the remaining ADDI funds the WDC will work with NHSW to do more outreach to locate potential qualified first time homebuyers who can benefit from the down payment assistance.

Emergency Relocation Assistance had an allocation for the 2009-2010 program year of $250,000 and a carryover balance of $201,261.94. Program income of $115,175.18 was also added to this line item for a total allocation of $566,437.12. Total expenditures were $131,986. During the program year, a total of $114, 725.94 was reallocated via a substantial amendment which resulted in a remaining balance of $319,725.18.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 26 families were assisted with these funds representing 83 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, 26 households representing 83 people were relocated during the past program year. The clients were relocated for lack of essential services water, heat, fire and electricity. Tenants displaced were either returned to their original unit or another apartment.

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

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

The Consolidated Plan identified employment and job training services as a high priority need with a five year goal of assisting 725 people and a one year goal of helping 145 people. In the 2009-2010 program year, the **Community Based Development Organization (CBDO), In-The-Making** received $30,000 in CDBG funding to empower, educate, train, employ, service and advocate for the low-income community of the Waterbury. The agency works in conjunction with area businesses to provide job training and hands-on job skills to women for employment. In-The-Making served 85 clients in the past program year. HUD funds invested in In-The-Making leverages $173,380 in other public and private funds. During the

DRAFT

program year, they expended a total of $19,643 and in the spring of 2010, gave up their independence and became an organization affiliated with New Opportunities. They did not provide the City with advance notice that they were dissolving their corporation. The balance of $10,357 will be reprogrammed as part of the upcoming CD Year 37 Annual Action Plan process.

WDC staff have also partnered in matching local residents to job opportunities provided under the City's "Good Jobs Ordinance," and ordinance which sets a 25% target on publicly-funded construction projects for the hiring of local residents. WDC is presently working to achieve that target in the construction of three new City schools. The City is currently reviewing its existing procurement ordinance and will amend it to include the Good Jobs Ordinance and its Section 3 Policy. It is anticipated that this review will be completed by Spring 2011.

As previously reported in last year's CAPER, the City also received $608,548 in CDBG-R funds under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Awards were made to two Waterbury companies both of which will create needed employment opportunities for low and moderate income residents of the City. Volubilis Food Inc located at 407 Brookside Road (CT 3522.00-1) predicts they will create 15 full time jobs over the first two years with good faith efforts to create another 10 over the following three years as a result of receiving $200,000 for their olive production and bottling line. Many of the employees will be women, as the stuffing of olives is a delicate operation and requires the employee to have small hands/fingers with a degree of manual dexterity. The jobs require no specialized education or training. During the program year, the project was bid and awarded to a company in Indiana. The customized equipment is currently being manufactured and is expected to be completed and installed by January 2011. The second project is the rebuilding of a supermarket by JD 91 Cooke LLC at 91 Cooke Street in ordered to replace one that was destroyed by fire. With a grant of $350,000 for equipment and fixtures, the company has estimated they will create 25 full time and 17 part time jobs in this low and moderate income community. The store will be located in the northeast corner of Census Tract 3501.00-4 and is surrounded by several low and moderate income neighborhoods. The store will primarily serve the residents of these neighborhoods all of which are low to moderate income. The jobs require no specialized education and training and the owner has estimated that most will be filled by neighborhood residents who can walk or bus to the site. The project was put out to bid in the fall and no bids were received. The company developed specs for new equipment and it is anticipated to be bid in December, 2010. The supermarket is estimated to open in early 2011.

The City received a direct allocation of Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) funds from the State Department of Economic and Community Development. The City structured its program to provide Acquisition/Rehabilitation grants for the purchase of foreclosed homes by low, moderate and middle income persons. The NSP is focused on 3 tier one neighborhoods while still allowing the flexibility of additional streets throughout the City that qualified using multiple data sets. The 3 tier one neighborhoods were chosen by such factors as being listed as local target neighborhoods in the 5 year plan, neighborhoods with new schools being built and neighborhoods where recent City and State investments had recently been made. The tier one neighborhoods are Brooklyn (CT 3517.00-2), North End ((CT 3502.00-1,2,3,4),(CT 3503.00-1,2,3)) and Willow-Plaza/Hillside CT 3501.00-3,4),(CT 3508.00-1,2,3,4)).

DRAFT

The NSP funds are fully committed having provided for the Acquisition/Rehabilitation of 31 housing units. These units have been or 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 completed or currently underway, the current values of the properties and the anticipated increased values once the rehabilitation work is completed.

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
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
Rita Ritucci	129 Longmeadow	1	88,000.00	130,000.00
Krista Marucci	574 Frost Rd	1	70,000.00	150,000.00
Rosa Munoz	41 Valentino Dr	1	72,000.00	149,000.00
Tina Colangelo	29 Robert St	1	140,000.00	185,000.00

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	250,000.00	250,000.00	35,000.00	285,000.00
John Salvatore	135 Congress	Brooklyn	0	300,000.00	300,000.00	42,000.00	342,000.00
Primo Enterprises	1657 South Main St	South End	0	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	300,000.00	300,000.00	37,000.00	337,000.00
David Pires	750 Baldwin St	South End	0	195,000.00	195,000.00	27,720.00	222,720.00

DRAFT

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	169,937.00	198,000.00	55,800.00	253,800.00
Rita Ritucci	129 Longmeadow	South End	38,300.00	130,000.00	168,300.00	54,900.00	223,200.00
Krista Marucci	574 Frost Rd	Fairlawn	25,720.00	136,280.00	162,000.00	41,757.00	203,757.00
Rosa Munoz	41 Valentino Dr	Bucks Hill	33,000.00	139,000.00	172,000.00	36,750.00	208,750.00
Tina Colangelo	29 Robert St	Overlook	52,500.00	197,500.00	250,000.00	79,000.00	329,000.00

The City of Waterbury has been granted a direct allocation of $1,036,101.00 of NSP3 funds to continue NSP eligible activities. The local NSP3 will be formulated based on the upcoming Federal regulations to best stabilize the housing market in Waterbury. It is anticipated that no more than two neighborhoods will be selected in order to maximize the program's impacts.

Goal # 4 Projects That Leverage Funds
As can be seen from the list below most, if not all of the projects selected for funding in CD Year 35 had additional funds for the project through other sources.

Leveraging of HUD Funds

CDBG

Demolition
Funds Expended: $ 218,122.76
Funds Leveraged: $ 135,805.80

Fire Station Improvements
Funds Expended: $ 5,120
Funds Leveraged: $ 0

Community Based Development Organization (CBDO)
Funds Expended: $ 19,643
Funds Leveraged: $ 173,380.57

Neighborhood Sidewalks
Funds Expended: $ 385,028.12
Funds Leveraged: $ 0

Emergency Relocation
Funds Expended: $ 131,986
Funds Leveraged: $ 0

Commercial Rehabilitation: Neighborhood Façade Program in Downtown
Funds Expended: $ 166,092
Funds Leveraged: $ 34,181.48

Neighborhood Park Improvements
Funds Expended: $ 468,575.10
Funds Leveraged: $ 0

DRAFT

Public Facility Improvements: Neighborhood Community Gardens
Funds Expended: $ 91,992.15
Leveraged Funds: $ 90,290

Public Services:

Aspira of CT
Funds Expended: $3,000
Funds Leveraged: $29,900

Catholic Charities
Funds Expended: $7,000
Funds Leveraged: $119,037

Connecticut Legal Services
Funds Expended: $15,000
Funds Leveraged: $50,510

Family Services of Greater Waterbury Inc.
Funds Expended: $15,876
Funds Leveraged: $827,268

Greater Waterbury Interfaith Ministries
Funds Expended: $25,000
Funds Leveraged: $237,024

La Casa Bienvenida
Funds Expended: $15,000
Funds Leveraged: $53,477

Literacy Volunteers
Funds Expended: $7,500
Funds Leveraged: $133,364

Mattatuck Historical Society After-School Program
Funds Expended: $5,000
Funds Leveraged: $12,000

Mattatuck Senior Center
Funds Expended: $8,942.44
Funds Leveraged: $29,520

Morris Foundation (CDBG)
Funds Expended: $11,000
Funds Leveraged: $2,346,351

Mt. Olive Senior Center
Funds Expended: $14,343.50
Funds Leveraged: $23,388.80

NHS of Waterbury, Inc
Funds Expended: $15,000
Funds Leveraged: $256,978

DRAFT

Police Activity League of Waterbury
Funds Expended: $28,046.60
Funds Leveraged: $1,044,149

Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury
Funds Expended: $12,444
Funds Leveraged: $448,500

St. Margaret/Willow Plaza NRZ Assoc.
Funds Expended: $15,000
Funds Leveraged: $38,600

Staywell Health Care
Funds Expended: $8,000
Funds Leveraged: $66,900

Waterbury Day Nursery
Funds Expended: $5,000
Funds Leveraged: $649,000

Waterbury Senior Shuttle
Funds Expended: $121,677.50
Funds Leveraged: $29,940.65

Waterbury Youth Services
Funds Expended: $10,000
Funds Leveraged: $72,711

Wellpath, Inc.
Funds Expended: $10,000
Funds Leveraged: $1,803,973

WOW-NRZ Association, inc. Community Learning Center
Funds Expended: $41,810.32
Funds Leveraged: $19,370.64

Total Public Service Funds Expended: $394,640.36
Total non-CDBG Funds Leveraged: $8,054,938.09

ESG Funds

Morris Foundation
Funds Expended: $11,249
Funds Leveraged: $950,939

Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury
Funds Expended: $16,250
Funds Leveraged: $281,000

Salvation Army
Funds Expended: $11,750
Fund Leveraged: $ 315,421

DRAFT

St. Vincent DePaul Society
Funds Expended: $75,570
Funds Leveraged: $787,330

Total ESG funds Expended: $114,819
Total non-ESG funds Leveraged: $ 2,334,690

HOME Funds

Total HOME funds Expended: $ 639,195.56
Total non-HOME Funds Leveraged: $ 329,650.00

5c. Required Matches
The Morris Foundation allocation was matched and leveraged with other federal funds of $64,885, local government funds of $533,572, and private funds of $20,134 and $332,348 in fees.

The Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury allocation was matched and leveraged with $29,000 in other federal funds, local government funds of $152,000, $13,000 of private donations $87,000 of other donations and fees.

The St. Vincent DePaul allocation was matched and leveraged with other federal funds of $26,094, local government funds of $438,228, and private and other funds of $323,008.

The Salvation Army allocation was matched and leveraged with other federal funds of $21,617, $288,804 in local government funds, and $5,000 in private funds.

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

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

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

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. In addition to the

DRAFT

three sites mentioned in last year's CAPER - 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 – two new projects were approved and started during CD Year 35 – The Enlightenment School and The Waterbury Career Academy.

Originally an all-girls Catholic school, the Enlightenment School is an alternative learning program for Waterbury's middle and high school aged students with behavioral and truancy problems. The extent of the $13.5 million, 40,000 square foot renovate-as-new project includes bringing all systems to a 20-year life span will include classrooms, kitchen/cafeteria, gymnasium, offices and support spaces. The city began the abatement and demolition for the new gym in an unused portion of the school in January 2010. The renovation of the existing sections began in the summer of 2010 and will resume in the summer of 2011. The project is anticipated to be complete when the school year begins in September 2011.

The second project approved during CD Year 35 is the construction of a new Waterbury Career Academy school in the North End section of the city. Currently the project is in the early stage of acquiring the 22 properties needed to make way for a 550-student school. Demolition work on the $48 million project will begin late this fall and the school is slated to open in September 2013.

The Duggan School renovation/expansion project which was scheduled to be complete by the fall of 2011 ran into problems when the contractors working on-site found it to be in far worse shape than originally anticipated by consultants hired to help school officials craft their building projects. The resulting budget overrun is projected to be close to $6.5 million. The revised completion date is scheduled for fall of 2012.

The Gilmartin School Project was completed and opened in September 2010. The state of the art school for the children in the Gilmartin neighborhood will soon begin additional improvements. The city recently approved a proposal to install energy-saving electrical features to the project including daylight harvesting, occupancy sensors and lighting design using less than one kilowatt per square foot. The solar panels will reduce the yearly power consumption by roughly 15%. The project is still in the early stages and more information will be available once the supply of solar panels becomes available.

The target approach of CDBG funds for sidewalk reconstruction in the area surrounding the Gilmartin School and in the Brooklyn neighborhood has been met with unanimous approval of the residents. The projects will lead to the replacement / repair of existing sidewalks, curbing and crosswalks leading to the school site.

The Robinson/North Main Street School mentioned in last year's CAPER will be named Jonathan E. Reed Elementary School, after the late Rev. Reed, has completed the Phase III environmental assessments and began demolition of existing structures in September 2010. The construction and remediation work went out to bid in late November with a target start date of February 2011 for construction. The anticipated date for the School opening remains to be September of 2012.

The CAC continues targeting projects around the new schools and exploring additional housing and non-housing community development needs with future allocations of CDBG and HOME funds.

DRAFT

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

During the 2009-2010 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. As previously reported the number of on-site monitoring visits was decreased from one to two visits. More follow up technical assistance was provided to those social service agencies that required additional help in getting their reporting correct and submitted on time. Technical assistance was also provided on payment and voucher requests in order to ensure that the proper supporting documentation was submitted.

As a result of HUD's suggestion, two additional staff positions were created and funded: Community Development Program Specialist and Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist. These positions have added professional capacity to the organization.

As a result of the citizen participation process for the CD Year 36 Annual Action Plan, the applications will be consolidated into one form for the City agencies, public services and non-City agencies. This will be completed and used for the upcoming CD Year 37 planning process. In addition, the WDC will create an on-line request form so that interested parties can submit their contact information and receive the latest information on the program.

The WDC staff have begun meeting on a more regular basis with the City departments, namely the Fire Department and the Public Works Department in order to monitor the progress on their projects. Given the complexity of the Fire Department projects and the historic nature of several of the stations, it became apparent that the services of an architect were required. The securing of these services should have been factored into the timeline previously given.

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

DRAFT

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 13.9 percent as opposed to 13.5 percent the same time last year.

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

DRAFT

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 natures of the fair housing complaints received on an annual basis and prepare summary reports. 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

- Maintained a relationship with Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities
- Maintained a Fair Housing file with activities/promotions/complaints
- Fair Housing posters placed throughout WDC office
- Took out two Fair Housing Billboards in English and Spanish on heavily traveled roads throughout the city
- Had the Waterbury Board of Alderman approve a resolution proclaiming April 2010 as Fair Housing month in the City of Waterbury. Fair Housing Month is a time to celebrate the progress made in opening the doors of housing opportunity to every citizen of this nation regardless of race, gender, color, national origin, religion, familial status or disability and to acknowledge the fair housing challenges that still remain, and to collectively commit to finding viable solutions to those challenges
- Utilized Spanish translator when needed
- Attended The Fair Housing Association of Connecticut monthly meetings
- Maintained a Fair Housing Section to the WDC website with a link to a Public service announcement

DRAFT

- Attended HUD training Cross Cutting Federal Requirements which focused on Fair Housing and Acquisition and Relocation at the Hartford Field Office
- Attended Training for Protecting the Housing rights of persons with Disabilities put on by Ct. Legal Project Inc. The topics covered were: Eviction process, Security deposits, Landlord tenant relationship, Housing discrimination and Reasonable accommodations
- Provided Fair Housing and Emergency Relocation training to The Department of Children and families
- Spoke at The Connecticut Association of Housing Code enforcement officials on Illegal Dwelling Units
- Spoke at the Connecticut Coalition for Urban Revitalization Waterbury Housing forum sponsored by The Greater Waterbury Board of Realtors
- Continue to meet on a weekly basis with neighborhood group about housing and quality of life concerns
- Attended The Greater Waterbury Board of Realtors Public Symposium on Housing Solutions and sat in on a foreclosure, short sales & remediation class

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

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

- Met and spoke with the Greater Waterbury Board of Realtors and spoke about Fair Housing and let them know that our office is available for questions and concerns.
- 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
- Monitored Housing Authority ads in the newspaper

d. Recommendation: Monitor Fair Housing Complaints

Action Taken: Appointment of a Fair Housing Officer

- Monitored The Waterbury Republican-American newspaper apartments for rent/sale on a weekly basis
- Provided listing of affordable housing units to Emergency Relocation tenants.
- Successfully relocated Eighty Three tenants representing Twenty Six households to decent, safe and affordable units
- 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 10 cases per week are heard/resolved
- Continued to educate landlords on Fair Housing laws
- Provided a pamphlet to tenants "Is your landlord going through a foreclosure" What a tenant needs to know, published by Connecticut Legal Services.
- Responded to an average of three fair housing complaints a week. Answering typical questions and concerns such as how a tenant can

DRAFT

get their security deposit returned or how a one can access The State of Connecticut Security Deposit program
- Referred unemployed to Workforce Connection
- Continued to make referrals to Connecticut Legal Services
- Monitor and maintain citywide list of foreclosures
- Established a working relationship with the State of Connecticut's Secretary of States office to assist in getting owner information on Limited Liability Corporation owned properties
- Met and established a contact with the State of Connecticut's Banking Commissioners' office to assist in banks on the properties they own
- Maintain a list of vacant properties pursuant to Connecticut Public Act 09-144 in which the foreclosing entity must name a local property maintenance/management company
- Maintain contact information for Banks
- Established a point of Contact with Fannie Mae.
- Provided insight and recommendation to the City of Waterbury's School Building Project in which the City acquired several occupied buildings
- Continue to monitor the State of Connecticut Judicial website for foreclosures

2. Public/Private Partnership Step Recommendations
a. Recommendation: Joint Review of Housing Programs and Regulatory Environment

Action Taken: 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 recession and meet their basic needs. Through the project, housing services will be provided to those families and individuals renting apartments in buildings that are being foreclosed. Additional services other than the "core" service areas including special education, disability, and elderly services will be provided.

b. Recommendation: Impact of Foreclosures on Housing Choice

Action Taken: Neighborhood Stabilization Program

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

DRAFT

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.

DRAFT

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 more than 40 million dollars of the City's annual budget is devoted to funding the City's Pension Fund. During this CAPER period, the City contributed $44.5 million to the Pension Trust. The sale of Pension Obligation Bonds in the amount of $350 million is estimated to generate a budgetary saving to the City over the next thirty years.

The City has balanced its budget for nine 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. The renovation of its historic City Hall through local bonding will be completed in December 2010. 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. Park renovations are being addressed primarily through state and Federal grants.

During this program year, the City continued its commitment to the Loyola Development Corporation, supplementing their previous budget allocations with the award of the Economic Development Initiative Grant of $487,000. In addition, the City is utilizing some of its Neighborhood Initiative funds to conduct environmental assessments on sites requested by Loyola. 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. The City has also partnered with COC and was actively involved in preparing a Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness. The United Way took the leadership role with the project and the City served an important supporting role. Part of the support included the funding of a new position at the WDC, that of Housing and Community Planning Director which was filled in early September 2009.

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. Working with the Community Foundation, several senior strategies roundtables were held to determine which programs should be funded.

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

The City, acting by and through the WDC, is in the final stages of a feasibility study for the Waterbury Naugatuck River Greenway funded through the United Way of

DRAFT

Greater Waterbury. This study is being conducted by ALTA Planning and Design and is estimated to be completed by early 2010. Once the feasibility study is finalized, WDC will start the selection process for design firms. This linear park/greenway will serve a variety of needs including but not limited to economic development, public recreation and alternative transportation. The City has secured four million dollars through the Department of Transportation and an additional nine hundred seventy four thousand dollars through the Consolidated Appropriations Act for the first phase of greenway construction. Land has generously been donated to the city towards the Greenway project and the city has already taken an active role in speaking with stake holders in regards to the future of the Waterbury Naugatuck River Greenway Project.

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 is 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 $64,885, local government funds of $533,572, and private funds of $20,134 and $332,348 in fees.

DRAFT

The Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury allocation was matched and leveraged with $29,000 in other federal funds, local government funds of $152,000, $13,000 of private donations $87,000 of other donations and fees.

The St. Vincent DePaul allocation was matched and leveraged with other federal funds of $26,094, local government funds of $438,228, and private and other funds of $323,008.

The Salvation Army allocation was matched and leveraged with other federal funds of $21,617, $288,804 in local government funds, $5,000 in private 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 2 CAPER Managing the Process response:
For fiscal year 2009-2010, all HUD regulations were followed to ensure that each activity that was funded had the potential to be completed. The 2009-2010 Annual Action Plan was the second Plan in the City's new Five Year Consolidated Plan (2008-2013). The process was the third one conducted by the Citizens Advisory Committee which was appointed in 2007 following the adoption of the City's Citizen Participation Plan (CPP). The majority of the Committee's members represent low-moderate income neighborhoods, while comprising membership also from social service agencies, business, the Office of the Mayor, the Board of Aldermen, the City Planning Commission and the Waterbury Housing Authority

The following outlines public input and review opportunities provided as part of the CPP:
Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for CDBG/ESG/HOME Funding Issued 3/11/09
Public Hearing No. 1 Needs Assessment for Annual Plans before CAC 4/2/09
Applications Available for CDBG/ESG 3/17/09
CAC Monthly Meeting 3/19/09
Technical Assistance Workshop: Application Preparation 3/24/09
Technical Assistance: Application Preparation 3/31/09
Application Submission Deadline 4/07/09
Application Review and Evaluation Period by CAC 4/16/09 – 4/28/09
CAC Monthly Meeting: First Review and Evaluation of Applications 4/16/09
CAC Meeting: Review and Evaluation of Applications 4/22/09
CAC Meeting: Review and Evaluation of Applications 4/23/09
CAC Meeting: Vote to Approve Annual Funding Allocations 4/28/09
Public Commentary Period for Annual Plan 5/19/09 – 6/17/09
Public Hearing No. 2: Public Hearing on Proposed Annual Plan 6/2/09
CAC Meeting to Vote for Recommendation of Annual Plan 6/18/09
Board of Aldermen Meeting/Vote to Adopt Annual Plan 6/22/09
Annual Action Plan Due at HUD 8/14/09
Mandatory Orientation and Technical Assistance for CDBG/ESG Awardees 8/25/09

DRAFT

The 2009-2010 program year commenced on October 1, 2009. The WDC had held a technical assistance meeting at the end of August 2009 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 2 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

DRAFT

indicator that no comments were submitted. The hard copy of the CAPER that was provided to the public included the CAPER narrative, CPMP Project Sheets, 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 CPMP Project Sheets, 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 December 2, 2010. The public was invited to comment for 15-day period that started December 3, 2010 at 8:00 a.m. and concluded December 17, 2010 at 5:00 p.m. The public was informed that all comments would be incorporated into the CAPER. The following is the text of the notice published in the Republican-American:

NOTICE TO PUBLIC
CITY OF WATERBURY
CONSOLIDATED ANNUAL PERFORMANCE & EVALUATION REPORT (CAPER)
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT YEAR 35 2009-2010

The Waterbury Development Corporation (WDC), on behalf of the City of Waterbury, has completed the CD Year 35 2009-2010 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, 2010 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 comments will be considered until 5:00 p.m. on December 17, 2010. The CAPER will be submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on or about December 22, 2010, the actual deadline to HUD is December 29, 2010. Citizens should contact:

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

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

Institutional Structure

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

DRAFT

Program Year 2 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 the 2008 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 now held by Diane C. Toolan. Following the hiring of Ms. Toolan in August of 2009, WDC evaluated its staffing levels and set out to hire two additional staff members: Community Development Program Specialist and a Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist. These positions were filled in January 2010.

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

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

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

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

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

DRAFT

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 process. 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 2010 in accordance to a schedule which 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 years, 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 considered high risk. Desk monitoring consisted of an in-house review of each subrecipient's file, including the application and contract, the completion of required reporting, the timeliness and quality of reporting and the submission of vouchers/bills for eligible activities. Desk reviews were performed in January- February 2010 and a copy was sent to all subrecipients.

The on-site visits occurred in February–April of 2010. The subrecipients received an advance checklist of what would be covered at each on-site visit. 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. Desk review performance was discussed at the on-site interviews. A formal letter was sent to each subrecipient within 30 days of the visit detailing any findings or concerns. The on-site visit was generally an opportunity to review any programs if they were in session such as the food pantry at GWIM, and have a personal question and answer session with technical assistance as to financials, reporting etc.

DRAFT

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 also monitored City–based projects. WDC staff used City procurement for bidding. City procurement encompassed City procurement regulations and WDC staff ensured that HUD bidding regulations were followed. WDC staff prepared contracts, guided contracts through the WDC Board of Directors 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. WDC's Construction Specialists monitored the rehabilitation/construction of projects by conducting onsite inspections. Payments were only processed after an inspection was conducted at the project site with the Construction Specialist, homeowner and contractor. Permits, certificates of approval, and certificates of occupancy are obtained when required by the City Building Department. The homeowner, contactor Construction Specialist and HOME Manager were required to sign off on a payment request before being processed. HOME funded rental properties require that income and rents be monitored on an annual basis and Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspections for rental projects on a schedule according to the number of units in a project. Projects consisting of 1 – 4 units must be monitored every 3 years, 5 – 25 units every two years and projects consisting of 26 or more units every year. Most of the rental projects being monitored are smaller; therefore yearly HQS inspections on some of the properties were not required. Although there were rental properties requiring an on-site inspection this year, only one was performed due to difficulties in procuring a Housing Quality Standards Inspector. Monitoring of income and rents began at the end of CD Year 35 and will continue through the beginning of CD Year 36. Owners were provided with the income and rent limits, utility allowance charts and lease requirements. Rental property owners were required to fill out and submit the HOME Rental Project Compliance Report (Form 6-D). HQS monitoring will be conducted on properties due to be inspected in 2011. A monitoring of tenant files will be conducted in the beginning of 2011. This monitoring will include the review of tenant's source documentation and leases.

As a result of the on-going monitoring requirements, WDC filled the newly created position of Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist in early in 2010. This position is responsible for implementing an effective monitoring and performance system that includes internal audit monitoring, project implementation monitoring, program monitoring and long-term monitoring in order to ensure City compliance with all federally funded programs received by the City and administered by WDC. The position also provides the Neighborhood Reinvestment Group Unit with administrative support.

2. Describe the results of your monitoring including any improvements.
One result of the monitoring resulted in changes to the quarterly forms to clarify the information requested and to avoid duplication of numbers. Another result is the building of positive relationships with the subrecipients. Many of the programs that

DRAFT

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 the programs might be experiencing in the present or will be experiencing in the future, and get to know new staff.

After encountering problems on a couple of HOME and NSP projects, the WDC found it necessary to increase the level of detail for on-site project inspections and bid forms. The increased documentation of inspections will provide more detail making it easier to recall the issues of a project if a problem were to arise. The HOME Manager worked with WDC's two Construction Specialists to improve and stream line WDC's Standards of Rehabilitation and Materials, scope of work/estimates, specifications and bid forms for its HUD funded projects. These bid documents will provide more detail on unit costs making it easier to add and remove items from a bid if necessary and cost analysis.

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

Program Year 2 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. Lead, Code and energy items continue to be priorities in our HOME funded projects. All of the rehabilitation projects completed this year have produced more energy efficient units making them more affordable for both homeowners and tenants. HOME funds have continued to create more lead-safe units in a city abundant with an older housing stock that contains lead hazards. Without these improvements the occupants of these properties might still be living in substandard housing. Of the projects completed this year, one provides housing to homeless individuals who have mental health and or substance abuse issues. These units will provide a safe, supportive environment to ten individuals. Another project created seven new units of townhouse style apartments providing housing to very, very low income (0 – 30%) households. The

DRAFT

redesign of the HOME Program, the implementation of two CDBG funded residential rehabilitation programs for owner occupied properties along with the targeting of other CDBG funds will allow the City ot address housing and neighborhood problems more strategically.

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

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

The City believes that HOME funds have greatly helped Waterbury make significant progress towards its objective of rehabilitating existing, older housing stock throughout disinvested neighborhoods, thus offering low-moderate income citizens safe, well-maintained and affordable choices in housing, whether rental, or owner-occupied. The projects chosen for HOME funding have been in keeping with the priorities of local residents and neighborhood associations, as well as those of our Consolidated Plan, which call for investing in pre-existing, older housing stock. The continuation of the ADDI program gives low income individuals and families the opportunity to own their own home. [RCL1]

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

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

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, the allocation of $200,000 in May 2009 for the Loyola Development Corporation

DRAFT

resulted in the hiring of an executive director who is focused on moving the South End neighborhood revitalization efforts to implementation. City leaders continue to realize 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.

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 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.

The projects completed during the 2009-2010 year, met the City's objectives 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 project of 7 townhouse style apartments. 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.

HOME also created more energy efficient units that helped lower utility bills for both homeowners and renters. HOME funds have also created 25 lead-safe units in a city with housing stock consisting of a large number of units built before 1978. Lead and code issues continue to be 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[TL2].

HOME dollars funded the rehabilitation of 8 owner occupied units, 17 rental units and the new construction of 7 rental units. Of the rental units assisted, 17 are occupied by tenants falling in the 0 – 30% of median family income (MFI) category, 1 by a tenant in the 30% - 50% MFI category and 6 are currently vacant but expected to be

DRAFT

rented soon. Of the owner occupied units assisted, 3 fell in the 0 – 30% of MFI category and 5 in the 60 – 80 % of MFI category.

In addition to the smaller rehabilitations completed during the 2009 – 2010 program year, there are two larger projects deserving further mention. One of the investor rehabilitation projects put 10 affordable units back on the market, making them available to homeless individuals with mental and or substance abuse problems. All of these tenants are very, very low income (0-30%) of MFI. The owner has partnered with the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services who provides supportive services along with a local non-profit Brass City Harvest.

Another investor project created 7 new town house style units consisting of 2 one bedroom units, 2 two bedroom units and 3 three bedroom units for low income residents. This project currently provides 7 households who are very, very low income (30% of Median Income) housing. [RCL3]

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

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.

For the HOME Program, there are 6 projects that have fallen behind schedule due to the City process and one due to a contractor issue. The Grace Development Corporation of Waterbury, Inc.'s development of 41 new housing units for the elderly fell behind due to State budgeting issues. Grace recognized the need to seek other funding as it became more apparent they would not have access to the full funding originally available to them from the State. In an effort to save the project Grace Development applied for and was successful in obtaining very limited and highly competitive Section 202 monies giving them the additional funds necessary to complete the project. Construction is expected to being in 2011. This project will help address the need for affordable housing for the elderly. [TL4]

DRAFT

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

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

The HOME Manger has been working with Community Housing Development Organizaitons (CHDOs) on the development of projects located in targeted neighborhoods which would address the housing needs of those areas. The HOME Manager has also been working on increasing the number of CHDOs by reaching out to local non-profits who have had success in housing projects and or have been CHDOs in the past. Increasing the number of CHDOs will help the City better address its housing needs and goals. [TL5]

The WDC continues working with Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury (NHSW) on the development of housing projects that will address the needs of the City and help make a bigger impact by focusing on target areas and needs. It is a great provider of a variety of homeowner, landlord and mortgage foreclosure counseling services. This year NHSW was successful in the rehabilitation and sale of a three-family home using State HOME funds. The home was sold to a first time homebuyer who successfully completed both NHSW's homebuyer and landlord classes. NHSW is also working on the new construction of 10 units of affordable town house style apartments in the North End Neighborhood, one of the City's targeted areas. This development will compliment the efforts already being made in the North End with the construction of a new school and the continued growth of the Police Athletic League (PAL).

This year Loyola Development Corporation (LDC) was certified as a CHDO by both the City and State. LDC continues to focus its efforts in the South End Neighborhood, another targeted area. This year LDC will be receiving CHDO technical assistance offered by HUD through Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC). This assistance will provide LDC with a consultant to help with real estate development and structuring partnerships with other nonprofits and for profit developers. The LDC will also be receiving an Economic Development Initiative Grant of $ 487,000 through the City. The City will continue to work with LDC on the development of affordable housing in the South End Neighborhood[TL6].

Grace Development continues to work on the new construction of 41 elderly apartments. Last year the project was put on hold due to State budgeting issues. As previously stated, Grace Development recognized the need to seek other funding as it became more apparent they would not have access to the full funding originally available to them from the State. In an effort to save the project Grace Development applied for and was successful in obtaining very limited and highly competitive Section 202 monies giving them the additional funds necessary to complete the project. Construction is expected to being in 2011. This project will help address the need for affordable housing for the elderly.

New Opportunities, Inc. has submitted an application to become a CHDO which is currently under review. New Opportunities has a strong presence in the community and successfully runs several programs throughout the State.

DRAFT

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. Another indicator of HOME success is the continued high public interest in the program and the number of individuals renting an assisted unit with income and rent restrictions which allow them a safe, decent place to live. [TL7]

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

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

Barriers that have had a negative impact on fulfilling the overall vision are several. The major barrier is financial. The City's road to full financial recovery is long, although significant achievements have been made in a steady and measurable fashion in the past nine years. The City's bond rating has improved over the past few years and recently was upgraded again, which bodes well for the future. However, the City is required by local law to make an annual contribution of over 40 million dollars each year to the City's pension fund. It has done do so for the past eight years and has been able to do so without a significant increase in local taxes, once property reevaluation was implemented. Were this contribution available to meet community development and housing needs, the task of accomplishing identified objectives and goals would be significantly easier. Given the continued fragile state of the economy and the projected widening gap between city revenue and spending, it appears that both property taxes will need to increase and spending decrease in order to balance the budget.

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

A barrier that every community is experiencing is the distressed economy and the deepening trough of the worst recession since the Great Depression. Waterbury

DRAFT

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

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

Major CDBG/ESG /HOME goals are on target. Most importantly, the City met and exceeded the 1.5 performance ratio during CD Year 35 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 originally allocated to Family Services of Waterbury Inc. in CD Year 34 was done in April 2010 and the funds were given to the four remaining eligible ESG subgrantees.

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

During the Consolidated Planning process the need to created targeted neighborhoods was addressed. The North End, South End and Brooklyn neighborhoods were all targeted in the Con Plan. Targeting funds will help the City make a bigger impact on neighborhoods by concentrating its efforts. As a result of technical assistance received through HUD by Rocky Wade of Training Development Associates, Inc. and Dionne Roberts of Porchlight Consulting we are restructuring the HOME Program. The Redesign of the program from smaller investor and owner occupied projects to investor projects with the concentration on larger projects, will allow the City better meet its housing needs and make a bigger impact by targeting funds. During the CD Year 36 funding process, the creation of a residential rehabilitation program funded by CDBG was approved. This will allow the City to continue to meet the housing needs of its owner occupied properties and allow the City to focus on larger projects with HOME funds. The allocation of CDBG monies in the amount of $ 250,000.00 was will fund two residential rehabilitation programs. One program will provide owner occupied properties consisting of 1 – 4 units in targeted neighborhoods the opportunity to rehabilitate their homes. The second program will provide the elderly and disabled homeowners of 1 – 4 unit properties throughout the City the opportunity to rehabilitate their homes.

As mentioned in 3e, the HOME Manager has been working with Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs) on development projects located in target areas which will help the City better address its housing needs and use its HOME funds in a more strategically. The HOME Manager has also been working on increasing the number of CHDOs by reaching out to local non-profits who have had success in housing projects and or have been CHDOs in the past. Increasing the number of CHDOs will help the City better address its housing needs.

Lead-based Paint

DRAFT

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Lead-based Paint response:
The Preventive Health and Health Services (PHHS) Block Grant continued to fund the City's Childhood Lead Poisoning Surveillance Program (CLPPP). This City's CLPPP provided prevention, health education, screening and case management services to the children of Waterbury. This coordinated and comprehensive child and environmental case management program reduced the risk of lead poisoning to the children throughout the City, ages 6 months through 6 years of age. These services included lead poisoning education, outreach, tracking all blood lead levels (BLL), follow up to providers and parents when BLL are overdue, epidemiological and environmental investigation when interventions do not reduce BLL and relocation of child and family when medically necessary. The HOME program requires lead hazards to be addressed in projects disturbing a painted surface in a property built prior to 1978.

Case management included:

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

(Lead Inspector):

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

PLANNED REVISIONS, ADDITIONS IN SERVICES:

Lead Hazard Control Program funded by HUD:
Waterbury 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.

DRAFT

Currently, W.E.L.H. has completed 345 units that received lead hazard reduction. In addition, 70 units are currently under construction and should be cleared by February 2011. 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.

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

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

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

LIST OF OTHER PROGRAMS RUN BY APPLICANT SERVING THIS POPULATION:
The City of Waterbury, Department of Public Health provided the following to children:

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

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

Target Population:
The target population included all children between the ages of 6 months-6 years residing in the City. According to the Childhood Lead Poisoning in Connecticut, CY

DRAFT

2004 Surveillance Report, by the CT DPH, 9785 children reside in the City of Waterbury. Currently there is no documented breakdown for this population by race, age, or sex.

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

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

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

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

DRAFT

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.)

In September 2010, the head of Waterbury Eliminates Lead Hazards (WELH), the city's lead abatement program was put on paid administrative leave pending the outcome of a city investigation into the awarding of abatement contracts. The program's construction manager was also placed on paid leave the same week. Both were later released from their positions.

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.

DRAFT

Upon completion of this class, participants are eligible to apply to the State of Connecticut for their license.

The HOME program continues to make properties built prior to 1978 lead safe, as it is a requirement of HOME, this year the HOME program has made 25 units lead safe.

HOUSING

Housing Needs

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

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Housing Needs response:
During the 2009-2010 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 610; of which 90%, 549 were seeking foreclosure intervention assistance. NHS also partnered with WDC to provide first time homebuyer education to 23 participants in the NSP Program. They also helped 3 Waterbury households receive SMARTMOVE/Workforce Housing down payment assistance.

Specific Housing Objectives

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

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

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

Program Year 2 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 2009-2010, 17 rental units assisted under HOME are occupied by extremely low-income (0-30% of median) households and one unit by very low income (30 – 50% of median income) household. Six rental units are currently vacant but are expected to be rented soon. Of the owner occupied units assisted, 3 households fell in the 0 - 30% range and five in the 60 -80% range of median income.

DRAFT

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 28 new individuals and families, many of whom also suffer from a variety of physical and mental ailments. Local public service organizations and social workers from the state Department of Mental Health and Addiction continue to access a variety of state, federal and private funds in order to assist them and find them permanent housing.

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

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

Public Housing Strategy

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Public Housing Strategy response:

In the last year, the Waterbury Housing Authority (WHA) has completed The following projects:

Project: Site Improvements at Various Sites (CT6-4) Oak Terrace (CT6-5) Bergin Apartments (CT6-6) Springbrook Apts. (CT6-7) Truman Apts. (CT6-9) South End Adjusted Contract Sum: $242,764.00

DRAFT

Status: Complete
09-ARRA

Project: Bathroom Renovations at Various Sites (CT6-4) Oak Terrace (CT6-5) Pearl Lake Apts. (CT6-6) Springbrook Apts.
Adjusted Contract Sum: $996,177.95
Status: Complete
09-CFP & 09-ARRA

Project: Security Cameras at Various Sites (CT6-1) Berkeley Apts. (CT6-4) Oak Terrace (CT6-6) Springbrook (CT6-7) Truman
Adjusted Contract Sum: $348,293.00
Status: This project is substantially complete with the exception of punch list items.
09-ARRA

Project: Vacancy Rehab at Springbrook (CT6-6)
Adjusted Contract Sum: $12,110.00
Status: Complete
09-ARRA

Project: Renovations and Upgrades at FDR (AMP 4) Franklin D. Roosevelt Apts.
Adjusted Contract Sum: $858,275.25
Status: This project is substantially complete with the exception of punch list items.
09-ARRA

Project: Window and Roof Replacement at Kelly (AMP 5) Fairmount St.
Adjusted Contract Sum: $116,031.62
Status: This project is substantially complete with the exception of punch list items.
09-ARRA

Barriers to Affordable Housing

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Barriers to Affordable Housing response:

NHS of Waterbury – Fiscal year 2009 -2010

NHS of Waterbury (NHSW) had a very productive year in fiscal year 2009-2010. They completed the substantial rehabilitation of a three unit house under the State Surplus Property Program that was sold to a moderate income homebuyer this spring. They are targeting for our community revitalization efforts and have secured over $1 million in funding to build ten units of affordable rental housing on North Main Street using a mix of HOME and HTCC funds through WDC, CHFA and DECD.

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 Mararkesh to provide financial education to Waterbury youth and work

DRAFT

with Waterbury Youth Services to provide hands on homeownership training to NHSW clients.

The total number of Waterbury residents assisted during the period October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010 was 610. Of this approximately 90%, 549 were seeking foreclosure intervention assistance. The remaining clients participated in a combination of pre-purchase counseling and education, homeownership and financial education. NHSW continues to provide down payment assistance through several programs targeting Waterbury area residents. During the last year NHS helped 3 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 2 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. In the area of owner housing, improvement to the quality of the existing affordable housing stock through rehabilitation financing assistance; increased opportunities for very low and low income households to become and remain homeowners through home purchase or rehabilitation financing assistance; and the provision of pre and post-purchase housing counseling and mortgage foreclosure assistance were identified as priorities in the Consolidated Plan. The Year 2 goal for increasing the opportunities for very low and low income households to become and remain homeowners was 0 [TL8] but should have been 2, actual households that received assistance this year was 0. Due to the subprime lending issue, foreclosure crisis, Waterbury's high unemployment rate, and the economy were large factors in the inability to expend the balance of

DRAFT

ADDI funds during Year 2. As previously mentioned, WDC will work closely with NHSW to do more outreach to help located potential qualified first time homebuyers.

Priority Housing Activities
Year 2 Goals & Actual Units Assisted

Priority Need	Year 2 Goal	Actual
HOME		
Production of new rental units	35	17
Rehabilitation of existing units	50	7
Rehabilitation of existing owner units	15	8
Homeownership assistance	0	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. 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 2 goals by income level with actual households assisted.

Priority Housing Needs
Year 2 Goals & Actual Households Assisted

Priority Need	Year 2 Goal	Actual
Renters		
0 – 30%	45	17
31 – 50%	30	1
51 – 80%	10	0
Owners		
0 – 30%	2	3
31 – 50%	6	0
51 – 80%	7	5

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

DRAFT

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

The WDC tried on two occasions to secure the services of a Housing Quality Standards inspector during CD Year 35. Previously it had utilized Daystar Housing Inspections, LLC to undertake these inspections. Due to their workload and staff capacity, Daystar while initially indicating their interest in continuing declined to respond to both Request for Proposals advertised in both April and May of 2010. In addition, the HOME Manager contacted her counterparts in other PJs and found that the way inspections are conducted vary widely. Only one firm was found and contacted. They expressed interest, Request for Proposal package was sent to them but they did not submit a proposal. It has been decided to use our current construction specialists to perform ongoing Housing Quality Standards inspections of rental properties. As mentioned in the Monitoring section, HQS monitoring will be conducted on properties due to be inspected in 2011. A monitoring of tenant files will be conducted in the beginning of 2011. This monitoring will include the review of tenant's source documentation and leases.

It should be noted that an on-site visit was conducted by WCD's Housing and Community Planning Director, Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist and HOME Manager of a 7 unit project completed by CREDO Housing Development Corporation, Inc. one of the City's CHDOs. The site visit included a review of CREDO's tenant selection process, income & rent requirements and a tour of the building. On a suggestion by WDC's Housing and Community Planning Director that CREDO look into obtaining Veteran's Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) vouchers, one of CREDO's tenants is currently in the process of obtaining one of these vouchers.[TL9]

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

HOME-funded projects follow HUD's Affirmative Marketing regulations.
WDC HOME staff requires owners of five or more unit properties to submit an Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan (HUD-935.2).
An Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan was prepared. The City's Fair Housing Officer became a member of the Fair Housing Association of Connecticut and attended their 30th Annual Fair Housing Conference. He also developed a rapport with the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities. A Fair Housing section was added to the WDC website, advertisements were placed in the Waterbury Republican-American, El Canillita (Spanish) newspapers and on Spanish Radio. The Fair Housing Officer also made a Fair Housing presentation to the Greater Waterbury Board of Realtors.

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

DRAFT

Homeless Needs

*Please also refer to the Homeless Needs Table in the Needs.xls workbook.
Identify actions taken to address needs of homeless persons.

1. Identify actions to help homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living.

2. Identify new Federal resources obtained from Homeless SuperNOFA.

Program Year 2 CAPER Homeless Needs response:

HOMELESS

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 2009-2010 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.

One of the major undertakings in 2010 was the intersection of Continuum of Care work and the work of the Implementation teams for the Waterbury Ten year Plan to end homelessness. This included aligning Subcommittee work of both groups and adding report outs to the full Continuum regarding the progress of the implementation of the Ten Year Plan. This effort was needed to avoid duplicative efforts and to insure the success of implementation strategies as they are developed by Ten Year Plan teams.

DRAFT

On January 27, 2010, 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 3rd Annual Project Homeless Connect Event for the City of Waterbury. This event took place at the Armory in Waterbury on October 22nd. 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:

- 353 total persons registered
- 157 Veterans Benefits/Employment Services
- 13 Mammograms
- 5 Prostate Exam
- 24 Social Security Numbers/Birth Certificate
- 104 Haircuts
- 66 Eye Screenings
- 67 Flu Shots
- 220 Medical Triage/BP & BMI; Blood Sugar Screenings/ & Foot Evaluations
- 14 Dental Screening and 12 Dental Cleanings
- 287 Winter Coats Distributed
- 230 Books Distributed
- 225 Baggies of instant meals/drinks distributed
- 193 Hygiene Bags/Feminine Hygiene Products
- 76 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 2010. 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

DRAFT

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 2011 SuperNOFA to create 8 new units of permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals using Shelter Plus Care certificates. Funding worth a total of $146,613 is to be utilized as housing assistance for homeless individuals in Waterbury. If awarded the housing assistance will be administered through the Western CT Mental health Network. Additionally, renewal projects were applied for Pilots I and II, Beyond Shelter, Society of Support, Freedom Walk, Credo, Inc., 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 completed participation in a pilot internship project between the CT Coalition to End Homelessness and the University of Connecticut. An intern was 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. The consumer group continues to meet monthly and reports out to the full Continuum membership at the group's regular meetings. One of the consumers was able to share their story at the United Way's Annual Meeting.

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

DRAFT

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 2009 – 2010 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 applied for through the Continuum in the 2011 round of SuperNOFA funding include:

$146,613 was applied for by the Western CT Mental Health Network for the provision of 8 units of supportive housing.

Total Amount funded: $146,613 (approval pending)

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.

DRAFT

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 and there are reports of upwards of 28 new 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 and local public service agencies work to document these numbers and outreach to individuals to address both emergency and permanent housing. The announcement of an additional 25 Veterans Affairs Supported Housing (VASH) Vouchers for the homeless veterans in need of case management services with special targeting to the chronically homeless veterans is good news to help alleviate some of those living in the woods.

The City received $931,128 in Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing (HPRP) funds as part of the ARRA funding. These funds were allocated to a collaborative of the Connecticut Coalition to End Homelessness; Connecticut Legal Services; The Salvation Army and St. Vincent DePaul Mission of Waterbury. The funds are designed to assist those at risk of homelessness and prevent eviction

DRAFT

through the provision of rent arrearages; security deposits; and utility deposits. The funds are also designed to assist those recently homeless (not the chronically homeless) with the resources needed to be rapidly re-housed. To date, 114 households containing 286 people have received homelessness prevention services and 41 households containing 78 people have received homeless assistance services. Approximately 47% ($345,980)of the HPRP funds have been expended and the City is confident that it will meet the statutory 60% expenditure by July 2011.

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

Waterbury's St. Vincent DePaul Shelter is the largest shelter in the state. During the 2009/2010 program year St. Vincent DePaul Mission Shelter serviced 931 homeless people compared to 927 people in 2008/2009 with a total bed nights of 27,099 this year compared to 31,111 last year. At this point in time, there is an average of 126 people staying each night at St. Vincent DePaul's.

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

The COC continues to apply for additional funding to create more permanent supportive housing. Using the Housing First model, the Continuum hopes to provide immediate access to affordable, safe housing for those in need. However, the lack of service funding by the State, and the limited funds available through the SuperNOFA make this a lengthy and difficult process that is not meeting the needs of the homeless population that is currently living on the streets and shelters right now. Furthermore, changes to the definition of homeless by HUD is limiting access to permanent supportive housing, making it more difficult to gain access to the few housing options that are out there. This is creating a situation where the system is funneling the homeless into the Shelters, in order to prove eligibility of need for the homeless to gain access to housing. A system designed in this way does not allow for prevention of homelessness, but in fact creates more homelessness.

Through its Emergency Shelter Grants in 2009-2010, the City granted the Morris Foundation $7,500 for utilities and food at the Therapeutic Shelter. Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury received $12,500 for operating costs for their shelter, which

DRAFT

provides a safe place for physically and/or psychologically abused women and their children. The Salvation Army received $8,000 for administrative and operating expenses for the Family Shelter. Finally, St. Vincent DePaul received $71,820 for the operation of their homeless shelter and other supportive services to aid the homeless.

In CD Year 34 (2008-2009), there were five Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) subrecipients: St. Vincent DePaul; Salvation Army; Morris Foundation; Safe Haven and Family Services. When HUD monitored the programs in June 2009, they determined that Family Services clients, runaway and abused children who become wards of the State, did not meet their definition of homeless. Wards of the State are however eligible to receive assistance through supportive services under the Community Development Block Grant Program, and, in fact Family Services was awarded funds in CD Year 35 in order to continue this program as a public service.

As a result, the $14,999 which had been awarded to Family Services under ESG was reprogrammed. The amount was divided equally among the four ESG remaining subrecipients.

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 2009-2010 agencies and amounts funded by ESG for 2009-2010 were identified.

   The Morris Foundation ($7,500) ESG funds were used for utilities and the purchase of food at the Therapeutic Shelter. The Therapeutic Shelter provided 7,182 bed days and 21,546 meals in program year 2009-2010. Audits by the CT Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, CT Department of Corrections, CT Court Support Services Division and the Department of Public Health were all positive. 2009-2010, the Foundation Served 306 people which included 147 White (70 of which were Hispanic), 82 Black/African/American, 1

DRAFT

Asian, 3 American Indian/Alaskan native, and 73 other Multi-Racial. The Morris Foundation allocation was matched with new Federal funds of $64,885 (FEMA and DMHAS), local/state government funds totaling $533,572 (DMHAS, Department of Correction and state Judicial Branch), $20,134 in private donations and $332,348 in fees.

The Salvation Army ($8,000) used their ESG funds for administrative and operating expenses at their family shelter. In 2009-2010, a total of 141 individuals and 51 families were served which included 47 White (includes 10 Hispanic), 66 were Black/ African American (8 Hispanic), 7 American Indian/Alaskan Native (includes 7 Hispanic), 12 Black/African American & White (includes 7 Hispanic) and 9 other Multi-Racial. The Salvation Army operated its shelter 7 days/week, 24 hours/day. Numbers have been lower than expected this year due to the on-going, though almost conquered, bedbug issue. 26 families were discharged from the shelter during these months into independent permanent housing, 5 left the area from the shelter, 9 have found other suitable housing, 3 left the shelter after less than a 48 hour period and 8 families remain in the shelter. The Salvation Army allocation was matched with Other Federal Funds of $21,617.00, Local Government Funds of $288,804.00, and Private Funds of $5,000.00.

Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury ($12,500) 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. In 2009-2010, a total of 140 individuals, 50 of whom were children. were assisted. This number included 83 White (including 23 Hispanic), 54 Black/African American, 8 Asian, 1 American Indian/Alaskan Native, and 6 Other/Multi-Racial (including 1 Hispanic) persons received assistance. The Safe Haven allocation was matched with $29,000 in Other Federal funds, $152,000 in Local Government funds, $13,000 in Private Funds, and $87,000 in Donations.

The St. Vincent DePaul Society ($71,820) grant was used for operating costs for the operation of the homeless shelter. The St. Vincent DePaul Mission Homeless Shelter served 927 individuals which included 352 White (includes 6 Hispanic), 303 Black/African American (includes 46 Hispanic), 3 American Indian/Alaskan Native, 3 American Indian/Alaskan Native & White, 1 Asian & White and 265 Other Multi-Racial (includes 196 Hispanic). Of the 927 persons 144 were children. The shelter also serviced 72 single female families and 1 two-parent families. St. Vincent DePaul Mission Homeless Shelter provided a total of 27,099 bed-nights this year. 97% of the homeless population was unemployed with only 34% employed. However, 518 or 83% did graduate from high school or had a GED with 9% having attended college. The major reasons people residing at the homeless shelter gave were eviction, release from jail, or addiction, with more than 84% exhibiting different degrees of mental illness. Each guest or family was assigned to a case manager within five working days after entering the shelter. The St. Vincent DePaul ESG grant was matched with Federal Funding of $26,094, Local Government Funds of $438,228, and Private Funding of $310,508, and other Funding of $12,500.

All of the agencies listed above helped the City address its priority needs for this population by expanding existing programs of assessment and outreach targeted

DRAFT

to serve homeless families, individuals and persons with special needs, and providing transitional housing.

The COC also worked with other housing agencies to help provide this population with permanent housing and worked closely with area hospitals to make sure all the needs for medical attention (emotional, physical or routine) were addressed to promote a true continuum of care.

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 2 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.

DRAFT

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Health Care	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Mental Health	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Corrections	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

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 served to 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.

DRAFT

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 served to 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 served to 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.

DRAFT

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 presentation was made at the May CoC meeting by DOC regarding discharge protocols which served to strengthen the relationship between DOC and the Continuum member agencies. Additionally, a number of CoC member agencies are currently participating in the Waterbury Re-Entry Council convened by the Department of Corrections.

***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.

DRAFT

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

DRAFT

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 2 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

DRAFT

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

2. Changes in Program Objectives

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

The City did not change its program objectives for CD Year 35 which was the second year of its Five Year Consolidated Plan (2008-2013). During the CD Year 37 citizen participation process, changes will be proposed to the HOME Program so that the focus will be on undertaking larger projects and a residential rehabilitation program will be created in order to handle the smaller (1 to4 units) projects.

3. Assessment of Efforts in Carrying Out Planned Actions

a. Indicate how grantee pursued all resources indicated in the Consolidated Plan.

b. Indicate how grantee provided certifications of consistency in a fair and impartial manner.

c. Indicate how grantee did not hinder Consolidated Plan implementation by action or willful inaction.

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

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

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

DRAFT

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

Activities are verified through income benefit forms to ensure that at least 51% of

DRAFT

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 $31,389.72 in Program Income was received: $16,376.52 for loan repayments and $15,013.20 for a deferred loan payoffs.

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 $35,317.81 from loan repayments; $88,938.45 in relocation liens and $10,335 in demolition liens.

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

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

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.

DRAFT

10. b. The total number of loans outstanding is 30 with a principal balance of $499,105.

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.

b. 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.

c. 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 did not fund rehabilitation programs with CDBG during this program year.`

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 2 CAPER Antipoverty Strategy response:

DRAFT

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

NON-HOMELESS SPECIAL NEEDS

Non-homeless Special Needs

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

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

Program Year 2 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 42 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

DRAFT

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

DRAFT

(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 2 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 2 CAPER Other Narrative response:

DRAFT