



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 first year.

Program Year 2 CAPER Executive Summary response:

The goal of the City of Waterbury's Second Annual Plan (July 1, 2006 – September 30, 2007) is very simple and is not changing in the third program year; 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 them quality of life choices and opportunities for residential living, recreation and employment.

In order to accomplish this with the use of HUD funds in the past program year, 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. The City's seven main focus areas were: Public Safety and Services; Quality Public Education; Economic Development; City Blight, Litter and Beautification; Neighborhoods of Choice; Human Services and Development; and the Waterbury Downtown. The goals and initiatives for the Second Year Plan have been measured by the outcomes of availability/accessibility, affordability and sustainability.

This document serves as a progress update on how we have met our goals in general, but particularly those that relate to community planning and development. The City of Waterbury, through the Waterbury Development Corporation (WDC) administered the following programs:

- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
- Emergency Shelter Grant program (ESG)
- HOME Investment Partnership program (HOME) (included American Dream Downpayment Initiative or ADDI)

Needs assessment data, goals and objectives, and specific methods for distributing these program allocations are located in the City of Waterbury 2006-2007 Annual Action Plan. A substantial amendment to the 2005-2010 City of Waterbury

Consolidated Plan, that governs the second year for this reporting period, further defined the goals and objectives of the original Consolidated Plan. Furthermore, in the past program year, the City of Waterbury substantially amended their program year by changing it to October 1-September 30. As a result, the 2006-2007 program year became a 15-month extended year.

In an effort to meet HUD goals and objectives, while also meeting the City's goal or mission and focusing on seven focus areas, the City of Waterbury and the WDC worked to partner with City departments, local nonprofits, housing developers and Community Housing Development organizations (CHDO). The WDC administered \$2,306,582 in CDBG funds, \$971,258 in HOME funds and \$98,596 in ESG funds. All ESG funds have been expended for this program year. CDBG and HOME projects can be multi-year, so that while not all funds from 2006-2007 have been expended at this time, both programs are on target for meeting expenditure requirements. HOME funds expended during 2006-2007 totaled 799,857.12. This includes \$163,222.60 in program income.

The City of Waterbury's CAPER provides a complete listing of all program activity for the 2006-2007 year and includes program accomplishments and financial data. HUD mandates that the City of Waterbury provide specific technical information for all programs funded by the Consolidated Plan. This is also provided in the on-line computer system Integrated Disbursement and Information System, **IDIS**. The CAPER, like the Action Plan, is provided to the community to encourage citizen participation. The CAPER integrates IDIS technical information with narrative information to describe the City's Consolidated Plan and funded programs, how they meet priorities established in the Consolidated Plan, and how successful implementation includes active community participation.

The City values community involvement in its Consolidated Plan programs. This past year, the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen supported the creation of a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to oversee the use of funds received under the Consolidated Plan. The CAC consists of seventeen volunteers that represent various ethnic, cultural, neighborhood, political, social service and business interests in the City. It conducts regular monthly meetings, holds public hearings on the Annual Plan, reviews proposals/applications, makes recommendations, and provides valuable input to the staff who administer programs. The City also created a new Citizen Participation Plan (CPP) that it feels will not only address HUD regulations, but go beyond the requirements to embrace a proactive approach to engaging community involvement.

The information provided in this CAPER represents a comprehensive array of programs that address the many needs of the low-moderate income community in Waterbury. Using established objectives and outcomes this document will provide a summary of the City's progress in addressing its goals, objectives and priorities during the reporting period July 1, 2006-September 30, 2007.

The Waterbury Development Corporation is responsible for the preparation of the CAPER, but the document represents program accomplishments achieved through a collaboration of partners including the Office of the Mayor, the Health Department, the Public Works Department, the Waterbury Police and Fire Departments, the Continuum of Care, various City boards and Commissions, Main Street Waterbury, the Chamber of Commerce, and many business, neighborhood and social service

organizations. In fact, these collaborative efforts are essential to the delivery of the program services and the completion of Consolidated Plan objectives.

General Questions

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

Program Year 2 CAPER General Questions response:

1. Assessment of 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 Waterbury Development Corporation (WDC) made significant strides in fulfilling its one-year goals and objectives for the expanded program year July 1, 2006-September 30, 2007. Specific long-term goals for the City are:

1. The Preservation, Improvement or Revitalization of the City's Neighborhoods
2. The Retention, Growth and Attraction of Businesses and Promotion of Entrepreneurship: the Provision of Job Training

3. The Support, Maintenance and/or Renovation of Neighborhood Community Centers and Parks; the Seeking of Solutions to Funding Long-term Facility Maintenance; the Creation of Additional Opportunities for Recreation in Underserved Neighborhoods
4. The Improvement of Public Transportation Service and Access for all City Residents
5. The Revitalization of the Main Street District of Census Tract 3501
6. Support of the Continuance or Expansion of Social Service Agencies/Programs that provide care, treatment, housing, or support for children, seniors, the homeless, disabled, elderly, impoverished, and/or persons with special needs or substance abuse problems

These broad goals are also reflected in the City's updated Plan of Conservation and Development. To the degree that the activities that fulfill these goals fit HUD's national objectives and are eligible for funding support, CPD formula grant funds have been expended, in order to provide for affordable housing, a suitable living environment and expanded economic opportunities, principally for low/moderate income persons. The City has also leveraged its funds, as well as additional State and Federal dollars to accomplish these goals and their supporting objectives.

Goal #1: Preservation, Improvement and Revitalization of City Neighborhoods

Supporting objectives under this goal include:

(a) The improvement and/or renovation of existing schools and the planning and future building of three new-K schools (with complementary surrounding housing, infrastructure and neighborhood improvements)

In the past program year, the City has continued work on the building of three new K-8 schools. These school projects are being financed through over 100 million dollars in state bonding money and local funds. Three sites have been chosen this past year for the new schools: the Brooklyn neighborhood, the Gilmartin neighborhood and the NEWPAC neighborhood of the North End. All three sites are in low/moderate income census tracts. In addition, WDC partnered with Capital Access, Inc. and continued the planning process of generating a housing revitalization plan for new and infill housing around the site located in the North End. In the past program year a plan has been produced for that housing rehabilitation project.

The three schools are at various levels of progress. The Brooklyn neighborhood school is a renovation/expansion of the existing historic Duggan School. In the past year a conceptual design for historic Duggan School has been completed and Phase 2 environmental testing of individual properties has begun. The City has secured purchase agreements for seven private properties out of the thirteen targeted for acquisition. The final two properties are owned by the City. The new Gilmartin school plan requires no acquisition of additional property. A conceptual design has been completed for the new school and all environmental studies are complete. The North End school is still in the initial planning stages. The proposed site has undergone Phase 1 testing and additional borings have been performed. The City is applying for additional State funds for environmental clean-up, as the site has a history of

varied industrial use. In addition, a first round of appraisals has been performed on property designated for acquisition.

CDBG "**Public Facility Improvements-School System**" funds were allocated for the 2006-2007 program year for masonry work at Tinker (Census Tract 3516.01-3) and Wilson (Census Tract 3512.00-1) schools. Work included repairs, pointing and cleaning of exterior masonry construction at both schools. Renovations at both schools have been completed. The project improved the exterior of the buildings and therefore benefited the immediate surrounding neighborhoods. All the census tracts surrounding Wilson School which is located on 235 Birch Street in the WOW neighborhood are low-moderate income census tracts and includes census tracts 3503.00-1-3, 3504.00 -1-4, 3511.00-11-2, 3512.00-1-3, 3513.00-3, 5, 6. In each case the percentage of low-income is above 51%, with 54.9% in 3513.00-6 being the lowest. Tinker School is located at 809 Highland Avenue in what is considered the Town Plot neighborhood. More than 51% of the census tracts in the immediate surrounding neighborhood are low-income. The average is 56.9%. Those census tracts surrounding Tinker School include 3516.01-2-4, 3516.02-2-3 and 3517.00-0.

The purpose of the project was to benefit low/moderate income persons with an area benefit. The project dates to the 2004-2005 Annual Plan. This year \$386,409.35 in CDBG funds were expended to complete the project. There is \$4,788.60 in encumbered funds and a remaining balance of \$15, 831.00.

The project/activities are in keeping with the 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan (pp.5, 88), which lists maintaining and improving neighborhood facilities (including schools) as a high priority. In table 2B (Community Development Needs) of the 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan, under public facility needs, "Other Public Facility Needs" receives high priority with an unmet priority need of six units(schools). It was originally estimated that \$577,071.00 would be needed to address this unmet priority need. "School improvements" also received a high score in the Survey of Priority Needs in the original Plan (p.7).The 2006-2007 Annual Plan worksheet "Public Facilities-Schools" sets a goal of two schools for improvements. With the completion of work at these schools the goals have been met.

In the amended Consolidated Plan 2005-2008, the specific three-year priority need and objective is in the Public Facilities PF-5 (p.16). The PF-5 objective serves the PF Priority Need Category which is "to maintain, improve, expand or construct public facilities essential to urban life and neighborhood living, including the improvements of private, neighborhood, facilities." The PF-5 specific objective for the amended three-year Plan is to "use CDBG funds to improve, repair renovate or construct six schools in low/moderate income neighborhoods." The objective was given high priority. Since this is a three-year goal, using funds in Year Two to address issues at two schools (Tinker and Wilson) is in keeping and is also in pace with the amended Consolidated Plan.

(b) The removal/remediation of blighted buildings and clean up of litter and illegal dumping

Blighted building removal/remediation and litter clean-up efforts increased throughout the program year as the City re-organized its blight/remediation operations. The Waterbury Police Department through the Community Police Division took over the management of litter and blight enforcement and clean-up. An active partner in the new program is the Waterbury Health Department. The City held a large Litter Summit in spring 2007 and a follow-up in late summer. Representatives from neighborhoods throughout the City were invited to work with City department heads, nonprofits, and residents at-large in devising and implementing an anti-litter and anti-blight strategy. The results have been demonstrable. Local news stories have applauded the noticeable improvement in the condition of neighborhood and downtown streets and vacant lots

An anti-litter/blight task force was assembled at the direction of Mayor Michael Jarjura. The Environmental Division of the Health Department started conducting field operations known as "Operation Clean Streets" on April 21, 2007. By September 1, 2007, over 130 streets had been canvassed and over 2,800 properties had been inspected in WOW, NEWPAC, Crownbrook, Willow Plaza, Hillside, and the Berkley Heights neighborhoods.

Enforcement has been the Health Department's main tool to accomplish this difficult mission. A total of 400 Notices of Violation have been issued and 30 applications for Arrest Warrants have been applied for. Initial resistance to enforcement actions has given way to compliance in most cases, especially as community leaders see the positive, visual results. The Health Department's partnership with the Community Relations Division of the Police Department has created the base for the success of this mission. The field operation has resulted in referrals to all appropriate City Departments and agencies to obtain maximum benefits. The City has received support from prosecutors, who present the cases, and from the courts in which they are heard. Additional City resources have been provided to departments to support this campaign in the current and next fiscal year. Blighted buildings that qualify for demolition have been identified and researched. Given that the Director of Health has the authority under State Statute and the City Charter to initiate the demolition process, six buildings were identified for demolition by the Department.

In 2006-2007 six vacant/blighted properties were acquired with CDBG funds under the "**Acquisition**" project line. The purpose was the elimination of slum and blight on a spot basis. Total funds expended for acquisition in 2006-2007 totaled \$272,620.50. This total reflects funds remaining from the prior 2005-2006 program year as well as the \$50,280 dedicated in the 2006-2007 Annual Plan. The remaining balance in this project account is \$48,011.75.

Three acquisitions were for lot acquisition and three were for the acquisition of blighted buildings. CDBG funding was used for title searches, appraisals, legal services and production of a procedure manual for the acquisition of real property in accordance with a community development plan. All properties were taken by eminent domain.

The future use of all the properties will be determined through public input and through public meetings held by the City's Board of Aldermen. All six properties were in low-moderate income census tracts: 1032 Bank St.(Census Tract 3517.00), Lot 351 Wood St. (Census Tract 3503.00), 186-188 Willow St. (Census Tract 3508.00), and Lot 234-236, 244-246, Lot 250-252 Walnut St. (Census Tract 3503.00). Additionally all six properties are located within Neighborhood Revitalization Zones (NRZ), a State of Connecticut designation, not to be confused with HUD Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas (NRSA). Acquisition and demolition of blighted properties is consistent with the respective neighborhood plans filed by the St. Margaret/Willow Plaza NRZ, the WOW NRZ and the Brooklyn NRZ.

In the 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan (p.8) the "Cleanup of Abandoned Lots and Building Demolition" received the highest rating (tied with school improvements" in a public survey of priority needs. The Plan (p.5) noted that neighborhood improvement was a high priority along with demolition, crime prevention etc. Table 2B identifies demolition needs as "other infrastructure needs" and the Community Development Needs Table with 5-year Quantities identifies Clearance and Demolition with 10 units of unmet need. Acquisition for rehabilitation was not identified in this table, since acquisition was intended for the spot removal of slum and blight, not rehabilitation. In November of 2005, the Plan was officially amended to add a new "Acquisition" line item to the Plan with a transfer of \$300,000 from demolition to fund the line item. Acquisition was listed in the 2006-2007 Annual Plan project work sheet with a goal of six units to be acquired. With the completion of six acquisitions, this goal has been met.

The amended 2005-2008 Consolidated Plan also identified under three-year Housing priority needs and objectives, the need to "undertake the selective demolition of vacant properties and blighted housing that have outlived their usefulness in order to improve the quality of life in neighborhoods..." The H-3 Specific Objective calls for using CDBG funds over three years to fund the acquisition and demolition of 15 blighted properties.

"Demolition" on the three acquired properties containing blighted, vacant buildings was financed through a federal Neighborhood Initiative grant, rather than through CDBG funds. The 2006-2007 **Demolition** project allocation, based upon slum and blight, was \$300,000. The original balance at the beginning of the year in this account was \$367,346.72. Of that amount \$200,000 was moved to Neighborhood Park Projects. There was a transfer into Demolition of \$25,000 from NRZ Community Development and a transfer of \$50,071 from Public Improvements-Parking and Signage. Demolition performed using CDBG funds totaled \$69,749.14 for the 2006-2007 program year. There is \$55,980 in total encumbrances and a remaining balance of \$116,688.58 in this project line.

Demolition expenditures of \$69,749.14 reflect the cost of demolition as well as environmental services. Four properties were demolished. The structures were either vacant or heavily damaged by fire. Demolishing these properties has helped eliminate slum and blight and therefore improve the overall quality of life in the respective neighborhoods. All of these properties were in low-moderate income census tracts. The properties demolished were 151 Locust St. in the WOW-NRZ neighborhood (Census Tract 3503.00-2), 222

Bradley Avenue in the Town Plot neighborhood (Census Tract 3516.02-2), 45 East Hawkins St. in the Hillside/Crownbrook neighborhood (Census Tract 3502.00-3) and 110 Cherry St. in the WOW neighborhood (Census Tract 3504.00-3) which was the subject of an asbestos survey only. This property will be demolished in the upcoming program year.

The public survey for the 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan identified Demolition as a top priority and a high priority in community development. Demolition was listed in Table 2B as "other infrastructure need." The amended Plan also listed demolition in H-3 for acquisition and demolition of 15 blighted properties over 3 years. The 2006-2007 Annual Plan project work sheet identifies 6 buildings as a goal for demolition in this year. Four were demolished with CDBG funds during 2006-2007. An additional three demolitions were accomplished through a Neighborhood Initiative grant. In total therefore, seven buildings were demolished. CDBG funds were used for four of these, and leveraged funds were able to finance the additional three.

(c) Façade Improvements in Low-Moderate Income Neighborhoods

Improvements to neighborhood facades are seeing limited accomplishments during 2006-2007. Although the Commercial Façade Program developed in association with Main Street Waterbury can be considered a neighborhood façade program in that it serves the downtown neighborhood of Census Tract 3501, assessment of that project will be considered under Goal #5.

Under "**NRZ Community Development**," there was a beginning balance this year of \$116,111.46. 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.

Dating back to 2000, Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) of Waterbury created a neighborhood façade program that would service the only two organizations/areas meeting this qualification, those being at the St. Margaret/Willow Plaza NRZ and the WOW Neighborhood Association NRZ. No new projects were proposed by NRZ organizations in the 2006-2007 Annual Plan, however. \$15,361.48 is presently encumbered for the NHS administered façade project. Total expenditures for this project item only totals \$750 for this program year for work performed in St. Margaret/Willow Plaza at 49 Plaza Avenue (Census Tract 3508.00-4). The neighborhood façade program as presently designed needs to be reworked, since NHS receives few applications for the funds. The new Director of NHS intends to redo the façade guidelines to generate more interest, since it presently has a limit of \$750 per façade project and the cost of the most basic façade improvement proposal usually exceeds that limit. This suggestion has been supported by WDC staff as a way to complete this façade project proposed under the NRZ Community Development activity line. The 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan (p.5) stressed the support of NRZ organizations as a "primary mechanism for neighborhood strategies" and the targeting of resources for neighborhood improvement activities. Neighborhood improvement was given a high priority in the Plan.

(d) Improvements to neighborhood infrastructures, streetscapes and general appearance

Infrastructure improvements in neighborhoods received major attention once again this program year. Streets and sidewalks were identified as a high priority (p.5) in the 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan. In the Community Development Needs Table that projected Five-Year Quantities, 4,000 ft. of sidewalk were identified. The same unmet need was identified in the annual Table 2B. In the 2006-2007 Annual Plan, Neighborhood Sidewalk Improvements were identified in the project work sheets with a goal of 1900 linear feet of sidewalk for the program year. The amended Plan identified in IF-2 (p.36) the goal of reconstructing 6,000 linear feet of sidewalk in low/mod income neighborhoods over three years, with an average of 2,000 linear feet per year.

Streets were not identified in the 5-year table but were identified as high priority throughout the text of the Plan (pp.5, 34) and in the first annual Table 2B "Community Development Needs" where there was an unmet priority need of 15,000 linear feet of street milling and paving. The 2006-2007 Annual Plan project sheet " Street Resurfacing/Reconstruction" set a goal of 15,000 linear feet of completed streets. The amended 2005-2008 Consolidated Plan identified (p.36) identified the specific 3-year IF-1 objective to mill and pave 45,000 linear feet of roads in low/moderate income neighborhoods over 3 years, the average therefore being approximately 15,000 linear feet per year

At the beginning of the program year, "**Neighborhood Street Resurfacing/Reconstruction**" had a balance of \$503,928.16. Of that amount, \$37,022.26 was transferred to neighborhood park improvements. The remaining \$466,905.90 was totally expended. The City also expended \$991,640.68 and paved 5.7 miles of roads. Streets paved were all in low-moderate income census-tracts and decisions were based upon severity of street conditions in the eligible low-moderate income census tract areas. The streets included Hill Street, Myrna Street, Short Street, Hotchkiss Street, Toros Street, Tudor Street, and Unity Street in the northern inner-city Crownbrook neighborhood, Census Tract 3510.00-3. WOW-NRZ neighborhood streets in Census tract 3504.00-2 included Cossett Street, Walnut Street, Wall Street and Cherry Street. Grove Street (Census Tract 3501.00-4) was paved in the St. Margaret's-Willow Plaza neighborhood. This street is heavily trafficked and considered a major street in this neighborhood. The City also devotes major clean-up efforts to this street on a regular basis. East End streets paved were Farragut Street and Ashmun Street in Census Tract 3512.00-1 and Plank Street in 3527.00-2. Congress Avenue (Census Tracts 3516.01-3 and 3516.02-2), another heavily trafficked street and major thoroughfare that connects the Brooklyn NRZ neighborhood and the Town Plot neighborhood, was also paved. The project boundaries include the following census tracts: 3501-01, 3502.00-1-4, 3504.00-1-4, 3510.00-2-3, 3512.00-1-3, 3516.01-2-3, 3527.01-1 and 3528.00-1. All census tracts in the immediate surrounding neighborhood are low-moderate income. All are above 51% low-moderate income. Paving of these streets replaced streets that were in deplorable condition and helps build the neighborhood and improve driving condition. The people in these neighborhoods use these streets on a daily basis. The goal of 15,000 linear feet was achieved during 2006-2007. A total

of 15,206 linear feet of street resurfacing/reconstruction was accomplished in 2006-2007.

Two sidewalk projects in low-moderate income neighborhoods were funded during the 2006-2007 program year under the "**Neighborhood Sidewalks**" line item. The balance in this account at the beginning of the year was \$537,808.99. Total sidewalks expenditures were \$339,714.28. Funds committed are \$101,475.45 with a remaining balance of \$96,619.26.

On North Main Street (Census Tract 3502.00-1) 1860 feet of sidewalks along the west side of North Main Street from Griggs Street to Platt Street were constructed. These sidewalks primarily serve residents in this low-moderate income census neighborhood area as homes that lie along North Main Street and bordering residential neighborhoods are served by these sidewalks. The population in this area uses public transportation, therefore having safe sidewalks serves those accessing public transport. The project boundaries are the following census tract areas: 3502.00-1, 3503.00-1, 3510-00-3 and 3511.00-1. All the census tracts in the immediate surrounding neighborhood are low-moderate income and no census tract falls below 64% low-mod income.

Sidewalks were also paved in the area surrounding Chase School in the East End. The national objective served is benefit to low/moderate income persons. The project boundaries are census tracts 3513.00-1, 3, 5 and 3526.00-1-2. Per 2000 Census, all census tracts in the immediate surrounding East End neighborhood are low income. No census tract is below 61% low-moderate income. 970 feet of sidewalk were planned and 489 feet have been completed. The sidewalks in this area are beneficial to the pedestrian traffic from the school as well as the people who use the bus line. The census tracts cited are those in the service area surrounding this school which is pre-K through fifth grade. Also using these sidewalks are a number of elderly and neighborhood low-moderate income individuals. The remainder of the project will be completed in 2008 after school is out of session. This project also received state funds. The City also spent \$142,838.10 on sidewalk restoration in Holmes Avenue in 3508.00-2.

A program for "**NRZ Community Development**" saw little action this past year. The program dates back several years and was designed to provide seed money for improvement projects that supported the neighborhood revitalization plans of neighborhood associations who are state-recognized NRZs. In the past year, \$25,000 was transferred out of this line item to be used for demolition in these neighborhoods. There is a remaining balance of \$75,000. In the upcoming year, viable projects will be sought for the remaining balance. One possible project that has been proposed is the refurbishing of a small parklet/open space area on vacant land in the St. Margaret's Willow-Plaza NRZ. The recently-finished Elmwood Community Center which is operated by the neighborhood association is nearby. This parklet would complement the Center which now hosts a variety of programs addressing the needs of seniors and area youth.

Another project line item, entitled "**Neighborhood Improvements,**" started the year with a balance of \$11,330.93. This program dates back to 2002 and was a general allocation to "plan detailed improvement programs that support

improvements to the public capital stock and implement specific objectives in low-moderate income areas." No new projects have been proposed in this area and the remaining balance was transferred to "Interim Assistance."

"Fire Station Improvements" started with a balance \$696,236.12 in fiscal year 2006-2007. Fire Station improvements were identified as high priority in the 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan (pp. 5, 85, 86). The amended 2005-2008 Plan clarifies the objective under Public Facilities needs and objectives, PF-1, where the renovation of two firehouses and the purchase of one pumper truck is identified as a high priority need over 2005-2008. The 2006-2007 Annual Plan work sheet for this project sets a goal of two units for fire station improvements. There was an allocation of \$225,000 in the 2006-2007 year. The project dates back three years when two fire stations were proposed for rehabilitation. The project is just now starting to come to fruition, with work on the Baldwin Street Fire Station #4 (Census Tract 3505.00-1) underway. The national objective was low-moderate income area benefit. Over the course of the 2006-2007 program year, payments were made for architectural and engineering services and for replacement of windows and doors at the Baldwin Street facility. The windows had been deteriorating to the point that they posed a safety concern. One window had actually fallen out of the building to the ground below. Payments totaled \$100,565.62. There is a remaining encumbrance of \$10,520 for architectural/engineering and an uncommitted balance for construction of \$585,150.50.

Meetings have taken place with the Fire Department and the project is expected to move to construction in spring, 2008. The difficulty of planning for this project lies in the moving of firemen from the Baldwin Street facility at the same time that the downtown Field Street facility adjacent to City Hall is due to be vacated for remodeling. The renovation of the Field Street firehouse will be financed through municipal bonding.

(e) The promotion of safe, affordable housing

The City promotes safe, affordable housing primarily through the use of its "**HOME**" funds. In 2006-2007 the City received \$971,258 in HOME funds. Funds were allocated to benefit low-moderate income households as determined through an application process administered by WDC. 10% of the funds were used for administration and 15% were directed towards CHDO housing development. The City expended \$799, 857.12 in HOME funds during 2006-2007. This includes \$163,222.60 in HOME program income.

The 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan identifies the cultivation of home ownership opportunities, the preservation of existing housing through rehabilitation and the improving of supportive social services to homeowners as high housing priorities (p.22).The amended 2005-2008 Plan clarified the numeric Housing goals to be accomplished with HOME funds. Specific Objective.H-7 set a goal of 40 units of multi-family rental renovations. Specific Objective H-8 set a goal of 23 units of multi-family housing by CHDOs, and H-9 set a goal of rehabilitation and/or construction of 60 single-family housing units. All were high priority. All of these were three year totals and average a projection of approximately 40-41 units per year. In addition, the 2006-2007 Annual Plan project worksheets for HOME Housing Rehabilitation estimated 38 units for

rehabilitations with an additional 2 units to be completed by CHDO organizations, for a total goal of 40 units in the year 2006-2007.

In the past program year, HOME funds made 40 units (18 projects) of housing safe and affordable. Of the 18 projects, 17 were home-owner occupied, single-family (1-4 units) and one project was multi-family, investor-owned (5 or more units). In addition, 69 units are underway that were started during the 2006-2007 program year. These units include very visible projects along the major north-south neighborhood gateway of Willow Street (Census Tract 3508.00 3-4) that are being developed by Mutual Housing Services. One of the Mutual Housing projects is a large, 16-unit building. The remainder are single-family (1-4 units). Other affordable housing projects completed in 2006-2007 program year include two additional units built by Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) of Waterbury at Old Farm Ridge. NHS also started the process of acquiring a 3-unit property on West Main Street that it will rehabilitate in 2008 for safe, affordable housing purposes.

In 2006-2007, NHS initiated the process of identifying a strategy to develop clusters of now-vacant buildings in areas of Waterbury that will have the greatest impact on neighborhoods once rehabilitated. They will continue to work on this strategy in upcoming years. NHS also serviced 65 loans through its CDBG Rehabilitation revolving loan funds. These funds include the NHS CDA Loan Program (5 unit goal), the NHS Commercial Loan program(3 unit goal), the NHS Crownbrook Loan Fund (4 unit goal), the NHS NEWPAC Loan Program(2 unit goal) and the NHS WOW Loan Program(2 unit goal) (see project worksheets, 2006-2007 Annual Plan). The neighborhoods serviced by these loan funds are located in the central inner-city and comprise Census Tracts 3501.00, 3502.00, 3503.00, 3504.00 and 3508.00. In 2006-2007 NHS did not build any units as it underwent reorganization. It is now in the process of evaluating these loan programs and determining how best these programs could serve the low-moderate income community throughout the City.

"Housing Rehabilitation-Engineering" through HOME was assisted with CDBG funds that were intended to support the provision of professional engineering services for HOME and/or CDBG rehabilitation projects. Housing rehabilitation was identified as a high priority in the 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan. The 2006-2007 Annual Plan project work sheet listed engineering support services as support for the provision of HOME rehabilitation services. During 2006-2007, \$25,000 was allocated for this purpose and \$2,850 was spent for engineering inspection and services. The remainder of the funds will be spent in the upcoming year as a new construction specialist is now under contract for services.

HOME ADDI funds were discussed in the 2006-2007 Annual Plan as increasing the number of people able to purchase single-family homes. No numeric goals were set, although it was stated that ADDI funds were to be administered by Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS). In July of 2006, NHS entered into contract for the administration of ADDI funds. Since starting the program, NHS has provided AQDDI home down payment assistance of \$10,000 to five households. The amended 2005-2008 Plan identifies ADDI as a high priority and set a three year goal of assisting 11 households through 2008.

NHS also administered a number of programs aimed at educating prospective first-time home buyers. "You Are Home" is a loan program that provides financial assistance to municipal employees to rehabilitate their homes. NHS also ran a first-time home buyer education on two different levels: 1) classes conditional for mortgage approvals and 2) eight-hour general classes covering a broad range of home owner purchase and retention issues. During the program year, NHS provided home buyer education and counseling to 600 households and 300 new buyers. It also provided foreclosure prevention and reverse mortgage counseling to 600 households.

"Emergency Relocation Assistance" had no allocation for the 2006-2007 program year, although it was anticipated that program income from Community Development and Economic Development would be added to this line item. The 2006-2007 Plan project work sheet identified the goal for Emergency Relocation Assistance as assisting 30 families. During 2006-2007 this goal was exceeded as 72 households were given emergency relocation assistance. 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. There was a carry-over of \$5,225.00 from the previous year. Of the \$168,692.00 in funds transferred into the account, all was program income (actual program income and reimbursements) with the exception of a \$45,000 transfer from the non-performing account **"Non-Commercial Rehabilitation."** Expenses for emergency relocation totaled \$173,354.00, leaving an available balance of \$563.09. Seventy-two households were assisted for lack of essential services, water, heat, electricity etc. Tenants displaced were either returned to their original unit or another apartment.

The **"Non-Commercial Rehabilitation"** project line dates back to 2005, when \$50,000 was allocated and to 2006, when an additional \$50,000 was put aside for proposed non-commercial rehabilitation projects. A proposed project had been the rehabilitation of the Yeshiva Gedolah, an elementary through graduate school campus located on the City's former UCONN campus in the north central Hillside neighborhood. The Yeshiva had intended to renovate the library of the school, the cafeteria and common areas. The Yeshiva additionally proposed to renovate the Community/student Entrepreneurship Center at the campus. Upon further examination, questions as to the eligibility of the project per HUD guidelines arose and it was determined, upon consultation with HUD, that the project was not eligible. In 2006-2007, \$55,000 was transferred to **"Neighborhood Park Improvement"** and \$45,000 was transferred to **"Emergency Location,"** leaving a \$0.00 balance in this account.

"Interim Assistance," a project line dating back to 2004, started the program year with a balance of \$27,158.00. No additional funds were allocated in the 2006-2007 program year. The securing of abandoned, vacant buildings, neighborhood improvement housing code enforcement and crime prevention were identified in the 2005-2010 a Plan (p.5) as high priorities. The purpose of the activity has been to secure and board up abandoned, vacant buildings on a spot slum/blight basis, thus making the buildings safer for the public and helping prevent the use of buildings for crime-related activities. An additional \$11,330.93 was added to the account as a transfer from **"Neighborhood Improvements."** Total expenditures were

\$23,260.46, with a remaining balance of \$15,228.45. Funds paid for the securing and boarding up of 49 vacant buildings throughout the City of Waterbury on a Slum and Blight Spot Basis.

Goal #2: The Retention, Growth and attraction of Businesses and Promotion Entrepreneurship; the provision of Job Training

Supporting objectives under this goal include:

(a) The initiation of a model business retention, growth and entrepreneurship program in the City of Waterbury

The City of Waterbury and the WDC have continued to grow their efforts at business retention, growth and attraction. The City of Waterbury invested \$450,000 in the Business Growth Group of the WDC to fund these expanded efforts. Business retention specialists visited over 110 companies and businesses, large and small, and recorded data produced by these visits using the "Executive Pulse" software program that facilitates the tracking of business needs. Many of the businesses are located in low-moderate income census tract areas.

A 2000 study entitled "Waterbury Inner City Business Strategy: Creating Jobs, Income and Wealth for Inner City Residents," sponsored by the City of Waterbury and the nationally-recognized nonprofit organization, Initiative for a Competitive Inner City (ICIC) defines Waterbury's "inner-city" area using 2000 U.S. Census data and isolates a set of demographics representing that area. The study estimates the inner city geographic area population at 33,800, or roughly 1/3 of Waterbury's total population, mainly residing in areas in the center of the City with corridors through the north and south ends. It concludes that the population differs from the City and the Labor Market Area (LMA) in a number of key ways: it is heavily minority, with substantially lower household income, higher rates of single-parent households and significantly lower levels of educational attainment. The inner-city median income is \$21,300 or 61% of the median for the City. Nearly 21 % of households have an annual income of less than \$10,000. The population is primarily 63% minority and 17% of the households are headed by single parents. The data also reveals that Waterbury's inner city accounts for 1/4 of the economic activity in the region and 1/2 of the economic activity in the City. This is significant in that the inner city area contains 2/3 of the City's minority population and yet is contributing half of the City's economic activity. In addition, approximately 37% of the City's manufacturing jobs and 14% of the region's are located in Waterbury's inner city. Since this area does not include the City's industrial parks, the manufacturing numbers reflect employment by small business manufacturers, rather than large firms. It should be noted, however, that, in addition, the two major industrial parks are located in low-moderate income census tracts (3522.00-1 and 3527.01-2).

Business outreach for the purpose of serving retention or growth needs therefore focuses to a large degree on businesses that are located in the inner-city area or the City's two industrial parks, both of which are low-moderate income census tracts. It is hoped that growth and retention efforts

will help stabilize and grow businesses and job opportunities in these areas of the City.

In addition, in the last program year, the WDC has activated a micro-loan program. The planning for the loan program dates back to 2005-2006, when the WDC applied for and received funding from Citizen's Bank for \$500,000. The micro-loan program aims at providing greater support and opportunities for entrepreneurship, including capital availability, and entrepreneurial training and counseling. According to CT. Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) 2000 statistics, there are 5,779 businesses in Waterbury, with 9.6% being minority-owned and 19.7% owned by women. The minority ownership is higher than the State's 7.2%, but the female ownership is lower than the State's (25.5%). The 2000 ICIC study recommended that the City, through a partnership between a nonprofit and various banks, offer a micro-loan program to increase capital availability, since many businesses were seeking modest non-traditional loans of \$5,000 to \$50,000 to cover funding gaps. The new micro-loan program sets these very same parameters. Three loans were initiated in 2006-2007. Presently the WDC is setting up a program to address the technical assistance needs of applicants, whether that be the writing of a business plan, health care benefits, physical improvements to a facility, the restructuring of a business etc. The goal is the creation of a stronger hands-on system of business and entrepreneurial support, the seeding of new small businesses, many of which will be owned by minorities and/or women, and the generation of employment opportunities. Long-term outcomes include the creation of new role models in the inner-city community, the step-by-step revitalization of inner-city neighborhoods through job creation, reinvestment and improvements to property, the building of a local entrepreneurial climate, and the instilling of personal and community pride.

On a planning level during 2006-2007, the City went out to bid for proposals to hire a consultant to re-write the City's land use regulations and re-draw the City's zoning map. A consultant has been retained and a steering committee formed, consisting of City, business and community representatives. The focus of the effort will be to support initiatives set forth in the 2005 Plan of Conservation and Development aimed at growing the City, while protecting, stabilizing and revitalizing its neighborhoods. The project is expected to take eighteen months.

(b) *The support of job training/retraining and the addressing of high unemployment in the City of Waterbury*

The 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan identified job creation and job training as a high priority community need (p.86-87) and The 2006-2007 Plan set a goal of assisting one Community Based Development Organization (project work sheet and Summary of Specific Annual Objectives EO-3). In the 2006-2007 program year, the "**Community Based Development Organization (CBDO), In-The-Making,**" received \$24,000 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 346 people in the past program year.

Throughout the past year, the City of Waterbury and the WDC continued to work on an ongoing basis with the Northwest Regional Workforce Investment Board to support job training and/or retraining. Once again, during the 2007 summer, a joint project was implemented, whereby state grant funds were used to hire over 200 local youth, primarily from disadvantaged neighborhoods in low-moderate income census tracts, to clean their city streets, sidewalks and blighted area. Older youth acted as supervisors and the project was once again managed by WDC.

(c) The attraction of new businesses and the revitalization of neighborhoods through the remediation and re-use of brownfields.

Significant accomplishments were made towards the re-development of the City's many brownfields in 2006-2007. In past years, the City had received a total of \$750,000 in state and federal funding to target up to 25 sites, mostly in low-moderate income neighborhoods. The WDC formed a Brownfields Site Selection Committee and a Technical Review Committee two years ago and selected a firm to perform site assessments. In 2006-2007, assessments (Phase 1 and/or Phase 2) were completed or started on 19 parcels with an additional 7 parcels scheduled. The Committees, WDC and the WDC brownfields consultant also developed a strategy to target efforts at the South Main Street/ South End neighborhood brownfields sites. They have produced a draft report of the resources needed to create sustainable re-use in this distressed corridor/area. The WDC has already received a number of letters of interest from developers interested in taking blighted properties for development once assessments are completed. Waterbury has also applied for additional brownfields funds through the Office of Brownfields Re-Development (OBRD) of the State of Connecticut.

Goal #3: Support/Maintain and/or Renovate Neighborhood Community Centers and Parks; Seek Solutions for Funding Long-Term Maintenance of Facilities; Create Additional Opportunities for Recreation in Underserved Neighborhoods

Supporting objectives under this goal:

(a) Support/maintain /renovate existing community centers

The 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan (pp. 5, 88) identified the upgrading of neighborhood public facilities as a high priority need and objective. The 2006-2007 Annual Plan (neighborhood park Improvement work sheet) set a goal of the rehabilitation of two public facilities, Washington Park and the River Baldwin Recreation Center. In 2006-2007, \$300,000 in CDBG funds were expended under "**Neighborhood Park Improvement**" on the renovation of the River Baldwin Recreation Center (3505.00-1). The renovation of the River Baldwin Center included the repair/reconstruction of a retaining wall around the facility. The collapsing wall posed an immediate safety risk to the community using the Center. Inside the facility, CDBG funds financed the renovation of the kitchen. Other financed repairs to the facility included the paving of the parking lot, a new roof, and new gutters. The Center houses recreation facilities and programs for the public and also includes offices for Latino social service agencies that serve residents in the immediate surrounding neighborhoods. These agencies include La Casa Bienvenida, the

Rivera Memorial Foundation, and the Spanish Coalition. CDBG funds for this project were leveraged with over one million dollars in State funds from the Department of Social Services.

The City continued to support programs at other community centers throughout the City. The downtown **YMCA** (Census Tract 3501.00-3) received \$12,100 in CDBG funds towards the operation of a summer day camp for economically disadvantaged and special needs children throughout the City. Funds were used to provide 15 scholarships for children to attend a two-week camp session and for staff to aid the special needs children. This program was funded through the public services portion of the 2006-2007 Annual Plan.

The **Mt. Olive Senior Center** received an allocation of \$29,557 (as a public service in the 2006-2007 Annual Plan) to provide nutrition, arts and crafts, education and entertainment services to elderly persons in the North End and city-wide. CDBG public services dollars (2006-2007) also provided support for the **WOW-NRZ Association Community Learning Center** (Census Tract 3503.00-2) in the amount of \$13,424. Funds were used to support existing after-school programs at the center for elementary through high school youth as well as programs for seniors, toddlers, and residents of the neighborhood who benefited from life skills classes. Also funded by \$13,590 in CDBG 2006-2007 Annual Plan Public Service dollars were programs at the new Elmwood Community Center, which is run and operated by the **St. Margaret's-Willow Plaza NRZ Association, Inc.** Programs were directed at neighborhood youth and seniors in the low-moderate income Census Tract 3508.00-4. Like the WOW (Walnut-Orange-Walsh) neighborhood, this area is a significantly distressed neighborhood in the City which lacks a City park or local recreation facility.

Pride, Inc. had been allocated \$12,600 for 2006-2007 to provide education, social interaction and recreation for inner-city youth in the North End and city-wide. The Pride Center is located on Cherry Street, adjacent to the WOW-NRZ. Unfortunately, the program and the Center closed down. Funds were then allocated per amendment to the YMCA's 2007 summer camp program.

The City continued its support of existing community centers throughout the City by sponsoring numerous after-school educational and recreational programs at the North End Recreation Center, the Chase Park House and the Waterville Recreation Center. Programs included dance classes, basketball leagues, swimming, field games, flag football, soccer, arts and crafts and cooking, to name a few. The City also continued to partner with agencies such as New Opportunities, the YMCA, Girl Scouts, Youth Net and various sports and neighborhood associations.

(b)Support/maintain/renovate parks

The majority of "**Neighborhood Park Improvement**" funds were directed primarily at Washington Park. Park Improvements had been marked as a high priority in the 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan (pp. 5, 88) and identified as a project in the 2006-2007 with a goal of 2 public facility improvements. Annual Plan work sheet as Neighborhood Park Improvements. In 2006-2007, \$833,123.94 was expended on improvements at Washington Park. Combined with the \$300,000 expended at River Baldwin Recreation Center, the total is

\$1,133,128.94 for the year. The park is situated in the "Washington Park" neighborhood in the South End of Waterbury in the low-moderate income Census Tract 3514.00-3. The park contains a playground, ball fields, a spray pool, a field house (in disrepair with no roof), a large community house/center, swimming pool, and dilapidated tennis courts. The large community house may be a historic building. The community house serves as a home for community programs that service youth and the elderly throughout the year, as well as dedicated summer recreation programs.

In 2006-2007, CDBG funds were used for engineering and construction on the ball fields and included rock excavation, drainage improvements, wetlands mitigation, and installation of an irrigation system. New bleachers, a flag pole and drinking fountains were purchased and installed. A handicapped accessible concrete sidewalk was installed leading from the parking lot to the renovated field. The fields were graded and seeded. The parking lot was enlarged and paved. Most of the work has been completed, although not all has been billed. There is a remaining balance of \$14,779.42 that will cover additional fix-up items and fencing installation to prevent field abuse/vandalism.

Washington Park still needs much additional work. The playscape is very old and needs to be replaced to reach code compliance. A complete renovation of the on-site community house is necessary due to a failing roof; there is a need for window replacement, a new boiler, and extensive interior and exterior work. In addition, there are failing retaining walls in the park, a leaking swimming pool, a small stone park house with a collapsed roof, unusable park furniture in the playground area, and dilapidated, unusable tennis courts. The local neighborhood association has worked hard to make small improvements through local fund raising and small private grants. Such improvements have included repair of historic monuments in the park and the installation of four new park benches.

"The **"Public Facility-Handicapped Accessibility"** project line started with a carry-over from prior years if \$22,261. 44. No funds were expended in this account. There is an intended project for these funds, which is the construction of handicapped accessible ramps to the "Bond House," a small public facility located in Hamilton Park. The specifications have been completed and the project is due to go out to bid in spring, 2008.

Another public facility-related line item is **"Public Facility Improvement-Parking and Signage."** This project line had no new funding for the 2006-2007 year but had a carryover from the previous year of \$50,071.00. The funds were originally intended for a parking lot and related signage. The project was never constructed and this year all funds in this project were transferred to "Demolition."

The City addressed other park needs throughout the City with use of its own City funds and additional state bonding funds. In 2006-2007, the City started the renovation of East Mountain Park. Work was financed with a combination of City funds and State bonding monies. The first phase of the renovation has been completed and includes newly graded fields, three new ball diamonds, a new playground, a new parking area with handicapped accessibility, new park furniture and drinking fountains. The second phase is pending upon receipt of

additional state funds and will include a gazebo, new fencing, a basketball court, spray pool and paved walking trail.

The City also finished its renovations of Fairlawn Park, a small community park in the East End of Waterbury at the corner of Homestead and Woodlawn Avenues. Renovations were funded with a combination of state bonding funds and LOCIP funds and included a new playground, basketball court, handicapped accessible sidewalks and irrigation system.

Planning work commenced for the improvements to the natural resources in Fulton Park, a large park located in the north central area of Waterbury (Census Tract 3510.00-2) adjacent to Overlook, Crownbrook, Hillside and other North End neighborhoods. The City received an EPA Water Quality Grant in 2004 to create a plan to clean the three large ponds in the park, filter out non-point source pollution, and address algae remediation. During the past year a consultant has been chosen to perform the assessments and engineering and meetings with CT. DEP have commenced. The park is a large facility and true gem in the center of Waterbury as it was designed by the architect of New York's Central Park.

A significant accomplishment for the City was the renovation of Municipal Stadium that was completed in September, 2007. Renovations included the installation of artificial turf, field remediation and the installation of a new scoreboard. The City invested \$650,000 of its own funds and 1.5 million in state bonding funds. The stadium services many of the local sports leagues, and school teams from elementary to high school level throughout the City.

(c) Seek additional sources of funding for the maintenance of City parks and recreation facilities

In the 2006-2007 program year, the City of Waterbury received its completed Master Park Plan. The Plan surveys the conditions of all park/recreation facilities throughout the City and identifies improvements that need to be made and issues having to do with code compliance. The Bureau of Parks will use the Master Plan to prioritize its renovations and generate long-term schedules. The Plan will also be used as a tool to apply for additional grant monies from a variety of state, federal and private sources.

The City also worked with the Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments to pursue additional federal funds that would contribute toward the financing of an engineering feasibility study for the Naugatuck River Greenway project. The study would propose routing options for the greenway with associated costs. This study is the next necessary step prior to the choosing of a route and going to construction. The proposed greenway would serve as an alternative transportation route and recreational trail. It would also function as a linear park, linking neighborhoods together throughout Waterbury along its 7.1 mile length.

(d) Create additional opportunities for recreation in underserved neighborhoods

In the past year the City has worked to meet the needs of underserved neighborhoods through the support of park renovations at Fairlawn Park and

East Mountain Park. The City has also worked with neighborhood residents and Greater Waterbury Interfaith Ministries to support the creation of inner-city community gardens on vacant lots. One such garden is completed and flourishing in the Crownbrook neighborhood. Others are in the planning stages.

Goal #4: Improve Public Transportation Service and Access for all City Residents

Supporting objectives under this goal include:

(a) Create an intermodal transportation center

Progress has been made on this long-term project. WDC has an assistance agreement with the State Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) to administer the transportation center project, which is now being called the "Waterbury Transportation Center." WDC has retained JCJ architects for architectural engineering and conceptual design services. In addition, 18 million dollars for construction is on the state bonding commission agenda to be taken up this year.

(b) Improve public transportation

The City's Engineering Office continued to perform routine maintenance work, replace faded traffic and street signs, re-paint faded pavement markings and install new signage throughout the City. Senior needs and social services had been identified as a high-priority community development need in the 5-year Consolidated Plan (p.5). The 2006-2007 Annual Plan identified the Waterbury Senior Shuttle as a project meeting that need and set a goal of serving 400 seniors for the program year. The City continued to operate the **Waterbury Senior Shuttle** Service (\$65,078 CDBG grant) which provides transportation for seniors throughout the city. The program is based upon a pre-determined number of paid rides (900) for seniors per month. Trips are for medical appointments, grocery shopping and recreation activities. Seniors pay a minimum token amount per ride. In addition, the Greater Waterbury Transportation District (GWTD) operates Dial-a-Ride which gives Waterbury Seniors access to areas outside the City, as the program is regionally based. The Dial-A-Ride program is funded through a non-competitive state grant. Funding of the Senior Shuttle serves as a match to access that grant. Waterbury is one of eight municipalities that comprise the GWTD.

Goal #5: Revitalization of the Main Street District of Census Tract 3501

Supporting objectives under this goal include:

(a) Improve the general aesthetic appearance of the area

Accomplishments in the revitalization of the Main Street District of Census Tract 3501 have occurred through a cooperative effort of Waterbury residents, nonprofits, businesses, Waterbury Main Street, the City of Waterbury and the WDC. Throughout 2006-2007, a Downtown Committee comprising several organizations met regularly to take steps towards the establishment of a downtown village district and the promotion of mixed-income downtown housing. The Main Street organization continued its

Clean Team activities and raised funds for a downtown street banner program. The downtown Ambassador program continues to operate successfully and more areas throughout the downtown were adopted as part of the City's Adopt-A-Spot program.

(b) Promote mixed use housing

This objective is primarily in the planning stages, although the City is in discussion with property owners who are assembling parcels of land downtown with the goal of creating a mixed-use, mixed-income project.

(c) Promote new businesses and support existing businesses

The WDC Business Growth group is focused upon the retention and growth of existing businesses and the attraction of new businesses to the City (see Goal #2) as a whole, but also works in tandem with Main Street Waterbury on business retention and attraction in the downtown area low-moderate income census tract.

(d) Restore/repair business facades

A façade program was initiated two years ago with CDBG funds under "**Commercial Rehabilitation.**" The program grew out of an identified need in the 5-year Plan to maintain and improve neighborhood facilities (p.5). The 2006-2007 Annual Plan project "Commercial Rehabilitation" set a goal of three commercial facades for the 2006-2007 program year. The project line has a balance of \$225,000. No funds have been expended on this project although eight applications were received. During the past year, WDC staff worked to get the first façade project off the ground, but no bids were received. Staff started a re-tooling of the project with Main Street Waterbury with the goal of making the façade program more user-friendly, while still HUD compliant. Staff researched similar CDBG funded façade programs in other states in order to assess the inherent weaknesses/difficulties in the present façade program as designed.

(e) Renovation of City Hall

The renovation of City Hall is finally moving forward after a referendum failed to approve a proposed renovation plan design. Following the turn-down at referendum, opposing political factions agreed to compromise on a plan. The compromise plan did not go to referendum, as no petitions for referendum were submitted. Work on City Hall is progressing. WDC will manage the project according to the approved Plan.

(f) Support local events

Event planning to revitalize the downtown continues to move forward with collaborative efforts of the City of Waterbury, the Chamber of Commerce, Main Street Waterbury, downtown businesses, the University of Connecticut-Waterbury, the Palace Theater and various nonprofits and residents. The Farmer's Market expanded its efforts through the support of grants. Main Street Waterbury held a Downtown Draw, the 2nd annual Waterbury Brew Fest, "Eat Your Art Out," a downtown Tag Sale and

numerous holiday and seasonal events aimed at drawing people to downtown Waterbury. The downtown businesses sponsored a large Halloween extravaganza, drawing over 4,000 children to the downtown area. City departments have also started holding more events on the downtown Green and in Library Park.

Goal #6: The Support of the Continuance or Expansion of Social Service Agencies/Programs that Provide Care, Treatment, Housing or Assistance for the Homeless, Disabled, Elderly, Impoverished, or Persons with Special Needs or Substance Abuse Problems

The City and the WDC sought to fulfill this goal through the direction of a full 15% of its total 2006-2007 CDBG funding allocation of \$2,306,582 to eligible public service agencies, programs and activities. *Social services were identified in the Consolidated Plan (p.5) as a high priority.* The City worked with these agencies to provide input and support of programs throughout the year. Two agencies, Pride Inc. and the Commission on Aging dissolved/disbanded during the program year. Their allocated funds were re-directed to the Waterbury Senior Shuttle program and to the YMCA 2007 summer camp program. With the exception of these two agencies, the 2006-2007 allocated funds for Community Development to social service agencies were totally expended as defined in the 2006-2007 Annual Action Plan.

Through the ESG funding allocation of \$98,596, the City and the WDC supported programs delivering emergency shelter services administered by Family Services of Waterbury, Inc., the Morris Foundation, Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury, the Salvation Army and the St. Vincent DePaul Society. Funds were totally expended.

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

2. The program is functioning well. However, the recipient (WDC through the City of Waterbury) made a number of changes this year so that the program would operate more smoothly and in concert with HUD goals and objectives. WDC, in concert with the City of Waterbury, subcontracted for the writing of a new Citizen Participation Plan (CPP). The Plan provided more specific and detailed enumeration of how citizens could and should become more involved in the Consolidated and Annual Plan process, the amendment process, the CAPER and general public outreach. The result of the new CPP was the formulation of a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), a seventeen member group that would oversee the HUD process. Care was taken in the constitution of the Committee. Whereas in prior years, the majority of decision-makers had been elected officials, the new CAC is made primarily of neighborhood representatives from low-moderate income census tracts, representatives from a variety of social service agencies, the Public Housing Authority, the Planning Commission, one representative from the Mayor's Office and three elected officials. Out of the 17 members, 11 members live in low-moderate income census tracts. The percentage of low-moderate income representation increases dramatically when one adds the delegates from various social services serving the low-moderate income community. In addition seven members or 40% can be classified as representing an ethnic minority. This constitutes a dramatic shift in decision-making to stakeholders in the process. In addition, the entire process was started over again, with re-notification and new public hearings and meetings. At the same time, WDC staff

revised the CDBG/ESG application process and forms to match with goals and objectives enumerated in the proposed amendment to the Consolidated Plan that was submitted and approved. An objective point-based system of evaluating applications was also created. To enable these changes, as well as providing for better timeliness in the execution of outdoor projects, the program year was changed to October 1-September 30.

The WDC and the City also started the process for a new Impediments to Fair Housing Analysis. An RFP was written and bids received. A consultant was chosen and the new Plan is expected in early spring, 2008.

Other changes are expected to be made in the upcoming year, as a result of our experiences in the past year. The WDC intends to research and augment its Title 3 language in its programs. Staff have also begun to look into methodology used by other successful cities to evaluate neighborhoods, conditions and existing potential in order to arrive at more objective and more leverage-producing investment decisions. WDC, through the City of Waterbury, has gone out to bid for a consultant for a new Consolidated Plan 2008-2013.

In terms of procedure, the new CAC has expressed an interest in fine-tuning the new application format and evaluation procedure. They also intend to form a sub-committee to visit the various social service agencies that are funded, so they can personally familiarize themselves with the programs. WDC staff are encouraging all agencies to send announcements of events and activities for inclusion in their program files and is notifying CAC members of all announcements so that they can attend.

The staff is reformatting the filing system so that all information is more accessible and includes easily-understandable project descriptions by project line item, so that new staff can more easily familiarize themselves with the history of a project and/or funding line item. They will also develop an updated monitoring plan that can be given to grant recipients.

A major consideration, as a result of experiences in the past year, is a re-evaluation of the project load that WDC CDBG/ESG/HOME staff can handle. There may need to be an assessment of the number of social service agencies that staff can realistically fund and monitor and a review by staff and the CAC of what types of agencies and for how long that funding should continue. Due to the non-performance of the downtown commercial façade program, WDC staff will need to revamp the program to make it more user friendly and more appealing to downtown property owners, while looking to make the work load on staff more stream-lined and easier to handle.

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.**

3. a-b. The City of Waterbury performed an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing in 1996. A new analysis is currently underway. Five impediments were identified in 1996 and an Action Plan was developed stating short and long-term recommendations to correct the impediments. These impediments and corrective actions have been updated for this document.

The fair housing impediments identified have led to a series of recommendations focused on internal and external policy/program changes and the implementation of specific actions. Some of the impediments raised in the 1996 study were related to the need to revise the City's Fair Housing Policy statement and Affirmative Action Plan. Those actions were taken shortly thereafter in April, 1997. Other impediments were long-term and systemic:

Impediment: Need for Affordable Housing and Cost Burden Strategy

The impediment identified in 1996 centered on the need to create safer, affordable housing through the rehabilitation of older housing stock and the development of a program that would help owners and/or investors deal with the cost of rehabilitation. The impediment also cited the need to address lead issues in older housing stock.

Action Taken: The City and WDC, through its HOME program, its efforts to support CHDO developments, and its support of Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury (NHS) has taken steps to address this concern throughout the past several years. This past year, the City and WDC also took steps, through funding, to support the development of two large scale neighborhood housing revitalization plans in significantly distressed neighborhoods. One such project is the neighborhood re-development plan around a future new elementary school along North Main Street in the North End of Waterbury. The second planned revitalization project is being implemented by Loyola Development in the South End of Waterbury surrounding St. Anne's Church. Both projects call for the rehabilitation of older housing stock, along with the demolition of vacant, abandoned buildings and the creation of new, affordable housing.

In terms of lead, the City of Waterbury, through the Health Department, is continuing their successful administration of "Waterbury Eliminates Health Hazards," a multi-million dollar lead abatement program. In addition, the City, through the WDC, has identified lead abatement as a priority in the administration of its HOME program.

Impediment: Housing for Special Needs Persons and Handicapped Persons

This impediment centered on the fact that there was an unsettling dual use of Section 8 properties by the elderly and the disabled/handicapped.

Action Taken: The City has supported revisions to HUD property management guidelines that eliminate incompatible dual uses of Section 8 facilities. It has also supported programs that provide set-asides for disabled persons such as those administered by NO, Inc. and the Continuum of Care. The City continues to support programs that help remove barriers to affordable housing in the area of transportation (The Waterbury Senior Shuttle and Greater Waterbury Transit District programs), recreation programs, special services and health.

Impediment: Lack of Assistance to Neighborhood Groups wishing to become NRZ organizations and/or lack of support for solving immediate neighborhood concerns.

Action Taken: The City is encouraging neighborhood-based organizations to "plan" effectively for their neighborhood revitalization efforts through a variety of means. Although not every group may wish to become a state-designated NRZ (Neighborhood Revitalization Zone), the WDC Neighborhood Re-Investment Group

supports and encourages projects and/or planning efforts of local organizations. These organizations include geographically-based neighborhood associations as well as civic organizations dedicated to the improvement of their neighborhood, housing nonprofits, ethnic-based organizations, sports organizations, and professional organizations. For example, in the past year, PAL (Police Activity League) acquired the former St. Lucy's School and Gymnasium in the North End of Waterbury, adjacent to the site of a future new elementary school. The City contributed funds toward the purchase and the PAL facility is now a cornerstone in the re-development of this area. The City, through WDC, has also worked with the St. Margaret/Willow Plaza NRZ in the building of the new Elmwood Community Center which the organization staffs and operates. The WDC, through CDBG funds, supports this NRZ-run Center, as well as the operation of the WOW-NRZ Community Learning Center and the River Baldwin Recreation Center.

The WDC, in the past year, has partnered with the Connecticut Foundation to offer legal seminars to area organizations on incorporation and creation of nonprofit. The WDC continues to work with groups looking for assistance in grant applications. In addition, the WDC partners in applications for state funds with neighborhood associations who are not nonprofits and are looking to implement their neighborhood improvement projects.

The City has set up a Citizen Service Center in City Hall to address everyday neighborhood concerns. In addition, in the past year, the City has strengthened its ant-litter and blight program in response to neighborhood calls for additional resources to be devoted to these areas.

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 it would like to make and needs to make. The City continues to fund most of its infrastructure needs through its Capital Improvements Plan. Having completed its Master Parks Plan in the 2006-2007 year, the City is hoping to generate more private, state, and federal grants that will support the rehabilitation of recreation facilities throughout the City. In the past year, the City has started to examine in depth its housing needs. It has funded a new Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Analysis (AI). It is engaging in meetings and financial support of Loyola Development, an organization devoted to the revitalization of a South End neighborhood. The City has also gone to proposal for a consultant to write the upcoming 2008-2013 Consolidated Plan. The hope is that the consultant will also identify additional resources and ways to leverage resources that will help the City meet its underserved needs. In order to address its continuing financial obstacles, the City has made wise choices in its allocation of HUD dollars, continued its pursuit of all types of partnerships, looked to develop partnerships with private organizations and volunteer-based nonprofits, and encouraged local nonprofits to aggressively seek additional private and public funding. The Connecticut Foundation has recently opened up a grants center downtown and purchased software that will allow organizations to access private grant web sites. Previously organizations had to travel out of town to use other city/town libraries that offered these software programs. The Foundation is also offering technical assistance to nonprofits on grant researching and writing.

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 also in "Attachments," along with maps."

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-c. 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, as well as technical assistance, is 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.

In 2006-2007, \$833,123.94 was spent on the renovation of Washington Park, a community park that serves a low-moderate income service area. The City did not spend its local funds on this park/public facility project. For the renovation of the River Baldwin Recreation Center \$300,000 in CDBG funds were expended. This project was leveraged with \$800,000 in State Department of Social Services funds. Although no local funds were leveraged for Washington Park, it should be noted that the City of Waterbury's Park Bureau under-funded and is faced with pending renovations for many of its City park facilities. It has recently completed a master Parks Plan which will allow the City to more effectively compete for outside grant dollars. However, the City still looks to CDBG to help in the funding of parks that are in the substandard condition and serve low-moderate income residents. Otherwise, with its budget restraints, these parks might not be rehabilitated or would be done in piecemeal fashion. In 2006-2007, the City of Waterbury leveraged its CDBG investments with \$625,000 of municipal funds and state funds totaling \$3,223,000.00. Parks funded with these resources included two community parks servicing low-moderate income residents-Town Plot Park and Fairlawn Park.

In 2006-2007, \$466,905.90 in CDBG funds were spent on the milling and paving of City streets in low-moderate income census tracts, where the streets primarily served local residents. The City contributed \$991,640.68 towards milling/paving and road reconstruction.

In 2006-2007, a total of \$339,714.28 in CDBG funds were expended on reconstruction of sidewalks in eligible low-moderate income neighborhoods where

the sidewalks primarily served low-moderate income residents. On the CDBG funded North Main Street sidewalk project, the City contributed \$282,195.00. On the Chase School sidewalk project, the City contributed \$77,209.32. The City therefore leveraged \$359,404.32 against the \$339,714.28 CDBG investment in the two sidewalk projects.

The Baldwin Street Firehouse project received an investment of \$100,565.62 in CDBG funds for the 2006-2007 year. There was no leveraging of funds in this project. There are a number of older firehouses in poor physical condition serving low-moderate income service areas in low-moderate income neighborhoods that are in need of repair.

In 2006-2007, CDBG dollars funded the demolition of four properties for \$69,749.14. Demolition efforts were leveraged by \$274,404.00 with federal Neighborhood Initiative Grant monies totaling \$272,404.00.

In 2006-2007 \$386,409.35 was allocated in CDBG funds for masonry repairs at Tinker and Wilson schools. The City of Waterbury Department of Education is requesting \$200,000 in the City 2008-2009 budget for additional repairs to Tinker School to complete the rehabilitation of this school facility. In 2006-2007 the City leveraged \$65,969.00 of its funds on the Tinker School project.

The City satisfied its match requirement for HOME and ESG. Due to project specific matching and a RAP match from New Opportunities, Inc. in excess of 12 million dollars, the City's HOME match requirement is satisfied for the foreseeable future.

The ESG Family Service allocation leveraged and matched with local government funds of \$657,036.00 and other funds of \$66,066.00. The Morris Foundation allocation was matched and leveraged with other federal funds of \$16,695.00, local government funds of \$127,747.00, private funds of \$4,557.00 and fees of \$49,029.00. The Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury allocation was matched and leveraged with \$613,000.00 in other federal funds, \$227,500.00 of private donations and \$307,000.00 in other donations. The St. Vincent DePaul allocation was matched and leveraged with other federal funds of \$24,600.00, local government funds of \$412,000.00, private funds of \$156,114.00, and \$82,000.00 in other donations. The Salvation Army allocation was matched and leveraged with \$13,406.00 in federal funds, \$207,646.51 in local government funds, and \$28,560.00 in private funds.

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 2006-2007, all HUD regulations were followed to ensure that each activity that was funded had the potential to be completed. Funding decisions for the 2006-2007 Annual Action Plan were made in the prior program year by a

Consolidated Plan Committee comprised of five members of the City's Board of Aldermen and ten members of the WDC Neighborhood Reinvestment Committee. The first public hearing was advertised in the paper on January 17, 2006. The hearing was held before the Consolidated Plan Committee on February 22, 2006. The Consolidated Plan Committee then held several workshops to review proposals. A second public hearing was properly noticed and then held on March 22, 2006. The draft 2006-2007 Annual Action Plan was placed on file for public review at the City Clerk's Office, the Silas Bronson Library and the WDC for a 30-day period commencing April 3, 2006. It was approved by the Board of Aldermen on May 8, 2006 and submitted to HUD on May 19, 2006.

In 2007, the WDC and the City of Waterbury spent considerable time reviewing its comprehensive planning procedures. WDC staff spent several months researching best practices in other Cities and towns and engaged legal counsel in improving the local decision-making process along with the citizen participation element that underlies that process for the next program year 2007-2008. A new Citizen Participation Plan (CPP) was written and approved by the City. Part of that Plan involved the creation of a 17-member Citizen Advisory Committee or CAC. Great care was taken that a 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 fact that Waterbury lacks a district system of electing its legislative body was a compelling factor in the creation of seats for the Committee that represented the broad spectrum of low-moderate income census tracts throughout the City. The CAC was formed in late April of 2007. Once formed, the CAC undertook a rigorous schedule of public monthly meetings, not only to ensure that Annual Process could meet its August 15, 2007 deadline, but also to learn about the Consolidated Plan process. The CAC, in many cases, met weekly, or more than once a week to ensure that the process moved forward in a timely matter. WDC staff distributed informational materials for the new CAC, which was briefed by City and private counsel as to Freedom of Information responsibilities and Robert's Rules of Order.

WDC staff also prepared a new application for proposals that would guide the process and dovetailed the amended objectives and goals to the application for tracking of projects. The application was complemented by an application evaluation sheet that assigned objective point values to questions/sections of the application. This was done to ensure fairness and objectivity in the evaluation of proposals. Objective, point-assigned evaluations had been recommended at a local CDBG roundtable discussion held in 2007.

WDC staff serve the CAC in terms of documenting meeting minutes and materials, notifying the City Clerk's office of meetings, mailing/calling individual CAC members, printing agendas etc. WDC staff also attend every CAC meeting to brief the Committee on upcoming issues, progress on Annual Plan projects and the entire planning process in general. This past year, the City amended its 5-year Consolidated Plan to a 3-year Plan. Consequently, the City went out to bid for a consultant for the new Plan. The Chairman of the CAC served on the team interviewing candidates.

The CAC and WDC followed its CPP and HUD regulations and held the required public hearings during the year, provided technical outreach, made the proper public notices to satisfy HUD and Freedom of Information and operated in such a manner

as to assure a fair process. Upon receipt of applications, the CAC held a public hearing during which time all applicants were required to make a presentation and answer questions by the CAC concerning their requests for funding. It held a number of public meetings to deliberate openly and fairly on the applications. Each member used the point-based evaluation form to review the applications and open discussion took place on each and every application as to why it should be funded and how much it should be funded. With approximately thirty application and seventeen CAC members, staff reproduced more than 510 multi-page evaluation forms so that each application for CDBG funds received a point-based evaluation by each member of the CAC. The CAC held a public hearing, as did the City's Board of Aldermen, on the proposed funding allocations. After submitting the Annual Plan to HUD in August, the WDC held a mandatory orientation for all awardees to brief them as to the reporting requirements and the contract process.

In the past year WDC staff have collected the required reporting information from funding recipients to gauge compliance with HUD regulations, including monthly direct benefit reports and performance measurements and outcomes put forth by each program applicant. This was done in order to evaluate the effectiveness of HUD funded programs and ensure that the City receives HUD funding. WDC staff also was available to applicants to technically assist them in meeting HUD regulations.

In March of 2005, HUD's Office of Community Planning Development (CPD) established and published notice in the Federal Register requiring grantees to implement a new CPD Outcome Performance Measurement System. The system allows HUD to readily access available data from grant recipients, aggregate the data nationally to demonstrate the positive impact housing and community development decision programs are making at the national level and communicate program results to funding decision makers and the public. The City of Waterbury is using this new system to assess and demonstrate its progress in addressing its high priority needs.

When funding an activity, the City determines which of the three objectives best describes the purpose of the activity (Suitable Living Environment, Decent Housing, Creating Economic Opportunities). Once the objective for the activity is identified, the City determines which of the three outcome categories best reflects what the City seeks to achieve by funding the activity (Availability/Accessibility, Affordability, Sustainability).

The WDC and CAC require applicants to provide a proposed outcome, performance measure and actual outcome. The applicant is responsible for keeping data to support the estimated outcome. This data is reported to WDC staff so that staff and the CAC can judge the success of the program. WDC staff work with applicants on their proposals to make sure that applicants understand the terminology and that they propose realistic outcomes and quantifiable performance measures. The end result should be the ensuring of production and accountability, compliance and consistency with HUD regulations, and the ability to evaluate organizational and project performance.

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:

1. Provide a summary of citizen comments.

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. The hard copy of the CAPER that was provided to the public included the CAPER narrative, CPMP project worksheets, 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 project worksheets, 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 Monday, December 10, 2007. The public was invited to comment for 15-day period that started Tuesday, December 11, 2007 at 8:00 a.m. and concluded Wednesday, December 26, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. The public was informed that all comments would be incorporated into the CAPER. The following is the text of the notice published in the Republican-American:

NOTICE TO PUBLIC
CITY OF WATERBURY
CONSOLIDATED ANNUAL PERFORMANCE & EVALUATION REPORT (CAPER)
PROGRAM YEAR 2006-2007

The Waterbury Development Corporation (WDC), on behalf of the City of Waterbury, has completed the 2006-2007 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 11, 2007 for citizen participation viewing at the City Clerk's Office, 236 Grand Street, the WDC, 24 Leavenworth Street, and at the Silas Bronson Library, 267 Grand Street, Waterbury. The CAPER narrative can be viewed at www.waterburyct.org and www.wdconline.org. Written/oral comments will be considered until 5:00 p.m. on December 26, 2007. Citizens should contact:

The Waterbury Development Corporation
Neighborhood Re-Investment Group
ATTN: Kathleen McNamara, Community Planning & Development Coordinator
24 Leavenworth Street, Waterbury, CT 06702
(203)346-2607 Ext. 115

R&A: December 10, 2007

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.**

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

Institutional Structure

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Institutional Structure response:

The City of Waterbury and the WDC have made a concerted effort 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. WDC staff and the Mayor's office sit on the Continuum of Care. This past year they have been meeting with the Continuum of Care (COC) to help plan a City strategy to develop a Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness. The Mayor's Office also stays informed through meetings of COC needs and grant applications through meetings with the COC. The Mayor's Office and WDC meet regularly with Main Street Waterbury, Waterbury Neighborhood Housing Services and the newly formed Loyola Development on issues related to neighborhood development. WDC staff also work closely with and maintain staff linkages with City departments, including the Office of the Mayor, the Planning Department, Public Works, the Waterbury Housing Authority, Fire and Police departments and the Health Department.

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

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

WDC staff take seriously their role 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.
2. Describe the results of your monitoring including any improvements.
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:

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 Program Specialist and advisory counsel. The City of Waterbury Risk Manager reviewed insurance requirements for the agencies. Upon successful completion of their contracts, agencies were able to request 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.

The WDC Program Specialist held a general meeting of all funded agencies at the beginning of the program year to explain regulations regarding program compliance and reporting concerns. At this point, monthly directed benefit reports were distributed along with step-by-step instructions for accurately completing the reports. WDC staff monitored the submission of the DBARs to make sure the forms were filled out correctly and submitted on a timely basis. The agencies were in compliance and no findings were issued. The WDC Program Specialist also offered regular technical assistance throughout the year to sub-recipients and was in regular contact with all agencies funded. In addition, WDC staff collected reports from agencies relating to actual project outcomes.

City departments aided in the monitoring of CDBG projects and worked closely with the WDC Program Specialist who monitored certified payroll reports, visited project sites, and coordinated program work.

Housing rehabilitation projects administered with HOME funds were also monitored closely by WDC staff from the application stage through completion. HOME funded rental properties require that income and rents be monitored on an annual basis. Rental property owners were required to fill out and submit the HOME Rental Project Compliance Reports (Form 6-D) Owners were also provided with the most current income and rent limits along with utility allowances. Projects that were under construction were monitored throughout construction. Payments were only processed after the required paperwork was received and an inspection of the work was conducted at the site with the homeowner, contractor and Building Official. All parties, including the WDC Housing/Neighborhood Specialist, were required to sign off on a payment request before being processed. This year, Daystar Housing Inspections, LLC. was hired to conduct our on-site monitorings of our rental properties. Inspections are being completed for all HOME assisted rental properties currently under their affordability period.

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

As a result of its monitoring activities, WDC staff have found that clients, whether they be CDBG, ESG or HOME, better understand HUD requirements regarding recipients of HUD funding. They also better understand the responsibilities of the entitlement jurisdiction in terms of collection of data that tracks the positive results of funded programs.

Participants in the HOME program have a greater understanding of their responsibilities. The monitoring database's information was updated and used to determine which properties were required to be monitored. If property owners had problems with compliance, WDC staff worked with property owners to resolve compliance issues. There were no defaults in 2006-2007.

Many of the programs that have been funded with CDBG have been funded in the past and WDC staff are familiar with the programs and their principal staff. However, monitoring allows staff to track changes in programs, understand any problems programs might be experiencing in the present or will be experiencing in the future, and get to know new staff.

3. Self Evaluation

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

3. a. The HOME program has continued to help alleviate blight on a spot basis and improve the general appearance of a street in a blighted area, particularly when the individual property was extremely rundown. It has, in some cases, started spin-offs of neighborhood improvements, as adjacent property owners start to become interested in repairing and maintaining their properties. The renovations have also created safe, affordable housing for the tenants or property owners, without which they might still be living in substandard housing. HOME funds have continued to create more lead-safe housing units and to address code-related issues. The HOME program will have a greater impact in the future as changes are made to target HOME funds towards specific geographic areas where in combination with CDBG and other leveraged resources, a greater visual statement and yielding of private investment will be realized.

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

3. b. The City believes that HOME funds have greatly helped Waterbury make significant progress towards its objective of rehabilitating existing, older housing stock throughout disinvested neighborhoods, thus offering low-moderate income citizens safe, well-maintained and affordable choices in housing, whether rental, investor-owned or owner-occupied. The projects chosen for HOME funding have been in keeping with the priorities of local residents and neighborhood associations, as well as those of our Consolidated Plan, which call for investing in pre-existing, older housing stock and to the greatest degree possible, owner-occupied single-family (per HUD definition) homes or buildings in order to increase neighborhood home ownership, pride and involvement. The implementation of the ADDI program has provided individuals and families with the opportunity to own their own home. Without this assistance, it may not have been possible for these individuals to be homeowners.

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

Our response to the first question of this CAPER (Assessment of one-year goals and objectives) summarized in detail the achievement of specific goals and objectives, which projects were completed and which are still underway or are non-performing and why. We believe that achieving all the goals, needs and objectives will be a long-term process in Waterbury. Waterbury has made substantial gains in the past several years, as its finances have become more stable, in being able to invest more of its dollars in planning. The City produced its first new Plan of Conservation and Development in over thirty years and this year is revising its land use laws and re-drawing its zoning map. It also is discussing the mechanics of creating a 10-Year Plan to End homeless. On the HUD front, the City has made significant steps at improving the HUD process, not only in the area of procedure and citizen participation, but in looking to understand how it might change its approach to allocation of HUD funds and target HUD investments in order to realize higher private investment. This is a large step forward in that the City is looking to be more creative and progressive in how it approaches community development in general. The City is actively supporting, with its own dollars, apart from CDBG, the support of

housing nonprofits that it sees have great potential to revitalize neighborhoods. It is targeting its brownfields rehabilitation efforts in heavily disinvested areas of the City in the South End. It is also supporting the building of a 7.1 mile greenway along the Naugatuck River, a greenway that would run through severely blighted industrial areas along the banks of the River and link neighborhoods lying along that River. It is looking at a variety of financing tools that it realizes it will need to implement in order make even greater progress in its City and its neighborhoods, including Weed and Seed, Tax increment financing, tax abatements, expansion of enterprise zones etc.

With the amending of the City's original 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan to a 3-year Plan, the City is signaling its intent to move forward in its new Consolidated Plan with a more targeted, progressive focus in its investment of HUD funds, in line with other City investments and financial strategies. This includes HOME funds as well, as the City looks to better define its housing polices and strategies in the new upcoming Plan to move forward in concert with its vision in of City and neighborhood revitalization.

If one were to look at projects completed during the 2006-2007 year, one would therefore say that each and every one met its objective and played a part in taking one more step towards fulfilling the defined goal. School facilities, community centers and parks were improved, roads and sidewalks in blighted neighborhoods constructed, blighted buildings acquired and 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. HOME funds were dedicated to the rehabilitations of existing housing stock. HOME funds helped families and investors create and maintain safe and decent affordable housing by financially assisting and educating the property owners in the rehabilitation of their buildings. As previously mentioned, the implementation of ADDI has made it possible for low-moderate income families to afford the purchase of their homes. Rehabilitation also created more energy efficient units that helped lower utility bills for both homeowners and renters of HOME-assisted units. HOME funds have also helped create more lead-safe units in a city where its housing stock consists of a large number of units built before 1978. Lead and code issues are a priority of the HOME program. For some properties, HOME funds helped prevent the further deterioration of a building, which allowed the unit(s) to remain safe, decent and affordable. In other cases, these funds provided homeowners on a fixed income the assistance needed to maintain a safe living environment; without the funds they might not have had the ability to stay in their own home. Per HUD requirements, HOME funds resolved many lead and code issues in the rehabilitated units.

HOME dollars funded 18 projects, constituting forty units of decent housing with a suitable living environment. In addition, 69 units are underway and were worked upon at various levels during the 2006-2007 program year. These units include very visible projects along the major north-south neighborhood gateway of Willow Street (Census Tract 3508.00 3-4) and are expected to have a major effect on the immediate neighborhood. In sum, \$163,222.60 of HOME program income was expended and \$799,857.12 (inclusive of income) on HOME projects.

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. Most activities were on schedule this year and we are meeting our timeliness factor. The commercial façade program is behind schedule in terms of its original projections as to how many facades would be completed. This program will receive added attention this year and may need to be remodeled in order to attract contractors that will bid upon individual façade projects. This has been a stumbling block to the program moving forward. WDC staff have researched similar commercial facade programs funded by CDBG dollars with similar project dollar limits and staff will work in the upcoming year improve the program.

Fire Station Improvements are behind schedule. Monies have been expended for architectural services and for new windows for the facility in the past year. WDC staff have met with Fire department officials and architects for the project. A major stumbling block to initiating this project has been the relocation of firefighters who now reside at the Baldwin Street station at the same time that another major fire house on Field Street is being shut down for remodeling as part of the City Hall renovation project. According to recent discussions with the Fire Department, the project may be getting off the ground in spring, 2008.

Due to the absence of a Construction Specialist and the new HUD rule on program income, the City has a challenge in meeting its July 31, 2008 commitment and expenditure deadline. With the hiring of a new Construction Specialist however, we can now move forward to meet the challenges of the projects on our waiting list and move toward making all of our commitment deadlines.

3. e. Activities and strategies have made a significant impact on identified needs in that each activity has answered a piece of the need, although there is still a long way to go in each of our identified focus areas that have been defined by our needs. Rehabilitation of older housing stock is still a formidable task and will be met by HOME appropriations in upcoming years. To move more quickly to meet housing needs in terms of housing rehabilitation, the City needs to attract more housing non-profits to our City, thereby easing the load of the public sector through investments in the private sector. The City looks forward to a newly-reorganized Waterbury Neighborhood Housing Services to contribute to easing this burden and to the successful organization of the new Loyola Development. 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. The dedication of the full 15% of CDBG funds towards social service programs continues to receive support from the City and 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. Indicators for the success of the HOME program are the number of units completed and underway. Another general indicator of HOME success is the continued high public interest in the program with a waiting list for future HOME funds. Another indicator is the number of individuals renting an assisted unit with income and rent restrictions which allow them a safe, decent place to live. Indicators for CDBG/ESG include performance measures and actual outcomes that appear in the CPMP project tables. In addition, competition for CDBG and ESG funds remains highly competitive and the request for funds far outweighs available HUD funding.

3. g. 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 five years. The City's bond rating has improved over the past few years and recently was upgraded again, which bodes well for the future. However, the City is required by local law to make an annual contribution of over 40 million dollars each year to the City's pension fund. It has done so for the past six years and has been able to do so without a significant increase in local taxes, once property reevaluation was implemented. Were this contribution available to meet community development and housing needs, the task of accomplishing identified objectives and goals would be significantly easier.

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

A barrier that still remains, but is currently being addressed, is the City's current approval process as related to procurement and contracts. Steps are being made to improve that process.

3. h. Major CDBG/ESG /HOME goals are on target. The CDBG commercial façade program needs re-working, but those efforts are underway.

3. i. There are no major adjustments to strategies or objectives, other than those already discussed. A comprehensive evaluation of strategies and activities will take place during the upcoming 5-year Consolidated Plan process. An improvement to the HOME program that would better meet our needs more effectively would be the creation of targeted neighborhoods. This would allow the City's HOME Program to be apparent and have a bigger impact.

Lead-based Paint

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Lead-based Paint response:

1. 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.

Case management included:

- Risk Assessment conducted for BLL >10 ug/dL
- Education material sent to families with children identified with BLL of 10ug/dL-19ug/dL
- Individualized case management services provided to families with BLL of 10ug/dL-19ug/dL
- >20ug/dL epidemiological investigation Environmental Case Management (Lead Inspector):
 - Risk Assessment conducted for BLL > 10ug/dL
 - Environmental investigations provided when BLL are >20ug/dL
 - Enforcement of Connecticut State Statues
 - 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.

Currently, W.E.L.H. has 76 units receiving lead hazard reduction during this reporting period. These units will be added to the database 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 Seatbelt Safety Housing Inspections
Woman Infant Children Urban Asthma Program Putting on the Airst
HCWC Lead Safe Homes IAP PPD Screenings
Identification and Eliminate Lead Hazards
School Nursing Services to all Public, Parochial and Private Schools in Waterbury*

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

Target Population:

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

Geographic Area Served by the Program:

Waterbury is an industrial city of 107,271 persons, occupying 28.9 square miles. Plagued by declining industry, high unemployment, and a shrinking tax base, it is understandable that there is a profusion of low-income residents. In addition, 55.2% of the City's housing stock built before 1960 is substandard and largely rental (46,000 units). The Lead Department has specifically targeted low- income neighborhoods, such as the WOW neighborhood (Walnut, Orange, 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 – 19ug/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 20ug/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 also realizes there is a large population of transient families living in Waterbury. Although the Lead Department has recently purchased a capillary blood lead screening device, it will be unable to identify and screen a large portion of those children not screened or not enrolled into the public school system. The Lead Department will be able to identify and screen those children enrolled into either pre-kindergarten or kindergarten, due to the Health Department mandate that all children enrolled in their first year of school enter with a documented blood lead level. All 38 of the school nurses working in the public, private, and parochial schools are employed through the Health Department. This collaborative relationship between the School Nurses and the staff of the Lead Department increases the number of documented blood lead levels throughout the City, i.e. WATERBURY ELIMINATES LEAD HAZARDS (W.E.L.H.)

Waterbury Eliminates Lead Hazards (W.E.L.H.) is a new facet to the City of Waterbury Department of Public Health. In November of 2005, the Department of Housing and Urban Development awarded the City of Waterbury a three million dollar grant over three years for lead treatment. This funding will allow W.E.L.H. to provide financial assistance to Waterbury residents to remedy lead hazards and exposures in their homes. The vast majority of housing in Waterbury is pre-1950 construction and is plagued with lead-based paint. The primary area of focus for services is communities inclusive of low- income families with young children.

W.E.L.H. is currently staffed with a director, health educator, construction coordinator, compliance officer, and an administrative assistant. Since the program is in its infancy stage, 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.

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

Childhood lead poisoning is a significant preventable environmental health problem in Waterbury. Even minimal amounts of lead in a child's body can have harmful effects. W.E.L.H. is committed to reducing the sources of lead exposure in Waterbury, and looks forward to working with partnering agencies to develop a

comprehensive approach to eliminating lead hazards and preventing lead poisoning.

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:

There have been a number of avenues pursued in the last year by the City to foster and maintain affordable housing. As previously mentioned, NHS provided homebuyer education and counseling to 600 households and 300 new buyers and reverse mortgage counseling to 600 households. They also serviced 65 loans.

In the past program year, HOME funds made 40 units (18 projects) of housing safe and affordable. Of the 18 projects, 17 were home-owner occupied, single-family (1-4 units) and one project was multi-family, investor-owned (5 or more units). In addition, 69 units are underway that were started during the 2006-2007 program year. These units include very visible projects along the major north-south neighborhood gateway of Willow Street (Census Tract 3508.00 3-4) that are being developed by Mutual Housing Services. One of the Mutual Housing projects is a large, 16-unit building. The remainder are single-family (1-4 units). Other affordable housing projects completed in 2006-2007 program year include two additional units built by Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) of Waterbury at Old Farm Ridge. NHS also started the process of acquiring a 3-unit property on West Main Street that it will rehabilitate in 2008 for safe, affordable housing purposes.

In 2006-2007, NHS initiated the process of identifying a strategy to develop clusters of now-vacant buildings in areas of Waterbury that will have the greatest impact on neighborhoods once rehabilitated. They will continue to work on this strategy in upcoming years. NHS also serviced 65 loans through its CDBG Rehabilitation revolving loan funds. These funds include the NHS CDA Loan Program, the NHS Commercial Loan program, the NHS Crownbrook Loan Fund, the NHS NEWPAC Loan Program and the NHS WOW Loan Program. The neighborhoods serviced by these loan funds are located in the central inner-city and comprise Census Tracts 3501.00, 3502.00, 3503.00, 3504.00 and 3508.00.

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 2006-2007, 5 units were extremely were very, very low income (0-30% of median), 9 units were very low (30-50% of median), 1 unit was very low (50-60% of median), and 5 units were low (60-80% of median). An additional 20 units have been completed (for a total of 40 units), but WDC is awaiting information on the tenants.

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.

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:

During the past year, the Waterbury Housing Authority has continued to use funds as requested by HUD under the Capital Fund grant to improve the quality of life for citizens in the City of Waterbury. A new development located on Hamden Avenue in Waterbury (Census Tract 3511.00-1) has been completed and filled to capacity. This development has ten 3-bedroom apartments in a row house design. The Waterbury Housing Authority has also opened three new community centers.

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:

Waterbury Neighborhood Housing continues to administer a Down-Payment Assistance Program. NHS offers technical assistance, first-time homebuyer classes and mortgage counseling to low-moderate income clients looking to enter the housing market. NHS administers the City's ADDI program. In the past year, five households were each given \$10,000 for home down payments. NHS also provides foreclosure prevention and reverse mortgage counseling and runs a program entitled "You Are Home," a financial assistance program for municipal employees.

The City of Waterbury is moving forward in its support of a neighborhood housing revitalization program in Waterbury's South End neighborhood surrounding St. Anne's Church. This project is in its early stages and CDBG funds for the 2007-2008 program year are supporting the construction costs of rehabilitating a basement undercroft to house non-profit agencies that will provide support services for residents in the neighborhood. The City continues to support a neighborhood revitalization program surrounding the proposed new North Main street school site. This project is stalled temporarily while the City seeks to obtain additional state funds for environmental clean-up costs on the site. Capital Access Inc. is under contract for both projects and both plans call for mixed-income housing with single-family homes that are to be made affordable through a number of financing strategies designed to break down traditional barriers to affordability.

As previously mentioned, the City's HOME program provides financial assistance for residential rehabilitation to low-moderate income property owners in order to preserve housing affordability in the City.

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 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan identifies the cultivation of home ownership opportunities, the preservation of existing housing through rehabilitation and the improving of supportive social services to homeowners as high housing priorities (p.22).The amended 2005-2008 Plan clarified the numeric Housing goals to be accomplished with HOME funds. Specific Objective.H-7 set a goal of 40 units of multi-family rental renovations. Specific Objective H-8 set a goal of 23 units of multi-family housing by CHDOs, and H-9 set a goal of rehabilitation and/or construction of 60 single-family housing units. All were high priority. All of these were three year totals and average a projection of approximately 40-41 units per year. In addition, the 2006-2007 Annual Plan project worksheets for HOME Housing Rehabilitation estimated 38 units for rehabilitations with an additional 2 units to be completed by CHDO organizations, for a total goal of 40 units in the year 2006-2007.

The City/WDC continues its improvements in its use of HOME funds. Last year 38 units were in progress. Forty units were completed, of which 20 units were part of a multi-family investor project, and 17 units were homeowner-occupied projects, 3 of which consisted of rental properties. NHS administered both City and State ADDI funds. This program made it possible for eight individuals/households to afford the purchase of their own home in Waterbury (5 households through City ADDI funds and 3 through State ADDI funds)

2. HOME Match Report

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

e.

See Section Five of this report, "HOME APR Report and Match Report."

3. HOME MBE and WBE Report

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

See Section Five of this report, "HOME APR Report and Match Report."

4. Assessments

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

The City has hired Daystar Housing Inspections, LLC. to perform its Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspections of HOME funded rental housing. Daystar began their inspections at the end of the CAPER year; therefore, only the initial results are in. Thirty units were inspected and all units passed. On-site monitoring will continue and is expected to be completed by the end of the year.

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

HOME-funded projects follow HUD’s Affirmative Marketing regulations. WDC HOME staff require owners of five or more unit properties to submit an Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan (HUD-935.2).

c. Describe outreach to minority and women owned businesses.

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

HOMELESS

Homeless Needs

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

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Homeless Needs response:

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

1. a. The City's of Waterbury's Action Plan to address homelessness is centered on an active partnership between the City, its service providers (most of whom are recipients of CDBG and ESG funding) and the Continuum of Care (COC). The COC 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 CCC 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 2006-2007 the COC has met monthly and has 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. During this time, the COC voted to hold a Project Homeless Connect Fair in August of 2008. This is part of a Regional effort to provide a one-stop event to address and overcome the barriers that homeless persons experience in gaining access to resources that would prevent and/or end homelessness for them. Project Homeless Connect is endorsed by the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness. Plans are currently underway to hold the event in Waterbury.

In January of 2007, the City of Waterbury and the Continuum participated in the first state-wide homeless count. The count was overseen by the Corporation for Supportive Housing and was locally coordinated by the Salvation Army. 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.

The Continuum and its members have remained active in the implementation of the HMIS (Homeless Management Information System). The HMIS committee and COC members have continued to attend trainings, workshops, meetings, and conferences held by Connecticut Coalition to End Homelessness (CCEH) to ensure proper implementation of the system within the continuum and participating agencies. The data collected helps the State and HUD to determine priorities in their strategic planning process. The Waterbury Continuum was selected by HUD to participate in the AHAR III and currently has plans to attend the technical assistance trainings that will enable the Continuum to begin gathering this data for HUD as well.

Conferences held by the Connecticut Coalition to End Homelessness (CCEH) in July of 2007, and the National Alliance to End Homelessness in Washington DC (also in July of 2007) were widely attended and provided essential trainings in the most current evidence based methodologies in responding to the issues surrounding homelessness; including helping homeless persons obtain entitlements, connecting resources, legislative advocacy, and Ten-Year planning to End Homelessness for cities and counties.

In an effort to engage a Ten-Year Planning process for the City of Waterbury, the Mayor met with a representative of the Interagency Council on Homelessness and

the Chair of the Continuum of Care. Waterbury Development Corporation has taken the lead in reviewing the way forward in this endeavor.

In an effort to increase access and involvement of the homeless in employment, the Northwest Regional Workforce Investment Board (NRWIB) job developers visited local soup kitchens weekly. The NRWIB also ran the Incumbent Worker Training Program that matches local corporation funds to provide training to workers/homeless in specific fields. The Homeless Outreach Teams from Greater Waterbury Mental Health Authority (GWMHA) and Waterbury Hospital have worked to increase access to employment supports and job training for families and individuals experiencing homelessness. The Homeless Outreach Treatment Services provided through these two teams of professionals have continued to visit shelters, soup kitchens, day centers and other areas to seek out homeless persons who qualify as disabled by mental illness or substance addiction. Local supportive housing providers have also developed vocational employment departments within their agencies to help homeless persons to find employment and increase their financial stability and independence. New Opportunities Inc. of Waterbury and Connecticut Association for Human Services have offered from tax-preparation and financial trainings. Home-ownership trainings and material have been made available to consumers and the community. Greater Waterbury Interfaith Ministries and Connecticut Association for Human Services have actively surveyed the community to ensure provision of food stamps to those that are in need.

In April of 2006, the Society of Support, a permanent supportive housing program funded through the Continuum, opened as collaboration between St. Vincent DePaul Mission of Waterbury, CHD/ CT Outreach West, and New Opportunities Inc. of Waterbury. The program successfully housed 11 chronically homeless individuals and 10 families within a few months. To date, the program has successfully discharged 3 clients to more independent living situations that do not require state or federal assistance.

The Continuum put forth for additional HUD funding in the 2007 SuperNOFA to create 15 new units of permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals and 4 new units of permanent supportive housing for families, using Shelter Plus Care certificates. Funding worth a total of \$822,300 is to be utilized as housing assistance for homeless individuals and families in Waterbury. If awarded the housing assistance will be administered through the Waterbury Housing Authority with supportive services provided by GWMHA and Salvation Army, respectively.

Applications were also made to the Next Step Initiative by several providers in the area to provide additional supportive services, as well as DSS State Rental Assistance, to chronically homeless individuals. The State has yet to announce the awards.

Efforts to provide additional services to Homeless Veterans in Waterbury were spearheaded by the VA, in collaboration with the GWMHA Homeless Outreach Team, the Continuum, and the Housing Authority.

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

2. a. The Continuum actively engages the access and coordination of the available resources to homeless individuals and families. The COC's Access and Participation in Mainstream Resources Committee helps the service providers to coordinate the utilization of supportive resources to maintain the stability of homeless persons in permanent housing. This is accomplished through the local screening committee that acts to collaboratively identify and direct the available resources to those in need. The screening committee is comprised of the Homeless Outreach teams, permanent supportive housing providers, shelter staff, and the Local Mental Health Authority. The screening committee meets regularly to coordinate and approve the placement of homeless persons into permanent housing. The committee also acts to identify needs of the homeless persons and recommends appropriate referrals based on the persons needs to the case manager assigned to them. Referrals may include: substance abuse treatment programs, employment outreach and training programs, individual and family counseling. This coordination plays out as daily action on the part of the service system; with the Homeless Outreach Team, the shelter staff, and the supportive housing case managers and administration remaining in constant communication. The Case Managers work with landlords and the Housing Authority to ensure that the homeless persons have a smooth transition into permanent housing and independent living. Once housed, the case managers remain engaged with the client to help them maintain stability and to maximize their independence. All supportive housing is permanent, independent and affordable. The case management provided is on-site and offers a wide-range of supports to the homeless person, including employment services.

3. Identify new Federal resources obtained from Homeless SuperNOFA.

3. New federal resources awarded to the Continuum in the 2006 round of SuperNOFA funding include:

\$324,000 was granted to Greater Waterbury Mental Health Authority to serve 10 chronically homeless individuals using Shelter Plus Care certificates

\$547,500 was granted to Salvation Army to serve 10 homeless families using Shelter Plus Care certificates.

\$397,056 was granted to CT Outreach West to renew the 47 permanent supportive housing units they currently operate, using Shelter Plus Care certificates.

Total Amount funded: \$1,268,556

All the above funding is administered through the Waterbury Housing Authority and is used to provide housing assistance to the homeless population of Waterbury.

Specific Homeless Prevention Elements

1. Identify actions taken to prevent homelessness.

Program Year 2 CAPER Specific Housing Prevention Elements response:

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

In the past year the following agencies/programs have addressed 'basic needs' of individuals in danger of becoming homeless: the Salvation Army Emergency Assistance Program, the New Opportunities CT Energy Assistance Program, DMHAS 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 Eviction Prevention Program, 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 has also worked to improve strategies to work with jails and hospitals to establish formalized discharge plans one month before discharge from jail or long-term hospitalization. The COC and the Northwest Regional Workforce Investment Board have partnered to increase access to employment supports and job training for families and individuals who are experiencing homelessness.

Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG)

1. Identify actions to address emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless individuals and families (including significant subpopulations such as those living on the streets).
2. Assessment of Relationship of ESG Funds to Goals and Objectives
 - a. Evaluate progress made in using ESG funds to address homeless and homeless prevention needs, goals, and specific objectives established in the Consolidated Plan.
 - b. Detail how ESG projects are related to implementation of comprehensive homeless planning strategy, including the number and types of individuals and persons in households served with ESG funds.
3. Matching Resources
 - a. Provide specific sources and amounts of new funding used to meet match as required by 42 USC 11375(a)(1), including cash resources, grants, and staff salaries, as well as in-kind contributions such as the value of a building or lease, donated materials, or volunteer time.
4. State Method of Distribution
 - a. States must describe their method of distribution and how it rated and selected its local government agencies and private nonprofit organizations acting as subrecipients.

5. Activity and Beneficiary Data
 - a. Completion of attached Emergency Shelter Grant Program Performance Chart or other reports showing ESGP expenditures by type of activity. Also describe any problems in collecting, reporting, and evaluating the reliability of this information.
 - b. Homeless Discharge Coordination
 - i. As part of the government developing and implementing a homeless discharge coordination policy, ESG homeless prevention funds may be used to assist very-low income individuals and families at risk of becoming homeless after being released from publicly funded institutions such as health care facilities, foster care or other youth facilities, or corrections institutions or programs.
 - c. Explain how your government is instituting a homeless discharge coordination policy, and how ESG homeless prevention funds are being used in this effort.

Program Year 2 CAPER ESG response:

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.

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

The COC has applied for another round of HUD 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 2006-2007, the City funded Family Services Association of Waterbury Inc., which received an allocation of \$14,959 for the staffing of Chapman House, an emergency sanctuary for children ages three to twelve, who have been removed from their home due to abuse or severe neglect. The City also granted the Morris Foundation \$2,992 for utilities and food at the Therapeutic Shelter. Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury received \$5,485 for operating costs for their shelter, which provides a safe place for physically and/or psychologically abused women and their children. The Salvation Army received \$10,338 for administrative and operating expenses for the Family Shelter. Finally, St. Vincent DePaul received \$64,822 for the operation of their homeless shelter and other supportive services to aid the homeless.

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 2006-2007 agencies and amounts funded by ESG for 2006-2007 were identified.

Family Services of Waterbury, Inc. (\$14,959.00) provides a valuable service at Chapman House for children aged three to twelve who have been removed from their families due to abuse or severe neglect. Funding was granted in 2006-2007 to support staffing that would allow for additional staff, thus providing more individualized attention for the children. The need for extra staff arises especially when there are more young children and toddlers in the shelter. Each child that was provided care at Chapman House left with short-term and long-term goals. The allocation for Family Services was matched by State Funds. In 2006-2007, Family Services of Waterbury served 22 children which included 6 Black/African

American, 7 White/Hispanic, and 2 Other/Multi-Racial. *New funding received to meet match included \$657,036.00 from the State of Connecticut Department of Children and Family Services and contributions of \$66,066.*

The Morris Foundation (\$2,992.00) ESG funds were used for utilities and the purchase of food at the Therapeutic Shelter. In 2006-2007, the Foundation served 108 adults of which 79 were White (including 10 Hispanic) and 29 were Black/African/American. As a result of the Morris Foundation's Shelter program in 2006-2007, 88% of clients secured admission for continuing treatment services, 92% receives physiologic and psychological stability assessments and needed interventions were undertaken/administered and 91% have been documented as understanding their need for treatment post shelter, as well as understanding the basic concepts of addiction. The Morris Foundation allocation was matched with other federal funds of \$16,695.00, local government funds of \$127,747.00, private donations of \$4,557.00, and fees of \$49,029.00.

The Salvation Army (\$10,338.00) used their ESG funds for administrative and operating expenses at their family shelter. In 2006-2007, the total number of households served was 115, of which 28 were White (includes 4 Hispanic), 35 were Black/ African American (includes 4 Hispanic), 38 were American Indian/Alaskan Native (including 38 Hispanic), 5 were Black/African American and White, 3 were American Indian/Alaskan Native and Black African American (includes 3 Hispanic) and 6 were Other/Multi-Racial (includes 6 Hispanic). 38 families received shelter services. The Salvation Army reports that 95% of families developed an Action Plan within 48 hours of admission and 100% of families were referred to programs and services relevant to their needs. 81% of families discharged from the shelter secured alternative housing according to the Action Plan. The Salvation Army allocation was matched with other federal funds of \$13,406.00, local government funds of \$207,646.51, and private funds of \$28,560.00

Safe Haven of Greater Waterbury (\$5,485.00) 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. 96% of clients who received counseling reported feeling calmer at the end of their sessions and 88% were provided shelter as verified by client logs and intakes. Safe Haven served 765 individuals, of which 595 were White (including 236 Hispanic), 103 were Black/African American (including 4 Hispanic), 3 were Asian (including 1 Hispanic), 3 were Native Hawaiian /Other Pacific Islander, 2 were American Indian/Alaskan Native and White, 5 were Asian and White, 3 were Black/African American and White, 4 were American Indian/Alaskan Native and Black African American and 47 were Other/Multi-Racial (includes 30 Hispanic). The Safe Haven grant was matched by contributions. The Safe Haven allocation was matched with \$613,000.00 in other federal funds, \$227,500.00 in private funding, and other contributions (United Way and Thrift Shop revenues) of \$307,000.00.

The St. Vincent DePaul Society (\$64,822.00) grant was used for operating costs for the operation of the homeless shelter. The St. Vincent DePaul Mission Homeless Shelter served 1074 individuals. Of those individuals 748 were White (includes 318 Hispanic), 317 were Black/African American, 6 were Asian and 3 were American Indian/Alaskan native. In terms of judging its success, the Shelter

looks to see that clients attain alternative housing and/or accesses social and/or treatment services. Alternative housing included, but was not limited to transitional housing, residential treatment programs, and supportive and permanent housing. Social services included domestic violence abuse counseling; family counseling; educational, employment, and financial counseling; childcare; and security deposit and rental assistance programs. During 2006-2007, at least 30% of single clients accessed another community housing setting, and 35% accessed another housing setting such as transitional or permanent. 75% of family clients accessed another housing setting. 81% of single clients entered a social service program and 92% of family clients did so. The St. Vincent DePaul ESG grant was matched with other federal funding of \$34,221.00, local government funding of \$502,161.00, private funding of \$406,855.00, and other contributions of \$1,753.00.

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

The COC also worked with other housing agencies to help provide this population with permanent housing and worked closely with area hospitals 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.

5a. All expenditures for the ESG program, by type of activity, are listed in the IDIS report PR19 and PR20. There were no problems 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.

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

COC Discharge Planning Policy Chart

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

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

Foster Care:

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

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

The continuum transitions youth through the life skills education and

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

Health Care:

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

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

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

Mental Health:

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

Corrections:*

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

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

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

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Community Development

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

1. Assessment of Relationship of CDBG Funds to Goals and Objectives
 - a. Assess use of CDBG funds in relation to the priorities, needs, goals, and specific objectives in the Consolidated Plan, particularly the highest priority activities.
 - b. Evaluate progress made toward meeting goals for providing affordable housing using CDBG funds, including the number and types of households served.
 - c. Indicate the extent to which CDBG funds were used for activities that benefited extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons.

2. Changes in Program Objectives
 - a. Identify the nature of and the reasons for any changes in program objectives and how the jurisdiction would change its program as a result of its experiences.
3. Assessment of Efforts in Carrying Out Planned Actions
 - a. Indicate how grantee pursued all resources indicated in the Consolidated Plan.
 - b. Indicate how grantee provided certifications of consistency in a fair and impartial manner.
 - c. Indicate how grantee did not hinder Consolidated Plan implementation by action or willful inaction.
4. For Funds Not Used for National Objectives
 - a. Indicate how use of CDBG funds did not meet national objectives.
 - b. Indicate how did not comply with overall benefit certification.
5. Anti-displacement and Relocation – for activities that involve acquisition, rehabilitation or demolition of occupied real property
 - a. Describe steps actually taken to minimize the amount of displacement resulting from the CDBG-assisted activities.
 - b. Describe steps taken to identify households, businesses, farms or nonprofit organizations who occupied properties subject to the Uniform Relocation Act or Section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, and whether or not they were displaced, and the nature of their needs and preferences.
 - c. Describe steps taken to ensure the timely issuance of information notices to displaced households, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations.
6. Low/Mod Job Activities – for economic development activities undertaken where jobs were made available but not taken by low- or moderate-income persons
 - a. Describe actions taken by grantee and businesses to ensure first consideration was or will be given to low/mod persons.
 - b. List by job title of all the permanent jobs created/retained and those that were made available to low/mod persons.
 - c. If any of jobs claimed as being available to low/mod persons require special skill, work experience, or education, provide a description of steps being taken or that will be taken to provide such skills, experience, or education.
7. Low/Mod Limited Clientele Activities – for activities not falling within one of the categories of presumed limited clientele low and moderate income benefit
 - a. Describe how the nature, location, or other information demonstrates the activities benefit a limited clientele at least 51% of whom are low- and moderate-income.
8. Program income received
 - a. Detail the amount of program income reported that was returned to each individual revolving fund, e.g., housing rehabilitation, economic development, or other type of revolving fund.
 - b. Detail the amount repaid on each float-funded activity.
 - c. Detail all other loan repayments broken down by the categories of housing rehabilitation, economic development, or other.
 - d. Detail the amount of income received from the sale of property by parcel.

9. Prior period adjustments – where reimbursement was made this reporting period for expenditures (made in previous reporting periods) that have been disallowed, provide the following information:
 - a. The activity name and number as shown in IDIS;
 - b. The program year(s) in which the expenditure(s) for the disallowed activity(ies) was reported;
 - c. The amount returned to line-of-credit or program account; and
 - d. Total amount to be reimbursed and the time period over which the reimbursement is to be made, if the reimbursement is made with multi-year payments.
10. Loans and other receivables
 - a. List the principal balance for each float-funded activity outstanding as of the end of the reporting period and the date(s) by which the funds are expected to be received.
 - b. List the total number of other loans outstanding and the principal balance owed as of the end of the reporting period.
 - c. List separately the total number of outstanding loans that are deferred or forgivable, the principal balance owed as of the end of the reporting period, and the terms of the deferral or forgiveness.
 - d. Detail the total number and amount of loans made with CDBG funds that have gone into default and for which the balance was forgiven or written off during the reporting period.
 - e. Provide a List of the parcels of property owned by the grantee or its subrecipients that have been acquired or improved using CDBG funds and that are available for sale as of the end of the reporting period.
11. Lump sum agreements
 - a. Provide the name of the financial institution.
 - b. Provide the date the funds were deposited.
 - c. Provide the date the use of funds commenced.
 - d. Provide the percentage of funds disbursed within 180 days of deposit in the institution.
12. Housing Rehabilitation – for each type of rehabilitation program for which projects/units were reported as completed during the program year
 - a. Identify the type of program and number of projects/units completed for each program.
 - b. Provide the total CDBG funds involved in the program.
 - c. Detail other public and private funds involved in the project.
13. Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies – for grantees that have HUD-approved neighborhood revitalization strategies
 - a. Describe progress against benchmarks for the program year. For grantees with Federally-designated EZs or ECs that received HUD approval for a neighborhood revitalization strategy, reports that are required as part of the EZ/EC process shall suffice for purposes of reporting progress.

Program Year 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

1. a-c. These questions have been addressed in a comprehensive fashion under "General Questions 1a-c" of this document. The 2006-2007 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 benefit. The only two project line items that are not calculated in meeting the CDBG 70% low-moderate income benefit are Acquisition and Demolition which have been justified on a Slum and Blight Spot Basis and Interim Assistance. In the past year, 89.13% 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 referred to a Community Development in the 2006-2007 Annual Action Plan public notice, which are in actuality the funding of social service agencies and nonprofits offering public services for Low-Moderate Income Client Benefit. CDBG funds were not used for affordable housing rehabilitation other than providing of housing rehabilitation engineering assistance to the HOME program and Emergency Relocation Assistance.

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.

2. a. In August 2007, the City of Waterbury submitted to HUD a Substantial Amendment to its 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan. The Amendment changed the Plan from a five-year to a three-year plan. It also clarified the overall mission or goal of the Consolidated Plan, that is, "to make Waterbury a City of Choice for residents and businesses alike; where businesses can take root, grow and flourish, and all residents can live in vibrant, thriving, neighborhoods that offer them quality choices and opportunities for residential living, recreation and employment. In order to do this, the City of Waterbury will work to create a suitable living environment, provide decent, affordable housing and create economic opportunities for Waterbury's low to moderate income residents."

The amendment defined focus areas which helped summarize the City's major goals, strategies, initiatives and projects that would help make Waterbury a City of Choice with neighborhoods of choice. These were Public Safety and Services; Quality Public Education; Economic Development; City Blight, Litter and Beautification; Neighborhoods of Choice; Human Services and Development and the Waterbury Downtown.

The focus areas encompass the goals and objectives delineated in the 2006-2007 Annual Action Plan (see "General Question 1 a-c of this document). The goals and objectives outlined in the Plan all can be placed within these focus area. The amendment also better quantified specific priority needs and objectives that serve these goals and objectives. These needs and objectives also do not vary in substance from those in the 2006-2007 Plan, but have been better defined in order to facilitate the future year application process and encourage a better outcome measurement framework.

As a result of our experiences during the prior year, we are looking in the future to better define in quantitative terms our goals and objects so that there is a seamless tie between the Annual Action Plan and Comprehensive Plan and all related activities from the application process and format to the reporting format of the CAPER at the end of the program year. We also hope to better define the City's housing policy during the next year as we prepare our new Consolidated Plan. As part of this we have already retained a consultant to prepare and write a new Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (AI). The City is also interested in developing a targeting methodology for implementation in the upcoming five-year plan.

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 2007 Grants Received," "City of Waterbury 2007 Education Grants," and "City of Waterbury 2007 Activity Report" in the appendix of this document. Resources should also include services provided by volunteer organizations in the City, whether civic, sports, or neighborhood-based.

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

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

4. For Funds Not Used for National Objectives

a. Indicate how use of CDBG funds did not meet national objectives.

b. Indicate how did not comply with overall benefit certification.

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

5. Anti-displacement and Relocation – for activities that involve acquisition, rehabilitation or demolition of occupied real property

a .Describe steps actually taken to minimize the amount of displacement resulting from the CDBG-assisted activities.

b. Describe steps taken to identify households, businesses, farms or nonprofit organizations who occupied properties subject to the Uniform Relocation Act or Section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, and whether or not they were displaced, and the nature of their needs and preferences.

c. Describe steps taken to ensure the timely issuance of information notices to displaced households, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations.

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

5. 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.

6. Low/Mod Limited Clientele Activities – for activities not falling within one of the categories of presumed limited clientele low and moderate income benefit

a. Describe how the nature, location, or other information demonstrates the activities benefit a limited clientele at least 51% of whom are low- and moderate-income

7. a. The City does not have activities that do not fall within one of these categories

7. 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.

8a. The City \$328,924.94 received back from Waterbury Neighborhood Housing Services (which has been reallocated to NHS). There was \$34,753.42 in General Administration, \$91,939.85 in Emergency relocation program income and \$11,598.02 in uncommitted program income.

8. b. The City does not float funds.

8. c. In addition to the receiving from NHS of the \$328,924.94 in revolving loan funds, the City received \$44,897.88 in loan repayments, \$55,032.61 in demolition lien payments and \$38,360.80 in relocation lien payments.

8. d. Not applicable

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.

9. a-d. Not applicable

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.

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

10. b. There are 10 loans outstanding with a principal of \$150,338.55.

10. c-e. Not applicable.

14. 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.

14. a-d. Not applicable.

15. 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.

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

16. 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.

16. 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:

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

NON-HOMELESS SPECIAL NEEDS

Non-homeless Special Needs

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

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

Program Year 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 eight clients with HIV/AIDS and their families. Funds were distributed to Connecticut Light & Power (CL&P) and Yankee Gas, so their services would not be interrupted. Also, rental payments for arrears are provided in order to stop an eviction.

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

Specific HOPWA Objectives

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

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

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

Program Year 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: