

Office of the  
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

## **FY 2003 Budget Recommendations**

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for  
Economic Development and Human Resources

**Division of Community Development**

Contents:

- 1.0 Summary
- 2.0 Issues
- 3.0 Programs
- 4.0 Additional Information



## 1.0 Division of Community Development

### Summary

The Division provides technical assistance, grants and loans to help local governments, agencies and citizens develop public infrastructure and services to improve the quality of life in Utah.

The Division also manages a capital budget and provides administrative support and programmatic oversight to the other boards and committees.

	<b>Analyst FY 2003 Base</b>	<b>Analyst FY 2003 Changes</b>	<b>Analyst FY 2003 Total</b>
<b>Financing</b>			
General Fund	5,552,700	(1,663,200)	3,889,500
Federal Funds	31,213,300		31,213,300
Dedicated Credits Revenue	650,000	32,000	682,000
GFR - Homeless Trust	150,000		150,000
Trust and Agency Funds	200		200
Permanent Community Impact	765,200		765,200
Transfers	4,880,000		4,880,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$43,211,400</b>	<b>(\$1,631,200)</b>	<b>\$41,580,200</b>
<b>Programs</b>			
Weatherization Assistance	7,124,300		7,124,300
Community Development Administration	767,500	(1,600)	765,900
Museum Services	288,100	(500)	287,600
Community Assistance	11,697,400	1,300	11,698,700
Pioneer Communities	231,300	(300)	231,000
Housing Development	4,148,500	(1,661,300)	2,487,200
Community Services	3,171,100		3,171,100
Homeless Committee	2,339,900	(200)	2,339,700
Commission on Volunteers	3,294,600	(200)	3,294,400
Martin Luther King Commission	67,800	31,600	99,400
HEAT	9,545,900		9,545,900
Emergency Food	120,000		120,000
Special Housing	415,000		415,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$43,211,400</b>	<b>(\$1,631,200)</b>	<b>\$41,580,200</b>
<b>FTE/Other</b>			
Total FTE	39		39

## **2.0 Issues: Division of Community Development**

### **2.1 General Budget Statement**

The Analyst FY 2003 Base budget recommendation includes *the Revised Estimate* from FY 2002 as approved by the Executive Appropriations Committee and the following items:

- ▶ Adjustment for FY 2002 one-time programs;
- ▶ Payroll cost of an extra day in FY 2003;
- ▶ Transfers of Market Comparability Adjustments; and
- ▶ Net Changes for Internal Service Fund Rates.

FY 2003 changes reflect the incremental costs of across the board reductions and annualization of partial budget cuts approved for FY 2002.

### **2.2 Intent Language**

The Analyst recommends the following intent:

*It is the intent of the Legislature that funding for Community Development be nonlapsing.*

*The Legislature intends that the Division develop performance measures for each program and where possible prepare a five-year history of those measures for the 2003 general session.*

### **2.3 Outcome-based Funding Initiatives**

In FY 2001 and FY 2002, the Division program managers and staff devoted significant time and resources to internal strategic planning, the development of performance measures and the adoption of an outcome funding model, as directed in the legislative intent language which supplemented the General Fund appropriations. In addition, several national partnerships were developed to demonstrate or provide grant funding for additional performance measurement activities within the division and for their sub-recipient partners.

## **2.4 Agency Restructuring**

In FY 2002, the four state Ethnic Offices (Office of Asian Affairs, Office of Black Affairs, Office of Hispanic Affairs and Office of Pacific Islander Affairs) were moved from the Division of Business and Economic Development to the Division of Community Development. Although each of these offices retained separate line item status in the agency budget, this restructuring, as well as the alignment of these offices with the Martin Luther King Human Rights Commission, capitalizes on the logical extension into communities and community programs managed by the division. Likewise, the restructuring will allow the division to identify efficiencies in staffing and administrative costs.

## **2.5 Customer Satisfaction Assessment**

In FY 2001, the Division completed customer satisfaction surveys with two target groups, their appointed board, committee and commission members and their sub-recipient organizations. These work products will be used to modify and enhance program work and communication with these target groups and other constituents to improve overall customer service.

## **2.6 Education and Professional Development**

Staff training and education continues to be a priority throughout all of the Department of Community of Economic Development and, in particular, the Division of Community Development. In FY 2001, six Community Development managers completed the Certified Public Manager designations. In FY 2002, an additional six staff members and managers will complete the program.

**3.0 Programs: Community Development**

**3.1 Administration**

**Recommendation** Analyst's recommends \$765,900.

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
<b>Financing</b>				
General Fund	446,000	417,800	460,700	42,900
General Fund, One-time		402,900		(402,900)
Permanent Community Impact	188,100	220,000	305,200	85,200
Transfers		3,600		(3,600)
Beginning Nonlapsing	8,700	10,200		(10,200)
Closing Nonlapsing	(10,200)			
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$632,600</u>	<u>\$1,054,500</u>	<u>\$765,900</u>	<u>(\$288,600)</u>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Personal Services	449,000	549,600	573,700	24,100
In-State Travel	1,900	5,000	6,300	1,300
Out of State Travel	13,100	14,000	16,000	2,000
Current Expense	(141,400)	(164,300)	(127,300)	37,000
DP Current Expense	11,000	11,800	13,800	2,000
Other Charges/Pass Thru	283,400	638,400	283,400	(355,000)
Operating Transfers	15,600			
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$632,600</u>	<u>\$1,054,500</u>	<u>\$765,900</u>	<u>(\$288,600)</u>
<b>FTE/Other</b>				
<b>Total FTE</b>	5	8	6	(2)

**Purpose** This program provides leadership to and financial management of division programs. It also administers several pass-thru programs, including General Fund financial support for the Associations of Government passed-through by contract to the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget.

**Activities** In FY 2001, the Community Development Administrative Program continued to direct development and use the Grants Management Information System (GMIS). GMIS is a comprehensive database developed in-house that allows staff to collect detailed information related to the approximately 1,500 grants, loans and contracts the Division manages each year. The database ties each of these agreements to the original funding source, through the expenditure phase, with significant programmatic and financial detail needed to remain in compliance with state and federal regulations and program rules. The database allows any Division staff member to have access to their programs while the Division Director, System Administrators and accounting staff have comprehensive access to all programs. Over 120 system reports allow the data to be sorted accordingly. GMIS was recognized for excellence by the State's Chief Information Officer in FY 2001. GMIS also received national recognition as a "Best Practices" project by the National Association of Government Accountants at their annual conference in Boston early this year.

In FY 2002, four members of the administrative and accounting staff will complete a nine-course training program and receive Certified Federal Grants Manager designations.

**3.2 Museum Services**

**Recommendation** The Analyst recommends a budget of \$287,600.

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
<b>Financing</b>				
General Fund	285,600	288,700	287,600	(1,100)
General Fund, One-time		1,049,100		(1,049,100)
Beginning Nonlapsing	8,100	76,800		(76,800)
Closing Nonlapsing	(76,800)			
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$216,900</u>	<u>\$1,414,600</u>	<u>\$287,600</u>	<u>(\$1,127,000)</u>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Personal Services	110,100	113,200	117,300	4,100
In-State Travel	3,200	5,000	500	(4,500)
Out of State Travel	1,100	4,000	4,400	400
Current Expense	36,800	(224,400)	51,400	275,800
DP Current Expense	1,700	8,400	4,000	(4,400)
Other Charges/Pass Thru	64,000	1,508,400	110,000	(1,398,400)
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$216,900</u>	<u>\$1,414,600</u>	<u>\$287,600</u>	<u>(\$1,127,000)</u>
<b>FTE/Other</b>				
<b>Total FTE</b>	2	2	2	0

**Purpose** The Office of Museum Services (OMS) promotes Utah museums and the essential role they play in our state as sources of community pride, centers of public education, and institutions that encourage economic development and tourism. OMS assists Utah museums in improving their ability to care for and manage collections, develop quality educational resources, provide access to collections for research, and identify and successfully compete for financial resources.

- Activities**
- ▶ OMS and the Utah Museums Associations sponsored the first celebration of Utah museums as part of *Utah Museum Day* on January 25, 2001, at the State Capitol. Forty-one museums participated and displayed a variety of objects from their collections, from exotic birds and snakes, to setting up a workable printing press, and from impressive exhibits of Utah art and history, to demonstrations on churning butter.
  - ▶ OMS joined with the Utah Humanities Council and other statewide committee members to help sponsor, *Yesterday's Tomorrows*, a traveling exhibition of the Smithsonian Institution's Museum on Main Street initiative. The exhibit examines how Americans of the past 100 years imagined their future and was shown in five locations: Brigham City Museum-Gallery, Peteetneet Academy in Payson, Hyrum City Museum, Washington City Historical Society, and the University of Utah Graduate School of Architecture.
  - ▶ OMS presented a workshop on State Performance Goals at the Utah Museums Association Annual Meeting in Price, September 22.

- ▶ Nineteen museums were certified by OMS for achieving State Performance Goals and received awards as part of the *Utah Museum Day* activities.

### **OMS Grants**

In addition to the programs and services listed above, \$121,897 was funded for grants to 35 museums and \$25,000 was provided to the Utah Museums Association to help small museums attend the UMA Annual Meeting.

### 3.3 Community Assistance

**Recommendation** The Analyst recommends a budget of \$11,698,700.

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
<b>Financing</b>				
General Fund	241,400	218,800	155,400	(63,400)
General Fund, One-time		(4,400)		4,400
Federal Funds	7,684,300	11,359,000	11,083,100	(275,900)
Trust and Agency Funds			200	200
Permanent Community Impact	320,600	517,000	460,000	(57,000)
Beginning Nonlapsing	26,700	75,000		(75,000)
Closing Nonlapsing	(75,000)			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$8,198,000</b>	<b>\$12,165,400</b>	<b>\$11,698,700</b>	<b>(\$466,700)</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Personal Services	531,900	618,900	623,100	4,200
In-State Travel	34,400	46,000	46,500	500
Out of State Travel	9,400	13,000	13,200	200
Current Expense	259,400	230,400	265,400	35,000
DP Current Expense	4,600	5,500	5,500	
Other Charges/Pass Thru	7,358,300	11,251,600	10,745,000	(506,600)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$8,198,000</b>	<b>\$12,165,400</b>	<b>\$11,698,700</b>	<b>(\$466,700)</b>
<b>FTE/Other</b>				
<b>Total FTE</b>	9.35	9.35	9.35	0

**Purpose**

The Community Assistance program administers the federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG). It also provides staff leadership for and financial management of the Permanent Community Impact Fund, the Navajo Revitalization Fund, the Uintah Basin Revitalization Fund, the Rural Development Fund and the Rural Electronic Commerce Communications System Fund.

The **Community Development Block Grant** program provides funds in the state’s non-entitlement communities for public facilities, infrastructure, housing and economic development opportunities. (Non-entitlement communities are defined as those cities or counties with populations of less than 50,000 or 200,000 people respectively. Entitlement communities get their CDBG funds directly from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.) The Community Development Block Grant Policy Committee, made up of elected officials from each of the seven Association of Government offices, provides oversight of the program.

Priority is given to activities which will carry out one of three national objectives: the provision of primary benefit to low and moderate income persons, the elimination of a slum or blighted condition in communities, or the removal of an urgent public health or welfare issue. Typical projects include the construction or repair of public facilities, property acquisition for facilities development, services to eligible groups such as abused spouses, children or the elderly, community planning, housing assistance to low income persons, and economic development/job creation. Special set-asides of funds can also be created by the Policy Commission to address problems or issues of special concern in the state, such as the elimination of lead based paint hazards, the need for training and financial assistance to first-time low-income homebuyers, or water studies, for example. The Policy Committee also has authority to use program funds for short-term financing for economic development projects.

The **Community Impact Fund** is defined in **Community Development Capital Programs**. Administrative funding and costs for staff support and board expenses as well as staff time spent on Federal Mineral Lease and Exchanged Land Mineral Lease --analysis for the state are included in the Community Assistance Program.

The **Navajo Revitalization Fund Board** and the **Uintah Basin Revitalization Fund Board** are authorized in statute to maximize the long-term benefit of state severance taxes paid on oil and natural gas production. Revenue from these taxes fund grants and loans to agencies of state, county or tribal government in San Juan County for the benefit of Navajo Nation members and for Ute Indian Tribe members of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation and in Duchesne and Uintah Counties. Administrative costs for staff support are included in the Community Assistance Program.

The **Rural Development Fund Board** assists south-central Utah communities in the development of capital facilities and infrastructure to mitigate the impact of state and federal land exchanges associated with the creation of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument. Administrative costs for staff support are included in the Community Assistance Program.

The **Rural Electronics Commerce Communications Systems Fund Board** assists rural communities in the preservation and promotion of communication systems such as broadcast television. Administrative costs for staff support are included in the Community Assistance Program.

**Activities**

Only CDBG activities are included in the Community Assistance Budget. For FY 2001, funds were allocated to the seven planning regions as follows:

Bear River Association of Governments	\$1,056,118
Wasatch Front Regional Council	\$2,317,532
Mountainland Association of Governments	\$1,486,934
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	\$434,372
Six County Association of Governments	\$594,652
Five County Association of Governments	\$1,051,863
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments	\$518,863
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,459,600</b>

This CDBG program, which began operation in Utah in 1982, continues to be one of the most widely used programs by the state's smaller communities to help them assist those most in need within their boundaries. The state, to date, has received more than \$119,786,429 for this program from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which does not include the money leveraged over that 20-year time span by the participating entities. Estimated local leverage is comparable to the federal contribution.

**Performance Measures**

The CDBG will be a program which all eligible low and moderate income communities wish to participate for the purpose of developing projects or programs.

**Partnership Opportunities**

The State of Utah is a member of the national Council of State Community Development Agencies (COSFDA). COSFDA has been awarded a HUD-funded technical assistance contract to develop an outcome-based measurement system that states can use to measure the return-on-investment for Community Development Block Grant applications. COSFDA, in partnership with the Rensselaerville Institute, a New York based consultant, solicited letters of interest from states throughout the country in participate in a demonstration project. This program will assist approximately three states to develop an outcome-based evaluation program specific to the unique characteristics of the state Small Cities Program. The State of Utah, along with Colorado and Kansas, has been selected to participate in the evaluation development program at no cost to the state.

The intent of this program is to develop methods to measure the outcomes of the many eligible uses of the Community Development Block Grant Program. In the flexible CDBG program, eligible activity can vary significantly. It has always been difficult to determine the outcomes of these diverse projects in comparable terms or to apply traditional economic multipliers and determine economic impact/benefit. This effort will attempt to come up with a methodology to do just that.

### 3.4 Pioneer Communities

**Recommendation** The Analyst’s recommends a budget of \$231,000.

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
<b>Financing</b>				
General Fund	229,100	231,400	231,000	(400)
General Fund, One-time		(400)		400
Beginning Nonlapsing	106,800	19,400		(19,400)
Closing Nonlapsing	(19,400)			
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$316,500</u>	<u>\$250,400</u>	<u>\$231,000</u>	<u>(\$19,400)</u>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Personal Services	64,500	66,800	67,500	700
In-State Travel	1,700	2,500	2,500	
Out of State Travel	1,500	2,600	3,200	600
Current Expense	48,700	58,000	57,200	(800)
DP Current Expense	500	500	600	100
Other Charges/Pass Thru	199,600	120,000	100,000	(20,000)
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$316,500</u>	<u>\$250,400</u>	<u>\$231,000</u>	<u>(\$19,400)</u>
<b>FTE/Other</b>				
<b>Total FTE</b>	1	1	1	0

**Purpose** Pioneer Communities is comprised of two programs, the Utah Main Street Program and a regional heritage development component.

Utah Main Street helps communities under 50,000 in population revitalize their historic business districts. Main Street Partner communities receive ongoing, long-term training, technical assistance, and funding to complete a comprehensive downtown revitalization workplan.

Currently, there are seven Main Street Partners: American Fork, Helper, Mt. Pleasant, Panguitch, Payson, Richfield, and Roosevelt. Main Street provides general assistance (workshops, project planning, etc.) to other communities working to revitalize their downtowns. Grants are offered to owner of historic commercial buildings in downtowns around the state to encourage them to rehabilitate those properties and stimulate economic activity.

Pioneer Communities also provides assistance to regions undertaking heritage development. Staff currently serves as the state liaison to the Heritage Highway 89 Alliance and provides ad hoc assistance to other regions, as requested.

**Activities**

In FY 2001:

- ▶ Richfield was designated as a Main Street Partner community.
- ▶ Main Street provided assistance on various project to nine non-partner communities.
- ▶ Eighteen rehabilitation grants totaling \$67,515 were awarded to projects in 13 communities.

A recent analysis of the rehabilitation grants program suggests that, for every dollar granted through the program, the community sees an additional \$82 in ancillary economic activity.

**Performance Measures**

**Goal:** Communities whose downtowns have been transformed into viable, attractive, sustainable commercial centers.

**Measures**

- ▶ General changes in sales tax revenues
- ▶ Changes in targeted business activity
- ▶ Anecdotal information from residents, visitors, business owners

**Goal:** The ability to provide resources that --in the most efficient manner possible -- give communities the specific help they need to accomplish their goals for improving their downtowns.

**Measures**

- ▶ Client satisfaction levels
- ▶ Specific measures for specific projects (i.e., have we accomplished the specific goals that we set out to accomplish?)
- ▶ Analysis of Pioneer Communities grants program

### 3.5 Housing Development

**Recommendation**      The Analyst recommends a budget of \$2,487,200.

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
<b>Financing</b>				
General Fund	532,400	2,803,000	770,900	(2,032,100)
General Fund, One-time		198,200		(198,200)
Federal Funds	289,000	659,900	676,300	16,400
Dedicated Credits Revenue		40,000	40,000	
Transfers		1,700	1,000,000	998,300
Beginning Nonlapsing	96,900	48,000		(48,000)
Closing Nonlapsing	(48,000)			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$870,300</b>	<b>\$3,750,800</b>	<b>\$2,487,200</b>	<b>(\$1,263,600)</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Personal Services	314,600	757,100	316,400	(440,700)
In-State Travel	17,900	15,500	21,500	6,000
Out of State Travel	15,200	25,700	24,100	(1,600)
Current Expense	102,500	100,200	114,100	13,900
DP Current Expense	2,500	3,500	4,500	1,000
Other Charges/Pass Thru	417,600	2,848,800	2,011,600	(837,200)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$870,300</b>	<b>\$3,750,800</b>	<b>\$2,487,200</b>	<b>(\$1,263,600)</b>
<b>FTE/Other</b>				
<b>Total FTE</b>	5	5	5	0

**Purpose**

The Housing Development Program, under the umbrella title **Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund (OWHLF)**, includes resources from the state General Fund appropriation and the federal HOME Program award from The Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Fund is also supported by revenue generated from loan repayments, interest income and investment income.

The OWHLF plays key role in the assessment of statewide housing needs, and participates in financing for the affordable housing projects throughout the state. Single and multi-family projects are eligible. The Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund Board provides oversight of the program. (see Activities)

**Activities**

During FY 2001, the OWHLF Board and the Housing Staff completed the implementation of House Bill 151, which modified the board responsibility (previously an advisory board, currently a policy board) and defined the allocation of receipts in the Loan Fund. The restructuring of the Board was completed in October 2001. A completed Allocation Plan, defining both the multi-family and the single-family components of the Loan Fund, was adopted by the Board. The Allocation Plan is designed to respond to the statewide housing need as defined in the Consolidated Plan.

In FY 2001, resources from the OWHLF were used to participate in 76 rehabilitation and/or acquisition projects of single family homes statewide for families with incomes less than 55 percent of area median income, and participated in the financing of 460 units either created or preserved of affordable rental units targeting families with income less than 50 percent of area median income.

The OWHLF established and funded, in cooperation with Fannie Mae, the HOMECHOICE Housing Program. HOMECHOICE provides homeownership opportunities for disabled individuals or families with disabled individuals with incomes less than 80 percent of median income

The Housing Staff began an Outcome Based Funding analysis that sets forth goals which will increase current funding levels by 15 percent through diligent loan portfolio management and loan oversight and review.

**Performance Measures**

The State of Utah Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund will work to increase new resources coming into the Fund by 6 percent. Program income generated by repayments from loans in the portfolio will increase by 15 percent. Access to the fund and its programs by low-to-moderate-income (LMI) clients will increase 20 percent current levels.

**Single Family Performance Measurement Milestones**

Improved management and oversight of the single-family program will increase the payback rate and returns to the program income account. The expected increase in the return to the fund is 15 percent.

This will be done by the following:

**Training and Provider Outreach**

The training of recipients is critical. Training will be provided quarterly onsite with each single-family recipient. There will also be two training sessions provided statewide with mandatory attendance by our recipients.

**Improve Application Process**

Prepare simplified application for access to the program by January 2002. Improved pre-application qualifying working directly with clients and tied to the training element listed above.

**Access**

Increase access to the single family program for LMI families and individuals by expanding marketing through banks, mortgage companies, credit unions, real estate agencies, title companies and all public sources including cities, counties and regions, etc. More effective use of the media will be implemented as necessary. The development of a procedure for recipients to follow will be accomplished by November 2001, and a training session to be held in March/April 2002. The number of applicants will increase as a result by 20 percent.

**Improved loan portfolio management**

GMIS will be utilized and a loan data list will be prepared showing all loans made and the status of payments by October 2001. The loan portfolio manager (loan administrator) will track all loans and develop and implement portfolio management guidelines, approved by the committee, by January 2002. Thorough follow-up on deferred loans to assess the changing financial situation of the recipient in anticipation of a return on investment as their financial situation improves.

**Increased Outreach to Various Funding Sources**

Evaluate all other potential funding sources and prepare applications and other information to secure additional funding resources including Rural Development, Workforce Services, HUD and etc. by March 2002.

**Multi-family Performance Measurement Milestones**

**Develop written policies and procedures**

Develop new policy and procedures for the multi-family loan fund in conjunction with the OWHLF board of directors and staff. Develop a unified cost allocation plan, loan policies and modified application format, modified scoring process in conjunction with the UHC, Tax Credit Program by December 2001. Integrate the Private Activity Bond Program into the application process by June 2002.

**Increase program access by developer partners**

Provide one-on-one training with the applicants to assist them in understanding policies and procedures and priorities as established by the board. Meet with at least 6 for-profit developers by January 2002 and four non-profit entities by March 2002.

**Develop funding partnerships with other agencies and sources including other private and public entities.**

Complete a two-year funding relationship with Fannie-Mae prior to the end of 2001. Evaluate other federal programs and prepare funding applications. This will be ongoing over the course of the program year.

**3.6 Community Services**

**Recommendation** The Analyst recommends \$3,171,100.

	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>Est/Analyst</b>
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>Financing</b>				
General Fund	38,700	39,900	38,600	(1,300)
Federal Funds	2,940,300	3,129,100	3,132,500	3,400
Beginning Nonlapsing	38,700			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,017,700</b>	<b>\$3,169,000</b>	<b>\$3,171,100</b>	<b>\$2,100</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Personal Services	150,900	131,400	132,600	1,200
In-State Travel	10,100	10,000	10,000	
Out of State Travel	6,300	6,400	6,400	
Current Expense	46,800	46,600	46,400	(200)
DP Current Expense	1,800	2,000	2,000	
Other Charges/Pass Thru	2,801,800	2,972,600	2,973,700	1,100
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,017,700</b>	<b>\$3,169,000</b>	<b>\$3,171,100</b>	<b>\$2,100</b>
<b>FTE/Other</b>				
<b>Total FTE</b>	3	3	3	0

**Purpose** The Community Services block Grant (CSBG) program is a federal formula-based appropriation administered by the State Community Services Office for community action program (CAPs) across the state. The community action programs provide local leadership and support to combat the causes, as well as the effects of poverty.

There are nine community action programs serving all 29 counties in Utah. Community action programs implement the self-help philosophy through a process of innovative, practical and timely programs and services that emphasize self-sufficiency while addressing the immediate financial crisis needs of low-income people. Community action programs serve as a catalyst to coordinate efforts, to mobilize resources and to encourage other organizations to deliver needed services.

**Activities** Ninety-five percent of the funding for this program is passed through to the community action programs, with 90 percent being used for program activity at the local level.

Programs are designed to meet the special needs within the local communities. Around the state, a variety of services are provided, such as regional food banks and food pantries, outreach services, the Home Energy Assistance Target Program (HEAT),

Emergency services, home buyer education, mortgage default counseling, shelter services, eviction prevention and emergency rental assistance, senior services, budget counseling, and more.

A total of 32,985 unduplicated households were served in 1999-2000, more than half of all households living in poverty in the state.

Two-thirds of the families assisted, or 63 percent, are families that include children.

Nearly 80 percent of the single parent families assisted by these programs are not receiving assistance from other sources.

**Performance Target**

The nine community action agencies will be trained (staff and boards) in outcome-based management, and 80 percent of the community action agencies will implement Results Oriented Management Accountability (ROMA) concepts for all CSBG related activities to guide needs assessment, agency mission review, activity planning, resource allocations, service delivery, measuring and reporting results by October 2003.

### 3.7 Commission of Volunteers

**Recommendation** The Analyst recommends \$3,294,400.

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
<b>Financing</b>				
General Fund	92,300	93,600	92,400	(1,200)
General Fund, One-time		99,600		(99,600)
Federal Funds	1,799,300	3,145,500	3,202,000	56,500
Dedicated Credits Revenue	229,700			
Beginning Nonlapsing	5,300	134,700		(134,700)
Closing Nonlapsing	(134,700)			
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,991,900</b>	<b>\$3,473,400</b>	<b>\$3,294,400</b>	<b>(\$179,000)</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Personal Services	300,800	370,000	371,900	1,900
In-State Travel	14,900	15,000	13,000	(2,000)
Out of State Travel	12,000	14,300	13,200	(1,100)
Current Expense	112,500	95,200	85,800	(9,400)
DP Current Expense	10,200	10,500	10,500	
Other Charges/Pass Thru	1,541,500	2,968,400	2,800,000	(168,400)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,991,900</b>	<b>\$3,473,400</b>	<b>\$3,294,400</b>	<b>(\$179,000)</b>
<b>FTE/Other</b>				
<b>Total FTE</b>	6.2	6.2	6.2	0

**Purpose**

The mission of the Utah Commission on Volunteers is to improve communities through service and volunteering in Utah. The mission is accomplished through three main efforts: administration of programs of the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS), including AmeriCorps and Learn & Serve; establishment and support of local Volunteer Centers; and the promotion and support of the Utah’s Promise efforts.

**Activities**

In FY 2001, Utah received \$2.4 million from the CNCS and placed 657 volunteers (“paid” by educational stipend) in local programs in the fields of Health Care, Education, Human Service needs, the Environment, Public Safety. To date, more than 800 Utah resident volunteers have qualified for education awards totaling more than \$2,800,000.

Through a joint effort with CNCS over the next several months, the Commission will place and manage a “Team AmeriCorps” project. This project will consist of 400 AmeriCorps members serving Utah’s homeless population, hungry, medically-underserved and seniors needing additional assistance to mitigate the impact of the 2002 Winter Olympic Games.

Currently, the Commission has established 16 Local Volunteer Centers serving 26 of the 29 counties.

**3.8 Homeless Committee**

**Recommendation** The Analyst recommends \$2,339,700.

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
<b>Financing</b>				
General Fund	1,646,200	1,647,000	1,649,500	2,500
General Fund, One-time		99,500		(99,500)
Federal Funds	508,200	540,000	540,200	200
GFR - Homeless Trust	150,000	150,000	150,000	
Transfers		2,500		(2,500)
Lapsing Balance	(38,400)			
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$2,266,000</u>	<u>\$2,439,000</u>	<u>\$2,339,700</u>	<u>(\$99,300)</u>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Personal Services	70,300	38,300	39,100	800
In-State Travel	1,200	2,500	2,500	
Out of State Travel	1,600	5,200	5,200	
Current Expense	14,600	46,000	45,900	(100)
DP Current Expense		1,200	1,200	
Other Charges/Pass Thru	2,178,300	2,345,800	2,245,800	(100,000)
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$2,266,000</u>	<u>\$2,439,000</u>	<u>\$2,339,700</u>	<u>(\$99,300)</u>
<b>FTE/Other</b>				
<b>Total FTE</b>		1	1	1
				0

**Purpose**

This Homeless Committee Program channels state and federal funds to state and local homeless and housing service providers. Resources include funds from the Homeless Trust Fund general fund appropriation, the Critical Needs Housing General Fund appropriation, HUD’s Emergency Shelter Program, and revenues generated by the Homeless Trust Fund Tax Check-off Campaign.

The State Homeless Coordinating Committee, appointed by the Governor, provides oversight of the program and approves allocation of funding. Likewise, the Committee ensures that services provided to the homeless are provided in a cost effective manner and works to facilitate a better understanding of the concept of homelessness. Programs funded emphasize emergency housing and self-sufficiency, including placement in employment or occupational training activities, and where needed, special services to met the unique needs of the homeless with mental illness and those who are in families with children. Contracts are awarded to local providers based on need, diversity of geographic location, coordination with or enhancement of existing services, and use of volunteers.

The demand for these funds is reflected in the increase in poverty and homelessness statistics documented in the state:

- ▶ An estimated 60,500 (8.6 percent) of Utah's children between the ages 0-17 live at or below the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). Approximately 263,000 (37.2 percent) of Utah's children live at or below 200 percent of the FPL. For a family of three, the FPL is \$13,470.
- ▶ Ten Utah counties have poverty rates above the national average.

**Activities**

A variety of services were provided from the three funding sources, including meals, transitional housing, temporary shelter, emergency home repair, case management, homeless prevention, maintenance and operation at the service agency, essential services including job placement and training, education, grants to leverage other housing funds, disabled access design, home construction and daycare. A total of 12,688 *unduplicated* individuals were served by one or more of these programs in FY 2001.

Additional highlights include

- ▶ An average of 1,125 of 1,164 available shelter beds served homeless individuals and families on any given night throughout the year. Of this amount 45 percent were adult males, 21 percent were adult females and 34 percent were children aged 0-17 years old.
- ▶ This past year, The Road Home (formally Travelers Aid Society) placed 170 households, consisting of 326 individuals, into permanent or transitional housing. This is the highest number of housing placements that this organization has ever accomplished in one year.

**Performance Measures**

**Outcome Statement**

The State Community Services Office will implement the Outcome Funding model for the Homeless Trust Fund with the homeless and low-income providers statewide and funding decisions will be awarded based upon performance targets.

**Target**

The 56 homeless and low-income outcome management implementers will reach or exceed their annual performance target by December 31, 2002.

### 3.9 Emergency Food

**Recommendation** The Analyst recommends \$120,000.

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
<b>Financing</b>				
General Fund	140,000	120,000	120,000	
General Fund, One-time		50,000		(50,000)
Beginning Nonlapsing	16,900	18,600		(18,600)
Closing Nonlapsing	(18,600)			
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$138,300</u>	<u>\$188,600</u>	<u>\$120,000</u>	<u>(\$68,600)</u>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Other Charges/Pass Thru	138,300	188,600	120,000	(68,600)
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$138,300</u>	<u>\$188,600</u>	<u>\$120,000</u>	<u>(\$68,600)</u>
<b>FTE/Other</b>				

**Purpose** Funding provided to the Emergency Food Network (EFN) is administered by the State Community Services Office for distribution to emergency food pantries statewide. The funds assist local food banks and other providers with the distribution of emergency and supplemental nutrition to households in poverty.

The Emergency Food Network caseload numbers have been increasing annually. In 2000, there was a 36 percent annual increase in the number of households seeking help with food pantries statewide. This comes after a 31 percent increase in 1999 and a 28 percent increase in 1998. In a four-year period from September 1997 to September 2000, the number of households receiving assistance from food pantries more than doubled.

**Activities** The entire state appropriation for this program was contracted to ten local providers who used the funding for a variety of purposes including operation support, supplies, food transport, food storage (perishable and non-perishable) and food.

In FY 2001, there were more Utahns receiving assistance from the statewide Emergency Food Network (EFN) than in prior years. On average, 22,665 households, or 71,395 individuals received the equivalent of a three-day food box every month over the last year.

Local community support of food pantries is consistent statewide, as are efforts to leverage local resources. Communities donate regularly to food drives (food, cash, and in-kind donations) and residents volunteer at their local emergency food pantry. The value of the food donations given to the food pantries was more than \$1.7 million in 1999-2000. Volunteers contributed 35,708 hours of service; the equivalent of 17 full-time employees.

**3.10 Special Housing**

**Recommendation** The Analyst recommends \$415,000.

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
<b>Financing</b>				
Federal Funds	534,600	471,600	415,000	(56,600)
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$534,600</u>	<u>\$471,600</u>	<u>\$415,000</u>	<u>(\$56,600)</u>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Personal Services	10,500	6,700	3,300	(3,400)
Current Expense	500	4,300	700	(3,600)
Other Charges/Pass Thru	523,600	460,600	411,000	(49,600)
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$534,600</u>	<u>\$471,600</u>	<u>\$415,000</u>	<u>(\$56,600)</u>
<b>FTE/Other</b>				

**Purpose** This program pays for utilities, building renovations and leased space for the homeless. It also provides housing for the chronically mentally ill, disabled homeless and AIDS victims. All resources are federal funds but only one program, Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA), is a formula grant. All other funding, including the Shelter Plus Care Program and Rural Development, are competitive grants.

**Activities** In FY 2001, Utah received HOPWA funding \$386,000 from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist with rental and hospice expenses. However, the award was reduced to \$58,000 for FY 2002.

**3.11 LIHEAP/HEAT**

**Recommendation** The Analyst recommends a budget of \$9,545,900.

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
<b>Financing</b>				
Federal Funds	15,517,500	9,482,400	9,485,900	3,500
Dedicated Credits Revenue	79,200	60,000	60,000	
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$15,596,700</u>	<u>\$9,542,400</u>	<u>\$9,545,900</u>	<u>\$3,500</u>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Personal Services	127,300	178,500	167,900	(10,600)
In-State Travel	1,700	2,000	2,000	
Out of State Travel	5,100	4,500	4,500	
Current Expense	99,400	82,800	96,900	14,100
DP Current Expense	138,500	105,000	105,000	
Other Charges/Pass Thru	15,224,700	9,169,600	9,169,600	
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$15,596,700</u>	<u>\$9,542,400</u>	<u>\$9,545,900</u>	<u>\$3,500</u>
<b>FTE/Other</b>				
<b>Total FTE</b>	2	2	2	0

**Purpose** The federal Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), which also operates under the state title of Home Energy Assistance Target (HEAT) Program, is a 100 percent federally-funded block grant program used to provide utility assistance to low-income households during the winter months. This program is administered in partnership with local agencies such as the Associations of Government (AOGs) and non-profit agencies.

Benefit funds that are unused at the end of the heat season (typically, November through March), can be sub-awarded for home weatherization activity (between 15-25 percent of the total original award).

**Activities** In FY 2001, the program received 32,418 applications for assistance, an increase of 21 percent from the pervious year. A total of 31, 291 households qualified for and received assistance. The average benefit payment was \$391 an average increase of \$173 per household (or 73 percent) from the prior year.

A total of 502 homes were weatherized with unutilized benefit funds, an increase of 316 homes from the prior year (a 169 percent increase). Emergency winter utility assistance for such items as furnace repairs or replacements was provided to 1,263 households, an increase of 1,077 residences.

Nearly two-thirds of the residents who benefited from this program in FY 2001 were on fixed incomes, 21 percent were families with pre-school aged children, 40 percent were disabled, 39 percent were considered working poor, and 25 percent were elderly.

**Performance Measures**

Because federal funding is not adequate enough to meet the needs of the entire universe of the eligible low-income population LIHEAP has defined three targeted groups which they consider the most vulnerable: households with young children (pre-school age), the disabled, and the elderly (age 60+). Nationally, only about 20 percent of the entire eligible population receives LIHEAP assistance. HEAT is able to reach and serve about 40 percent of its eligible population.

LIHEAP has developed a method to survey how adequately these targeted groups are being served. A targeting index score of over 100 indicates that a group receives LIHEAP benefits at a rate higher than the average for the entire eligible population while a targeting index below 100 indicates that a group receives benefits at a rate lower than the average.

In Utah, the targeting index for elderly households is 85 (currently 25 percent of the entire HEAT caseload) while the targeting index for households with young children and for the disabled are 129 and 188, respectively. Therefore, the HEAT Program has decided to focus a greater proportion of its efforts on elderly households.

**Outcome Statement**

For the period 10/1/01 through 9/30/02 the HEAT Program will have increased the number of elderly customers served by at least 5 percent and/or raise the elderly targeting index score to 100 or better.

**Target**

At least 30 percent of all HEAT households will be comprised of elderly customers (and/or achieve a targeting index of 100) and they will enjoy.

1. Lower winter utility costs
2. Lower energy burden
3. More disposable income for other necessities such as food and medication, and
4. Stay warm and healthy.

**Milestones**

1. HEAT Offices will conduct public relations outreach efforts to prospective elderly customer.  
(There are about 18,245 eligible elder customer households in the state.)
2. Approximately 50 percent of eligible elderly customers will call for an appointment.
3. Ninety percent will keep their HEAT appointment
4. Ninety percent who keep the appointment will complete the HEAT application.
5. Ninety percent who complete the application will be approved for HEAT assistance.
6. One hundred percent of approved elderly customers will receive HEAT assistance.

### 3.12 Weatherization

#### Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a budget of \$7,124,300.

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
<b>Financing</b>				
General Fund	16,000	16,000	16,000	
General Fund, One-time		50,000		(50,000)
Federal Funds	1,485,400	1,727,300	2,678,300	951,000
Dedicated Credits Revenue	350,000	550,000	550,000	
Transfers	2,069,100	3,853,800	3,880,000	26,200
Beginning Nonlapsing		148,300		(148,300)
Closing Nonlapsing	(148,300)			
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$3,772,200</u>	<u>\$6,345,400</u>	<u>\$7,124,300</u>	<u>\$778,900</u>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Personal Services	98,100	162,500	195,100	32,600
In-State Travel	3,500	8,000	8,000	
Out of State Travel	4,900	7,800	7,800	
Current Expense	22,100	48,000	26,600	(21,400)
DP Current Expense	1,300	1,800	1,800	
Other Charges/Pass Thru	3,642,300	6,117,300	6,885,000	767,700
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$3,772,200</u>	<u>\$6,345,400</u>	<u>\$7,124,300</u>	<u>\$778,900</u>
<b>FTE/Other</b>				
<b>Total FTE</b>	2	3	3	0

#### Purpose

This program helps reduce the energy consumption and utility bills for low-income households. Priority is given to the elderly, disabled, families with pre-school age children, those with very high heating bills, and other at-risk households. Utah residents who are below 125 percent of the federal poverty guidelines are eligible for a one-time non-cash grant to make energy efficient improvements to their homes. In addition to energy efficiency, the program seeks to increase health and safety through heating system improvements and to increase the overall comfort of the occupants. This is important since program participants reside in the most neglected, oldest, least energy efficient, and most drafty housing stock in the state. Another goal of the program is to help preserve existing affordable housing and prevent homelessness.

#### Activities

The Division administers the program through eight local government and non-profit agencies. Primary core funding is made available through the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). Local agencies conduct a computerized energy audit on each home to identify the most cost effective improvements to make. They then implement a wide variety of improvements including, insulation air leakage testing and sealing, comprehensive heating system evaluations and tune-ups, client education, and electrical base load reduction measures. As a result of Weatherization, participating households realize an average annual reduction of 27.6 percent in energy use or \$249 per year savings.

During FY 2001 the Utah Weatherization Program accomplished the following:

Persons Served	3,171
Homes Completed	1,275
Elderly Units	437
Disabled Units	393
Native American Units	51
Units With Children	566

The Utah Weatherization Program has been very successful in leveraging it's appropriation of State funding to gain large amounts of federal, private and utility funding. Utah Power, Questar Gas and the Utah Public Service Commission have responded positively, becoming contributing financial partners in the funding of the Weatherization Program. Much of the \$550,000 contributed annually by these utility companies is a result of and dependent upon State matching funds for Weatherization.

During FY 2001, the Utah Weatherization Program was able to secure additional private and other non-DOE federal funding of more than \$2 million dollars. This exceeds the combined amount the State, DOE, and local utilities contribute to the program. For every dollar of State funds appropriated to Weatherization, over \$200 was leveraged from other sources.

### **Objectives**

- ▶ Increase the number of homes weatherized statewide by 20 percent through the securing of additional grant funds. (1.190 to 1.428 homes)
- ▶ Build local agency production capacities and reduce production backlogs.
- ▶ Implement the DOE "Weatherization Plus" enhancement program.

### **Outcomes**

- ▶ Leverage existing federal and state WAP funding with \$250,000 in Questar Gas contributions for enhancing and expanding the WAP gas appliance safety and tune-up program.
- ▶ Leverage existing federal and state WAP funding with \$300,000 in PacificCorp/Utah Power contributions for implementing an expanded electric base load reduction program for eligible Utah WAP/PacificCorp clients. This will also complement and implement the federal "Weatherization Plus" initiative.

- ▶ Implement the U.S. Department of Energy “Weatherization Plus” program by building technical and administrative capacity at both the State and local agency level. This will occur through increased funding, training, on-site visits by state WAP personnel, and follow-up with local agency staff. This will require coordination with all Utah WAP funding resources.
- ▶ Provide measure specific training and monitoring in key performance areas to each local Weatherization agency at least once during the fiscal year. Facilitate needed peer exchange training opportunities at four or more agencies.
- ▶ Increase production of homes and decrease production backlogs to no more than six months by funding required crew infrastructure enhancements and targeting additional funds where backlogs are greatest.
- ▶ Add performance measurements to the existing local agency budget/production process. Include a performance-based factor for increasing local agency grant awards in the allocation formula.

### 3.13 Martin Luther King Jr. Human Rights Commission

**Recommendation** The Analyst recommends a budget of \$99,400.

	2001	2002	2003	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
<b>Financing</b>				
General Fund	66,600	67,600	67,400	(200)
General Fund, One-time		(600)		600
Dedicated Credits Revenue		50,000	32,000	(18,000)
Transfers		800		(800)
Beginning Nonlapsing	1,200	1,400		(1,400)
Closing Nonlapsing	(1,400)			
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$66,400</u>	<u>\$119,200</u>	<u>\$99,400</u>	<u>(\$19,800)</u>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Personal Services	42,800	45,200	45,600	400
In-State Travel	400	1,000	1,000	
Out of State Travel	1,500	1,300	1,500	200
Current Expense	21,000	71,000	50,500	(20,500)
DP Current Expense	700	700	800	100
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$66,400</u>	<u>\$119,200</u>	<u>\$99,400</u>	<u>(\$19,800)</u>
<b>FTE/Other</b>				
<b>Total FTE</b>	1	1	1	0

**Purpose** The Martin Luther King, Jr. Human Rights Commission is a group of citizens appointed by the Governor to promote Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, to encourage appropriate ceremonies and activities, to provide advice and assistance to governments and private organizations. The Commission is to conduct workshops and training sessions on human rights, to partner with Public Education agencies and to promote training in the principles of non-violence. The Martin Luther King, Jr. Human Rights Commission has in place four sub-committees are: Education, Speakers Bureau, Holiday and Corporate Partnership. The MLK Human Rights Commission collaborates with the State Ethnic Offices.

**Activities** In FY 2001, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Human Rights Commission

- ▶ Formed a speaker’s bureau, which visits with schools and other organizations to promote Dr. King’s six principles of non-violence.
- ▶ Initiated the Adopt-A-School program and is expanding it to include one rural and one urban school during the current fiscal year. In collaboration with the state Ethnic Offices, the Commission is working to help develop relationships with at least four school districts.
- ▶ Worked to build partnerships with UEA, the state PTA, both the Salt Lake and Ogden NAACP branches, the Commission on Volunteers, and corporate groups that include American Express and Fidelity Investments.

- ▶ Celebrated, in conjunction with community-based organizations, universities and schools across the state, the national King holiday with an annual luncheon, guest speakers, receptions and presentations, activities that will be repeated each year.

**4.0 Additional Information**

**4.1 Funding History**

	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>
<b>Financing</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Estimated</b>	<b>Analyst</b>
General Fund	4,363,500	5,076,400	3,734,300	5,943,800	3,889,500
General Fund, One-time		184,500		1,943,900	
Federal Funds	23,990,200	22,842,600	30,758,600	30,514,800	31,213,300
Dedicated Credits Revenue	4,800	25,700	658,900	700,000	682,000
Federal Mineral Lease	10,000	472,500			
GFR - Homeless Trust	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
GFR - Olene Walker Housing TF	(1,465,900)				
Trust and Agency Funds					200
Permanent Community Impact	458,300	462,500	508,700	737,000	765,200
Transfers	2,004,000	(489,000)	2,069,100	3,862,400	4,880,000
Beginning Nonlapsing	2,653,000	279,600	309,300	532,400	
Closing Nonlapsing	(464,400)	(508,000)	(532,400)		
Lapsing Balance	(1,734,600)	(147,300)	(38,400)		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$29,968,900</b>	<b>\$28,349,500</b>	<b>\$37,618,100</b>	<b>\$44,384,300</b>	<b>\$41,580,200</b>
<b>Programs</b>					
Weatherization Assistance	3,038,100	3,003,000	3,772,200	6,345,400	7,124,300
Community Development Administration	660,000	539,500	632,600	1,054,500	765,900
Museum Services	208,200	209,700	216,900	1,414,600	287,600
Community Assistance	8,256,200	8,565,500	8,198,000	12,165,400	11,698,700
Pioneer Communities	203,600	267,500	316,500	250,400	231,000
Housing Development	3,737,300	796,800	870,300	3,750,800	2,487,200
Community Services	2,787,200	2,678,200	3,017,700	3,169,000	3,171,100
Homeless Committee	2,048,300	2,166,700	2,266,000	2,439,000	2,339,700
Commission on Volunteers	1,257,900	1,522,100	1,991,900	3,473,400	3,294,400
Martin Luther King Commission	35,300	51,900	66,400	119,200	99,400
HEAT	7,521,300	8,090,800	15,596,700	9,542,400	9,545,900
Emergency Food	67,800	145,300	138,300	188,600	120,000
Special Housing	147,700	312,500	534,600	471,600	415,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$29,968,900</b>	<b>\$28,349,500</b>	<b>\$37,618,100</b>	<b>\$44,384,300</b>	<b>\$41,580,200</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>					
Personal Services	1,957,100	1,826,600	2,270,800	3,038,200	2,653,500
In-State Travel	76,800	76,200	90,900	112,500	113,800
Out of State Travel	74,300	83,300	71,700	98,800	99,500
Current Expense	463,800	706,600	622,900	393,800	713,600
DP Current Expense	57,300	46,600	172,800	150,900	149,700
Other Charges/Pass Thru	27,339,600	25,610,200	34,373,400	40,590,100	36,228,100
Operating Transfers			15,600		1,622,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$29,968,900</b>	<b>\$28,349,500</b>	<b>\$37,618,100</b>	<b>\$44,384,300</b>	<b>\$41,580,200</b>
<b>FTE/Other</b>					
Total FTE	35	37	37	41	39

**4.2 Federal Funds**

<b>Program</b>		<b>FY 2001 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2002 Estimated</b>	<b>FY 2003 Analyst</b>
Community Development Block Grant	<b>Federal</b>	7,614,600	11,277,600	11,018,700
	<b>Required State Match</b>	168,800	168,800	168,800
Special Purpose Grants	<b>Federal</b>	69,800	81,600	60,000
	<b>Required State Match</b>			
HOME	<b>Federal</b>	4,175,000	3,363,900	3,365,000
	<b>Required State Match</b>	835,000	672,800	673,000
Housing Opportunities for Persons with Aids	<b>Federal</b>	422,600	315,000	315,000
	<b>Required State Match</b>			
Rural Development	<b>Federal</b>	17,600	50,000	50,000
	<b>Required State Match</b>	9,100	25,800	25,800
Low Income Home Energy Assistance	<b>Federal</b>	15,517,500	9,482,400	9,485,900
	<b>Required State Match</b>			
Weatherization Assistance	<b>Federal</b>	1,485,400	1,727,300	2,678,300
	<b>Required State Match</b>	16,000	16,000	16,000
Community Food and Nutrition Program	<b>Federal</b>	2,940,300	3,129,100	3,131,500
	<b>Required State Match</b>	37,800	39,900	39,900
Americorp	<b>Federal</b>	1,111,900	1,741,000	1,814,400
	<b>Required State Match</b>	92,300	93,600	93,600
CNS Professional Development and Training	<b>Federal</b>	112,100	150,000	150,000
	<b>Required State Match</b>			
CNS Learn and Serve	<b>Federal</b>	105,100	150,000	150,000
	<b>Required State Match</b>			
Americorp Disabilities Program	<b>Federal</b>	4,800	5,000	5,000
	<b>Required State Match</b>			
Promise Fellow	<b>Federal</b>	302,800	350,000	350,000
	<b>Required State Match</b>			
Education Grant	<b>Federal</b>	154,500	750,000	750,000
	<b>Required State Match</b>			
Emergency Shelter Grant	<b>Federal</b>	508,200	540,000	540,000
	<b>Required State Match</b>			
Shelter Care	<b>Federal</b>	94,400	106,600	50,000
	<b>Required State Match</b>			
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$35,795,600</b>	<b>\$34,236,400</b>	<b>\$34,930,900</b>