

Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

Needs Assessment Overview

The Needs Assessment (NA) section of the eCon Plan describes the primary housing problems in the region. Data and information for this section were provided by HUD and culled from the various housing needs assessments, market analyses and surveys conducted by the jurisdictions.

HUD provides pre-populated data tables for this section which compare housing problems for households by size and racial/ethnic composition. These are used to examine if disproportionate need exists in the City of Boulder (the jurisdiction for which the data are provided).

Housing needs are similar across the jurisdictions:

- 1) There is a mismatch between the number of households earning between 0 and 50 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI) and affordable rental units. In Boulder, this gap (adjusted for the student population) is a shortage of 5,000 units. In Longmont, the gap is 3,000 units. Longmont also shows a gap for renters earning between 50 and 80 percent of AMI (another 1,000 units).
- 2) Housing to purchase is very difficult to find for low and moderate income households. In 2012-2013, a household looking to purchase the median priced home for sale would have needed to earn \$88,000 in Boulder County and \$68,000 in Broomfield County.
- 3) Data on cost burden from the 2007-2011 American Community Survey (ACS) report 21,500 cost burdened owners (29% of all owner) and 24,000 cost burdened renters (62% of all renters) in Boulder County. For Broomfield County, the ACS identifies 4,000 (28%) cost burdened owners and 2,500 (46%) cost burdened renters.

NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment - 24 CFR 91.405, 24 CFR 91.205 (a,b,c)

Summary of Housing Needs

| Demographics | Base Year: 2000 | Most Recent Year: 2012 | % Change |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------|
| Population | 291,288 | 353,131 | 21% |
| Households | 114,680 | 141,436 | 23% |
| Median Income | N/A | N/A | |

Table 2 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2008-2012 ACS (Most Recent Year) Boulder County and Broomfield County combined

2000 Census numbers were not in line with FactFinder but appear to be a Boulder/Broomfield County number.

Number of Households Table

| | 0-30% HAMFI | >30-50% HAMFI | >50-80% HAMFI | >80- 100% HAMFI | >100% HAMFI |
|--|----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Total Households * | 20,742 | 16,432 | 15,769 | 12,704 | 77,014 |
| Small Family Households * | 4,954 | 4,437 | 5,060 | 4,833 | 43,429 |
| Large Family Households * | 1,083 | 964 | 1,027 | 690 | 5,384 |
| Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age | 1,926 | 2,157 | 2,352 | 1,945 | 11,097 |
| Household contains at least one person age 75 or older | 2,269 | 2,242 | 1,702 | 974 | 3,175 |
| Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger * | 2,909 | 2,182 | 1,953 | 1,529 | 9,498 |
| * The highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI | | | | | |

Table 3 - Total Households Table

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Housing Needs Summary Tables

1. Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed needs)

| | Renter | | | | | Owner | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30- 50% AMI | >50- 80% AMI | >80- 100% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30- 50% AMI | >50- 80% AMI | >80- 100% AMI | Total |
| NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities | 509 | 225 | 295 | 125 | 1,154 | 116 | 130 | 29 | 109 | 384 |
| Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing) | 170 | 80 | 30 | 34 | 314 | 85 | 40 | 60 | 20 | 205 |
| Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems) | 380 | 535 | 100 | 79 | 1,094 | 145 | 55 | 139 | 15 | 354 |
| Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems) | 10,614 | 2,447 | 530 | 55 | 13,646 | 3,421 | 2,523 | 1,563 | 667 | 8,174 |
| Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems) | 1,524 | 4,535 | 2,900 | 843 | 9,802 | 823 | 1,554 | 2,499 | 2,850 | 7,726 |
| Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems) | 704 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 704 | 324 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 324 |

Table 4 – Housing Problems Table

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

2. Housing Problems 2 (Households with one or more Severe Housing Problems: Lacks kitchen or complete plumbing, severe overcrowding, severe cost burden)

| | Renter | | | | | Owner | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | >80-100% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | >80-100% AMI | Total |
| NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Having 1 or more of four housing problems | 11,664 | 3,292 | 950 | 293 | 16,199 | 3,771 | 2,743 | 1,792 | 811 | 9,117 |
| Having none of four housing problems | 2,560 | 6,045 | 6,355 | 4,319 | 19,279 | 1,689 | 4,331 | 6,675 | 7,280 | 19,975 |
| Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems | 704 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 704 | 324 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 324 |

Table 5 – Housing Problems 2

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

3. Cost Burden > 30 percent

| | Renter | | | | Owner | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | Total |
| NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS | | | | | | | | |
| Small Related | 3,310 | 1,565 | 1,065 | 5,940 | 1,022 | 1,713 | 1,617 | 4,352 |
| Large Related | 705 | 454 | 165 | 1,324 | 287 | 185 | 214 | 686 |
| Elderly | 1,198 | 891 | 294 | 2,383 | 1,580 | 1,164 | 922 | 3,666 |
| Other | 7,743 | 4,613 | 2,055 | 14,411 | 1,556 | 1,157 | 1,314 | 4,027 |
| Total need by income | 12,956 | 7,523 | 3,579 | 24,058 | 4,445 | 4,219 | 4,067 | 12,731 |

Table 6 – Cost Burden > 30%

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

4. Cost Burden > 50 percent

| | Renter | | | | Owner | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | Total |
| NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS | | | | | | | | |
| Small Related | 2,685 | 460 | 115 | 3,260 | 819 | 1,093 | 528 | 2,440 |
| Large Related | 440 | 114 | 25 | 579 | 237 | 75 | 60 | 372 |
| Elderly | 950 | 427 | 85 | 1,462 | 1,102 | 594 | 438 | 2,134 |
| Other | 7,094 | 1,569 | 315 | 8,978 | 1,421 | 873 | 544 | 2,838 |
| Total need by income | 11,169 | 2,570 | 540 | 14,279 | 3,579 | 2,635 | 1,570 | 7,784 |

Table 7 – Cost Burden > 50%

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

5. Crowding (More than one person per room)

| | Renter | | | | | Owner | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | >80-100% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | >80-100% AMI | Total |
| NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Single-family households | 430 | 425 | 85 | 113 | 1,053 | 185 | 95 | 159 | 20 | 459 |
| Multiple, unrelated family households | 60 | 140 | 45 | 0 | 245 | 45 | 0 | 40 | 15 | 100 |
| Other, non-family households | 65 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Total need by income | 555 | 645 | 130 | 113 | 1,443 | 234 | 95 | 199 | 35 | 563 |

Table 8 – Crowding Information - 1/2

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

| | Renter | | | | Owner | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------|
| | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | Total | 0-30% AMI | >30-50% AMI | >50-80% AMI | Total |
| Households with Children Present | | | | | | | | |

Table 9 – Crowding Information – 2/2

Describe the number and type of single person households in need of housing assistance.

Estimating the needs of single person households in the City of Boulder is complicated by the large student population drawn to the area to attend the University of Colorado – Boulder. Because their earnings are limited, students can make up a significant proportion of households living in poverty and facing housing challenges. This is usually a temporary situation for most students, which changes when they graduate and find employment.

The presence of the large student population can make it challenging for non-student single person households to find affordable rents. The rental market caters to the student population. Many students live with roommates, are willing to live in smaller units and can pay more in rent.

The rental gaps analysis conducted for the City of Boulder to support the eCon Plan estimates that as many as 5,100 renters living in one person households cannot find housing they can afford. The gap is largest for those earning 0 to 30 percent AMI.

Apartment vacancy rates in the region are very low, less than 3 percent (data as of 3Q13). The median rent for an efficiency unit is \$800/month; the median 1-bedroom unit rents for \$1,045 per month. A single person household earning 30 percent AMI would need rental subsidies ranging between \$200 and \$500 per month to avoid being cost burdened.

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance who are disabled or victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.

Overall, 5 percent of Boulder residents have some type of disability. About 36 percent of those are seniors. In Boulder County as a whole, 7 percent of the population has some type of disability.

Forty-seven percent of households with a disability earn less than \$65,000 per year compared to 37 percent of all households.

According to the Housing Choice surveys completed for this eCon Plan, just over half (53%) of households with a disabled member said their home/apartment has the accessibility modifications to meet their family's accessibility needs. Modifications residents said they needed included access to stairs, accessible bathrooms, wheelchair accessibility, fire alarms (for hearing difficulty) and lower cabinets.

Thirty-seven percent of persons with a disability have some type of supportive service need, compared to just 7 percent of all residents. The most common needs for persons with a disability were help with housekeeping, yard work/shoveling and rides to doctor's appointments/grocery store/other places.

A person with a disability place high value on housing that is located near their place of employment, near transit and is affordable. This type of housing can be hard to find in the region, particularly in the City of Boulder, according to participants in the survey.

Among in-commuting households with a disabled member, 23 percent said they had to move from Boulder against their wishes in the past five years, primarily due to the cost of housing. None said they had to move due to accessibility concerns.

Sixty-eight percent of in-commuter households with a disabled member did consider Boulder when looking for their current housing. When asked why they did not choose Boulder, 61 percent said they couldn't afford it. Ten percent said they couldn't find accessible housing in Boulder.

The needs of victims of domestic violence were gathered through stakeholder interviews. These residents are extremely challenged to find housing that is quickly available given the region's very tight rental market. Additional transitional housing to serve this population is needed.

What are the most common housing problems?

According to the CHAS data above and the City of Boulder's Housing Market Analysis, the City of Boulder's most common housing problems occur for renters earning less than 30 percent of AMI. These renters have a very hard time finding affordable rentals beyond those provided by local housing authorities. This is true for the City of Longmont as well.

Housing problems this population faces most frequently are severe overcrowding, housing cost burden greater than 50 percent of income and zero/negative income. Over 50 percent (54%) of this population

problems face severe overcrowding and nearly 80 percent (78%) have housing cost burden greater than 50 percent of income.

Renters facing overcrowding are mostly those earning between 30 to 50 percent of AMI (49% live in overcrowded conditions). These renters are likely low income families working in the retail and service industries.

For owners, cost burden is the most common housing problem, reflective of the area's very high home prices.

Are any populations/household types more affected than others by these problems?

Nearly three-quarters (72%) of renter households with one or more severe housing problems earn less than 30 percent of AMI. Severe housing problems for owner households expand across a wider earnings bracket.

Describe the characteristics and needs of Low-income individuals and families with children (especially extremely low-income) who are currently housed but are at imminent risk of either residing in shelters or becoming unsheltered 91.205(c)/91.305(c)). Also discuss the needs of formerly homeless families and individuals who are receiving rapid re-housing assistance and are nearing the termination of that assistance.

Clients who are newly homeless or experiencing a first time major crisis are often in need of lighter touch housing assistance. To address needs of these clients, Boulder County Department of Housing & Human Services (DHHS) created the Housing Stabilization Program (HSP) to provide homelessness prevention and rapid rehousing services accessible via Boulder County's Community-Based Organizations. Boulder County contracts with seven external organizations to provide HSP services: EFAA, Sister Carmen, OUR Center, Bridge House, SPAN, Safe Shelter, and Mental Health Partner's Community Infant Program (CIP).

HSP serves individuals who are at or below 80 percent Federal Poverty Level (FPL) and who appear to need 12 months or less rental assistance to return to self-sufficiency. The program is intended as a short term, one-time program. This program has been especially helpful for victims of domestic violence or divorce. Clients with medical issues and sudden job loss also are good fits for the program. HSP also helps with one time deposit-only and first-month's rent. Clients accessing this assistance tend to have more stable lives in place, higher income levels (50%-80% FPL) and need only brief intervention. HSP clients who seek longer term assistance tend to be lower on the FPL range.

The Short-Term Housing, Family Unification Program (FUP), and TBRA programs serve higher risk of homelessness populations with slightly different entry criteria. Clients in these programs are almost universally at or below 30 percent FPL (with TBRA, documented homelessness is a requirement at program entry). The Short-term Housing and FUP programs require a child-welfare concern, while TBRA requires families to have McKinney Vento status. Both Short-term Housing and TBRA are Rapid-

Rehousing programs, whereas FUP can also be eviction prevention. Clients are typically either working minimum-wage jobs or are on TANF and SNAP.

The Family Self-Sufficiency Program (FSS) serves a population with lower risk of homelessness. Clients must have educational and/or employment goals that would benefit from five years of on-going assistance and case management. Typical clients are single parents who want to return to school for college degree or skilled trade.

Families are a large proportion (45%) of the City's homeless. Emergency Family Assistance Association (EFAA) is a local provider of shelter, housing and related emergency services to Boulder's homeless and near-homeless families. The agency provides 18 units of housing targeted to homeless families (six emergency shelter units and 12 transitional housing units) and an additional 38 units elsewhere in the county. EFAA's current eligibility criteria require families to have incomes of at least \$1,000 per month before they can qualify for services and transitional housing.

In 2014, Boulder Housing Partners (BHP) completed construction of and opened Lee Hill, a 31-unit apartment building housing chronically homeless individuals. Using a Housing First approach, residents will receive supportive services from case managers while residing in stable housing.

Boulder County provides rapid re-housing in all areas of the county. The City of Longmont has assisted 37 households into a Housing First Program with all maintaining their housing or finding alternative permanent housing solutions in 2014.

If a jurisdiction provides estimates of the at-risk population(s), it should also include a description of the operational definition of the at-risk group and the methodology used to generate the estimates:

In the City of Longmont, the 2014 Point-in-Time survey counted 214 persons in 91 households (HH) that were at risk of becoming homeless. Nearly 75 percent of the total persons were children. Over 50 percent (48 HH) were comprised of 42 singles and six couples with children. Another 27 HH were single parents with children. These persons at risk of becoming homeless reported a myriad of issues increasing their risk, including language barriers, serious mental illness, serious medical or physical conditions, and substance abuse.

At-risk of homelessness is defined as an individual or family who reported staying in the following locations on the night of the Point-in-Time survey:

- Temporarily with family or friends
- In a motel/hotel paid for by self
- In jail, prison or juvenile detention
- In a hospital, psychiatric hospital, substance abuse treatment program or halfway house

- Facing eviction from permanent supportive housing
- Facing eviction from an apartment or house including Section 8
- Staying “somewhere else” and said they are homeless
- Staying “somewhere else” and facing eviction

Specify particular housing characteristics that have been linked with instability and an increased risk of homelessness.

Characteristics that are linked with housing instability and increased risk of homelessness include: mental health issues, domestic violence issues, special-needs or disability conditions, low-education levels (i.e. high school drop-out, or lack of skilled trade), poor social networks, substance abuse, single-parenthood with multiple children, and/or former foster care history. Inter-generational poverty is also a typical client characteristic for many of our higher-risk housing programs.

Some populations are more at risk for homelessness including single parent families and youth. A primary indicator for persons/families at risk is poverty. Households with incomes at or below 30 percent of AMI are at particular risk. An inability to make a wage that would put a family above the poverty level directly increases their risk of homelessness. The fact that Longmont and the remainder of Boulder County is facing a severe rental housing shortage with vacancy rates below 3 percent and ever increasing rents is forcing more and more families and individuals that were barely hanging on, out of their housing and into unsafe situations.

Discussion

There are two key gaps for homeless families in the Boulder-Broomfield Consortium region: 1) lack of emergency shelter for families with either no incomes or very low incomes; and 2) very low vacancy rates in affordable rental housing. Access to affordable housing is a significant barrier for support services clients in reaching self-sufficiency.

NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems - 91.405, 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

A disproportionately greater need exists when the members of a racial or ethnic group at an income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (defined as 10 percentage points or more) than the income level as a whole. For example, assume that 60 percent of all low-income households within a jurisdiction have a housing problem and 70 percent of low-income Hispanic households have a housing problem. In this case, low-income Hispanic households have a disproportionately greater need. Per the regulations at 91.205(b)(2), 91.305(b)(2), and 91.405, a grantee must provide an assessment for each disproportionately greater need identified. Although the purpose of these tables is to analyze the relative level of need for each race and ethnic category, the data also provide information for the jurisdiction as a whole that can be useful in describing overall need.

Disproportionate housing needs in a population are defined as having one or more of the following four housing problems in greater proportion than the jurisdiction as a whole or than whites: 1) Living in housing that lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2) Living in housing that lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3) More than one person per room (overcrowded), and 4) Cost burden greater than 30 percent of AMI.

0–30 Percent of AMI

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 16,699 | 1,998 | 914 |
| White | 12,454 | 1,599 | 665 |
| Black / African American | 253 | 10 | 30 |
| Asian | 649 | 29 | 87 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 65 | 19 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 2,965 | 305 | 125 |

Table 10 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1) Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2) Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3) More than one person per room, 4) Cost burden greater than 30 percent.

30–50 Percent of AMI

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 11,454 | 4,261 | 0 |
| White | 9,574 | 3,255 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 100 | 75 | 0 |
| Asian | 365 | 145 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 15 | 20 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 1,320 | 729 | 0 |

Table 11 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1) Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2) Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3) More than one person per room, 4) Cost burden greater than 30 percent.

50–80 Percent of AMI

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 9,244 | 8,777 | 0 |
| White | 7,403 | 7,432 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 30 | 40 | 0 |
| Asian | 295 | 259 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 30 | 50 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 1,329 | 834 | 0 |

Table 12 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1) Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2) Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3) More than one person per room, 4) Cost burden greater than 30 percent.

80–100 Percent of AMI

| Housing Problems | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 5,312 | 8,528 | 0 |
| White | 4,556 | 7,169 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 100 | 4 | 0 |
| Asian | 180 | 298 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 415 | 899 | 0 |

Table 13 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1) Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2) Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3) More than one person per room, 4) Cost burden greater than 30 percent.

Discussion

The above disproportionate needs tables were generated by HUD for the eCon Plan from a proprietary data set. The numbers appear to represent on the City of Boulder.

The greatest disproportionate need in Boulder exists for households earning 80 to 100 percent of the AMI. Nearly 100 percent of African Americans in this earnings bracket have housing problems, 57 percent greater than whites and 58 percent higher than the jurisdiction as a whole.

The vast majority of Boulder households earning less than 30 percent of AMI with one or more housing problems are white, with 89 percent of whites experiencing problems. In this case, a disproportionate need for a racial or ethnic group would need to be 99 percent. Both African Americans and are close to that definition at 96 percent of their racial/ethnic group in this earnings bracket.

There are no ethnic groups with disproportionate housing problems in the 30 to 50 percent of AMI category. For households earning 30 to 50 percent of AMI, whites have the highest percentage of households with housing problems (75% of households) versus 57 percent of African American

households and 64 percent of Hispanics. Hispanics earning 50 to 80 percent of AMI show disproportionately greater housing needs than both whites and the jurisdiction as a whole (61% v. 50% and 51%, respectively).

NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems - 91.405, 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

This section discusses severe housing needs as defined by HUD, using HUD-prepared housing needs data. The tables show the number of Boulder households that have severe housing needs by income and race and ethnicity. Needs are defined as one or more of the following housing problems: 1. Housing lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Housing lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. Household has more than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Household cost burden exceeds 50 percent.

0–30 Percent of AMI

| Severe Housing Problems* | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 14,554 | 4,148 | 914 |
| White | 11,034 | 3,013 | 665 |
| Black / African American | 218 | 44 | 30 |
| Asian | 519 | 165 | 87 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 65 | 19 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 2,400 | 880 | 125 |

Table 14 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1) Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2) Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3) More than 1.5 persons per room, 4) Cost burden over 50 percent.

30–50 Percent of AMI

| Severe Housing Problems* | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 5,639 | 10,082 | 0 |
| White | 4,809 | 8,002 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 55 | 120 | 0 |
| Asian | 149 | 355 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 15 | 20 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 585 | 1,459 | 0 |

Table 15 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1) Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2) Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3) More than 1.5 persons per room, 4) Cost burden over 50 percent.

50–80 Percent of AMI

| Severe Housing Problems* | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 3,089 | 14,908 | 0 |
| White | 2,338 | 12,478 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 10 | 60 | 0 |
| Asian | 105 | 450 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 30 | 50 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 535 | 1,638 | 0 |

Table 16 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1) Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2) Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3) More than 1.5 persons per room, 4) Cost burden over 50 percent.

80–100 Percent of AMI

| Severe Housing Problems* | Has one or more of four housing problems | Has none of the four housing problems | Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 1,078 | 12,756 | 0 |
| White | 973 | 10,767 | 0 |
| Black / African American | 0 | 104 | 0 |
| Asian | 70 | 413 | 0 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 49 | 1,259 | 0 |

Table 17 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1) Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2) Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3) More than 1.5 persons per room, 4) Cost burden over 50 percent.

Discussion

Boulder households facing severe housing problems show disproportionate need among some racial/ethnic groups in all but the lowest income bracket.

For households earning 30 to 50 of the AMI, the disproportionate need is 63 percent (compared to whites and the jurisdiction as a whole).

In the 50 to 80 percent of AMI category, Native Americans have a 22 percent disproportionate need relative to whites and 23 percent disproportionate need to the jurisdiction as a whole. Hispanics households fall just under the disproportionate need definition (9%).

NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens - 91.405, 91.205 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

Cost burden is experienced when a household pays more than 30 percent of their gross household income toward housing costs, including utilities, insurance and property taxes (for homeowners). Severe cost burden occurs when a household pays 50 percent or more of gross household income in housing costs.

Housing Cost Burden

| Housing Cost Burden | <=30% | 30-50% | >50% | No / negative income (not computed) |
|--------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------------------------------------|
| Jurisdiction as a whole | 86,423 | 26,708 | 22,740 | 1,010 |
| White | 75,570 | 22,047 | 18,757 | 745 |
| Black / African American | 524 | 259 | 275 | 34 |
| Asian | 2,794 | 935 | 709 | 97 |
| American Indian, Alaska Native | 293 | 50 | 60 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 6,014 | 3,214 | 2,555 | 125 |

Table 18 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Data Source: 2007-2011 CHAS

Discussion

The only disproportionate housing cost burden is for Pacific Islanders, who experience severe cost burden at a rate 35 percentage points greater than whites. The rate is also nearly 36 percentage points higher than the jurisdiction as a whole. It is important to note that the number of Pacific Islander households is very small relative to the jurisdiction. Native Americans experience of housing cost burden is nearly disproportionate, at 73 percent versus 65 percent for whites.

NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion - 91.205 (b)(2)

Are there any Income categories in which a racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need than the needs of that income category as a whole?

See the Discussion in sections NA-15, NA-20 and NA-25.

If they have needs not identified above, what are those needs?

Housing needs of African American, Hispanic and Nepalese households were discussed in the focus groups conducted for the eCon Plan. The needs expressed in these groups that were particular to specific populations include:

- Long time African American homeowners worry they may need to move because of rising property taxes. Many do not view their homes as investments, but as the only opportunity their children may have to live in Boulder.
- Participants in the Hispanic and Nepalese focus groups said they highly valued living in Boulder. Most work numerous full and part-time jobs to pay their rent at the mobile home park. Both groups of immigrants described Boulder as safe and peaceful and they are willing to work as much as it takes to keep living in Boulder—until they want to buy a home. Because buying a single-family home is their dream, many explained that they would have to leave Boulder when they buy a home.

Are any of those racial or ethnic groups located in specific areas or neighborhoods in your community?

There are eight Census tracts in the Boulder/Broomfield HOME Consortium with high concentrations of residents who report Hispanic origin. These Census tracts are distributed between Longmont, Census tracts located adjacent to the City of Boulder in unincorporated Boulder County, and in the City of Lafayette.

In the City of Boulder, a Census tract located on the south end of Boulder is estimated to be 44.74 percent African American. A second Census tract is located west of Boulder in the foothills. In this community, 47.83 percent of residents (11 of 23 residents) are estimated to have two or more races.

NA-35 Public Housing - 91.405, 91.205 (b)

Introduction

This section contains tables showing the numbers and types of public housing available in the Consortium, as well as the makeup of persons that are utilizing the various types of housing, and housing assistance.

Totals in Use

| | Program Type | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|----------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Vouchers | | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Project-based | Tenant-based | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | Disabled * |
| # of units vouchers in use | 449 | 8 | 332 | 1,310 | 144 | 741 | 0 | 0 | 231 |

Table 19 - Public Housing by Program Type

*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center) **Public Housing -- 332 physical units; not vouchers

Characteristics of Residents

| | Program Type | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|----------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Vouchers | | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Project-based | Tenant-based | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | |
| Average Annual Income | 13,197 | 9,100 | 16,215 | 14,407 | 16,558 | 14,152 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average length of stay | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average Household size | 2.4 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Program Type | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------|----------------|----------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Vouchers | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Project - based | Tenant - based | Special Purpose Voucher | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program |
| # Homeless at admission | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # of Elderly Program Participants (>62) | 130 | 3 | 60 | 332 | 3 | 199 | 0 | 0 |
| # of Disabled Families | 202 | 5 | 82 | 522 | 9 | 361 | 0 | 0 |
| # of Families requesting accessibility features | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # of HIV/AIDS program participants | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # of DV victims | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Table 20 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Race of Residents

| Program Type | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|----------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Race | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Vouchers | | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Project – based | Tenant - based | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | Disabled * |
| White | 427 | 0 | 0 | 1,129 | 104 | 632 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Black/African American | 7 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 5 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asian | 3 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pacific Islander | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Program Type | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|----------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Race | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Vouchers | | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Project - based | Tenant - based | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | Disabled * |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

***includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition**

Table 21 – Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Ethnicity of Residents

| Program Type | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|----------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Ethnicity | Certificate | Mod-Rehab | Public Housing | Vouchers | | | | | |
| | | | | Total | Project - based | Tenant - based | Special Purpose Voucher | | |
| | | | | | | | Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing | Family Unification Program | Disabled * |
| Hispanic | 203 | 0 | 164 | 373 | 53 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Hispanic | 244 | 0 | 134 | 935 | 67 | 624 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

***includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition**

Table 22 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Section 504 Needs Assessment: Describe the needs of public housing tenants and applicants on the waiting list for accessible units:

The Longmont Housing Team (LHOT) has no current waiting list. The last lottery was in 2011, and the last issued voucher was in January 2013.

What are the number and type of families on the waiting lists for public housing and Section 8 tenant-based rental assistance? Based on the information above, and any other information available to the jurisdiction, what are the most immediate needs of residents of public housing and Housing Choice voucher holders?

The City of Boulder has a shortage of affordable attached homes in particular, but is in need of affordable housing stock in general. The City of Longmont is in need of housing stock in all sizes and ranges of affordability. In addition, housing maintenance funds are needed to maintain and preserve affordable housing.

How do these needs compare to the housing needs of the population at large?

In the City of Longmont, the needs of Section 504 recipients are the same as the population at large. Resident services are also needed to maintain low-income housing.

Discussion

Please see above.

NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment - 91.405, 91.205 (c)

Introduction:

Boulder County and Broomfield County provide homeless housing throughout the County, including the cities of Boulder, Longmont, and Broomfield. Below is a brief summary of homeless housing inventories and the population(s) they serve, followed by more detail by city/county.

- Warming Center Beds: 217 beds.
- Overnight Shelter: 276 beds; 20 vouchers.
- Transitional Housing: 334 beds; 379 vouchers.
- Permanent Supportive Housing: 145 beds; 415 vouchers.

City of Boulder

- Warming Center Beds: 177 winter beds serving adult men and women (32 of which are camping beds only available in the summer).
- Overnight Shelter: 218 beds, 160 of which serve adult men and women only (110 of these beds are only available in the winter). The remaining beds serve youth, families, and victims of domestic violence. The City also has six EFAA vouchers.
- Transitional Housing: 5.5 beds, 4 for HIV population and another 1 to 2 beds for homeless addicted to substances. Boulder has 35 vouchers for transitional housing, 16 of which are targeted to families.
- Permanent Supportive Housing: 41 vouchers for facility based housing, 31 of which target chronically homeless and the remainder are for those with serious mental illness.

City of Longmont

- Warming Center Beds: 40 winter beds serving adult men and woman.
- Overnight Shelter: 48 beds, 25 of which target families and the remainder target victims of DV and children. The City also has 10 EFAA vouchers for families.
- Transitional Housing: 34 beds of which all but 8 beds serve all homeless populations; 91 housing vouchers targeting all homeless populations.
- Permanent Supportive Housing: 95 beds with all but 16 beds (singles only) serving all homeless populations. The City has 64 supportive housing vouchers, 26 of which are designated for mental health, 2 for probation, and the remainder serves all homeless populations.

City/County of Broomfield

- Permanent Supportive Housing: Boulder and Broomfield Counties partner to provide 190 supportive housing vouchers targeted to homeless with serious mental illness. The current distribution of vouchers in use is as follows; 86 in Boulder, 78 in Longmont, 7 in Broomfield, and 10 in other Boulder County cities/towns.

Boulder (County-wide)

- Overnight Shelter: 10 beds and 4 vouchers targeted to families, located in the City of Lafayette.
- Transitional Housing: 295 beds countywide through BCHA are targeted to all homeless populations, and 253 vouchers that primarily target families (10 vouchers are available for transition-aged youth).
- Permanent Supportive Housing: 50 beds for chronically homeless veterans and their families, and 99 vouchers, 35 of which serve chronically homeless veterans. The remaining vouchers serve families involved in child protection and families participating in the self-sufficiency programs.

If data is not available for the categories "number of persons becoming and exiting homelessness each year," and "number of days that persons experience homelessness," describe these categories for each homeless population type (including chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth):

Becoming Homeless, Length of Homelessness

In Boulder County's 2014 Point in Time Count and Survey (PIT) the largest percentage of respondents (37%) reported being homeless more than one month but less than one year. The second highest percentage (20%) reported being homeless for one to three years.

In Boulder County PIT counts from 2012-14, an average of 125 people were counted as chronically homeless each year and an average of 394 people were considered newly homeless each year. National estimates suggest PIT undercounts the homeless population by at least half.

In the City of Longmont there were a total of 266 persons in 145 households who met the HUD definition of homeless, according to the 2014 PIT. There were 98 single persons, 107 were in single parent households (31 respondents), 51 were couples with children (12 households), and five were couples without children (10 persons). Persons of Hispanic origin represented 33 percent (49 persons). There were 10 (7%) veterans in addition to the 266 persons, but only six were receiving veteran's benefits. Newly homeless as of January, 2014 were 54 persons in 23 households (20% of those answering the PIT survey). Ten respondents reported being homeless for less than one month; 37 for more than one month, but less than a year (25.5%, the highest percentage); 23 for one to three years; and 15 for more than three years. There were 19 chronically homeless individuals and 12 were unsheltered at the time of the survey.

Exiting homelessness

In 2013, agencies receiving City of Boulder human services funding reported helping 330 homeless/formerly homeless people to obtain or maintain permanent housing. In November 2014, a new 31-unit supportive housing development (Lee Hill) opened in the City of Boulder to help an additional 31 chronically homeless individuals exit homelessness. Recently Boulder County was also awarded additional Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) vouchers to help veterans exit homelessness and enter permanent housing.

Since adoption of the Boulder County Ten-Year Plan to Address Homelessness in 2010, the following resources have also been developed to assist people in exiting homelessness:

- Bridge House started the Ready-to-Work (RTW) program.
- Bridge House and OUR Center have added peer navigator outreach workers to staff.
- Boulder County Cares (BCC) street outreach is in operation during winter months.
- Boulder County Medicaid enrollment increased dramatically to 42,000 people.
- Boulder County team accepted as part of Governor's Supportive Housing Toolkit Initiative.
- HUD VASH vouchers were issued to 35 homeless veteran households to permanently house them. Boulder County was invited to apply for an additional 25 vouchers.
- Boulder Shelter hired a full time benefits coordinator for SSI/SSDI applications.
- Homeless Outreach Providing Encouragement (HOPE) street outreach is operating year-round in City of Longmont.
- Longmont Housing Authority purchased The Suites, 71 units of housing for the homeless.
- Lee Hill 31-unit Housing First development is in process in Boulder.
- Fifty family and youth households housed by Boulder County via HUD Family Reunification funding.
- The town of Lafayette developed 24 family units.
- The town of Lafayette purchased 18 units for vulnerable homeless.

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance for families with children and the families of veterans.

One estimate of this population would be a combination of the McKinney Vento enrollment numbers from school districts multiplied by 1.4 to capture the families with children ages 0-5 who are not yet enrolled in school. The current McKinney Vento population in BVSD is 282 children, and in SVVSD is approaching 400 children. This would combine for nearly 700 homeless children as of October 20, 2014 (the at-risk of homelessness group does not qualify for McKinney Vento status). If we multiply $700 * 1.4 = 1,000$ homeless children (includes doubled-up) in Boulder County as of October 20, 2014. 1,000 children would represent approximately 500 families (average 2.0 children per family) who are currently homeless or unstably housed (doubled up) in Boulder County.

Our best estimate of families “at risk of homelessness” would be to double the number of documented homeless families. This is based on the Boulder County Housing Stabilization Program (HSP) metrics where approximately half the clients need to be rehoused, with the other half needing eviction prevention. This methodology suggests the number of families currently in need of housing assistance would be approximately 1,000 households. Of these, based on population demographics, approximately 30 percent may be undocumented and therefore ineligible for assistance unless there was a safety concern.

City of Longmont 2014 PIT indicates that about 61 percent of the City’s homeless are families with children. There were 10 veterans but familial status could not be determined.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Homelessness by Racial and Ethnic Group.

Racial and ethnic minorities are disproportionately impacted by homelessness in Boulder County. Below are percentages of people of color in the 2014 PIT, compared to their percentage of the overall county population.

Latino/Hispanic: 14 percent of county population, 19 percent of PIT.

African American: 1 percent of county population, 6 percent of PIT.

American Indian/Alaska Native: 1 percent of county population, 4 percent of PIT.

Mixed race: 3 percent of county population, 10 percent of PIT.

Persons affected by physical and/or developmental disabilities are also disproportionately impacted by homelessness in Boulder County, with 59 percent reporting a disabling condition in the 2014 PIT.

In City of Longmont the homeless population by racial and ethnic group is slightly different than Boulder County at large. The most significant difference is persons of Hispanic origin, which make up 20 percent more of the City’s homeless population than in Boulder County at large.

Hispanic/Latino: 34 percent of city population.

African American: 8 percent of city population.

American Indian/Alaska Native: 2 percent of city population.

Mixed race: 6 percent of city population.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.

In the 2014 PIT, 94 people (11%) of those counted in Boulder County were unsheltered. Unsheltered individuals may have multiple barriers including disabilities and mental health issues preventing them from accessing available services. They are often in need of permanent supportive housing.

In the 2014 PIT, 12 people (5%) of those counted in City of Longmont were unsheltered, 49 people (35%) were in an emergency shelter, and 78 (53%) were in time-limited transitional housing.

Discussion:

Please see above.

NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment - 91.405, 91.205 (b,d)

Introduction

This section provides an overview of the housing and supportive service needs of non-homeless special populations in the Boulder/Broomfield Consortium area. Information on needs was gathered through stakeholder consultation.

Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

Special populations with the most significant needs in the Boulder/Broomfield Consortium area include:

Undocumented residents and workers. Many have housing and supportive service needs but are reluctant to seek out services because of their citizenship status. In some cases, they cannot access services. Living in overcrowded conditions to avoid cost burden is a common strategy.

Pregnant young women who need both affordable housing and child care. Transitional housing options are limited in Boulder and Broomfield Counties. As such, many families needing transitional housing resort to living in their cars and/or cycling through shelters in Denver and surrounding communities with greater resources.

Survivors of domestic violence seeking affordable rental housing. In tight rental markets, when landlords are choosing among many tenants, survivors have a harder time finding rental housing due to rental histories that have been blemished by their former partners. They are more likely to remain housed with their abusers in very tight rental markets.

Elderly residents living on fixed incomes. Many residents affected by the 2013 floods were seniors. They have significant housing repair needs or have lost their homes.

Persons with mental illnesses. These residents need a variety of housing options to address their differing needs and are particularly difficult to house in tight housing markets.

Low income workers seeking affordable housing. For many workers—particularly those in low wage industries—down payment requirements for rental units are too high, and the funds needed to attain homeownership are unreachable. Many landlords are now requiring first and last months' rents in addition to a security deposit.

What are the housing and supportive service needs of these populations and how are these needs determined?

On September 24, 2014, the Consortium held a focus group with providers of housing and community development services to low and moderate income residents in Boulder and Broomfield Counties. The purpose of the focus group was to obtain information on the greatest unmet housing and community

development needs of low and moderate income and special needs populations in the Consortium. Attendees were asked to discuss:

- The most common housing problems of their clients,
- The need for specific types of housing,
- If and how needs differ by race and ethnic composition of clients,
- The primary supportive service needs of clients, and
- The strengths and gaps in the delivery of services to clients.

Stakeholders agree that all low income and special needs populations in the Boulder/Broomfield region have a consistent need for affordable rental units. The 2013 floods made an already very tight rental market much worse. Recent cutbacks in social services—primary food stamps and child care subsidies—have further exacerbated this need. Low income and special needs renters in the Consortium often compete with students when seeking rentals, many of whom receive parental help and guarantees or roommates and, as such, can afford to pay more per month in rent.

Many special needs populations also need housing with supportive services and, ideally, housing near public transit. Persons with mental illness, in particular, do best with onsite counselors. Some residents are seeking services for the first time, due to the floods, and are unsure how to obtain help.

A full discussion of the needs of special populations is contained in Appendix A, which is appended to this eCon Plan.

Discuss the size and characteristics of the population with HIV/AIDS and their families within the Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area: N/A

Discussion:

Please see Appendix A.

NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs - 91.415, 91.215 (f)

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Facilities:

With limited financial resources available to support the capital improvement needs of public facilities the City of Boulder's annual community development funding allocation prioritizes the capital needs, including facility acquisition and rehabilitation, of agencies that serve low-income households in Boulder. Recent public facility improvements have included: infrastructure improvements at a local urban garden, installation of solar panels, rooftop HVAC systems and outdoor education classrooms at a nonprofit preschool serving low income households, parking lot expansion, installation of a fire protection system and roof replacement for an early childhood education center serving low income households, installation of a secure entryway at the YWCA community facility, and capital improvements at Dental Aid, a facility which provides dental care to low income persons. While the majority of funds are distributed during the annual fund round, the City partners with service providers throughout the year to address emergency needs.

How were these needs determined?

The capital improvement needs of City of Boulder service providers are identified through the annual fund round. The availability of funds is announced through the Notice of Funding availability that is both published and released to housing and service providers. In addition to the City of Boulder Community Development Fund Round, staff coordinates closely with the Human Services Fund Round which provides programming funds to local service providers. Capital improvement needs identified through the Human Services Fund Round are referred to the City's Community Development Fund Round.

The City of Longmont determined capital improvement needs through an in-depth evaluation of the City's public facilities.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Improvements:

The City of Boulder prioritizes capital improvements to meet capital needs, including facility acquisition and rehabilitation, of agencies that serve low-income households in Boulder. Public improvements have included parking lot improvement, installation of bike paths and accessibility improvements.

How were these needs determined?

Needs are continuously identified through the annual funding round as well as ongoing coordination with local service providers serving low income populations.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Services:

The City focuses its allowable CDBG public service funds to support Family Resource Schools, a collaborative effort between the City of Boulder and Boulder County serving all residents of the City of Boulder with a child up to 19 years of age or families with a child enrolled in a BVSD school within the city limits. Programs are dedicated to supporting a family's capacity to raise healthy, well-functioning,

and successful children. The broad array of prevention and early intervention services are developed and delivered according to the unique needs of families in each school community. The program especially emphasizes outreach to traditionally underserved populations to increase access to basic services and involvement in school.

The City of Boulder's Human Services Fund (HSF) provides approximately \$2 million annually to community agencies providing services to Boulder residents in support of the Housing and Human Services Master Plan. As needs are identified that might be suitable for Community Development funding, the HSF Manager refers applicants to the Community Development Fund Round.

How were these needs determined?

Needs are identified through a competitive process that aligns with City of Boulder priorities and goals. Applications are submitted using an online grant management system, which is shared with the City of Longmont, Boulder County and Foothills United Way. Through the joint application system, agencies or organizations may apply to more than one funder and/or more than one impact area per funder, but individual programs can only apply for ONE impact area per funder. Although the cities of Boulder and Longmont, Boulder County and Foothills United Way are collaborating for the joint application process, each funder will be awarding its own funds through its own grant review process, and some funder requirements may be different as described in the application.