May 9, 2019

Memorandum to: Honorable Mayor and City Council
Thru: Charles P. Potucek, City Manager
       Victoria Yarbrough, Assistant City Manager
From: Matt McLachlan, Director, Community Development
Subject: PUBLIC HEARING
Consideration of the City’s Draft 2019-2024 Five Year Consolidated Plan and Draft 2019 Annual Action Plan for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funding

REQUESTED ACTION:

Provide Staff feedback and direction on Draft CDBG Five Year Consolidated Plan (2019-2024) and proposed 2019 Annual Action Plan, hold public hearing, and opening the 30-day public comment period.

INITIATED BY: City of Sierra Vista

BACKGROUND:

In 2013, the City of Sierra Vista entered the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) entitlement program as a direct recipient of annual grant funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The program was authorized under Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and is one of the longest continuously run programs at HUD. The Community Development Department administers the CDBG program and presents proposals and recommendations to the City Council, advisory boards, and the general public.

The primary national objectives of the program are the development of viable communities, principally for low and moderate income (LMI) persons, through;

- Decent Housing
- Suitable Living Environment
- Expanded Economic Opportunity

All CDBG activities must result in one of the following:

- Benefit low and moderate income (LMI) persons;
- Prevent or eliminate slum and blight; or
- Meet an urgent need having a particular urgency because existing conditions pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community.
The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires jurisdictions that receive Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding to develop a Five-Year Consolidated Plan detailing how the City plans to invest its resources to meet ongoing affordable housing, community and economic development and public service needs. Additionally, jurisdictions must develop an Annual Action Plan each year to implement the Five-Year Plan. Typically, the development of the Five-Year Plan includes the simultaneous development of the first year Annual Action Plan for that cycle. In this case, the 2019-2024 Consolidated Plan includes the concurrent development of the 2019 Annual Action Plan, with subsequent annual action plans developed in their respective years.

**CONSOLIDATED PLAN SCHEDULE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council Work Session – Overview of Consolidated Planning Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Funding Availability Published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification Sent to Public Service Agency Distribution List with Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmichael Neighborhood Association – CDBG Priorities Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Online Survey and Funding Announcement in City Email Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Commission Meeting - CDBG Priorities Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Disabilities Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting with Social Services Providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM Staff Meeting – Discussion on Recommended City Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG Funding Applications Due to City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council Public Hearing – Tentative Selection of 2019-2020 Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum of Care Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Hearing on Draft Consolidated Plan (30 Day Review)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorize Submission to HUD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOALS, ANTICIPATED RESOURCES, AND PRIORITY NEEDS:**

On April 15, 2019, the City received an award letter from HUD stating its official FY 2019 CDBG allocation amount of $271,147. This represents a four percent increase over last year’s award of $260,652. The Consolidated Plan anticipates future resources using the City’s historical five- year average grant amount of $228,000 which would yield $1,140,000 over the next five years. Staff is seeking City Council direction on the goals and priority needs provided in the Draft Consolidated Plan, as summarized in the following tables. The Draft 2019 Annual Action Plan recommends funding for improvements to Solider Creek Park ($175,000) and James Landwehr Plaza ($25,000); the installation of ADA ramps and sidewalks ($46,174); youth program scholarships for before and after school programs for services provided by the Boys and Girls Club ($15,000); and program administration ($10,000). NAMI has rescinded their request for program funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Need Name</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Geographic Areas</th>
<th>Goals Addressing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Improvements/Infrastructure</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Non-housing Community Development, Moderate Income (80% AMI), Low Income (50% AMI), Extremely Low Income (30% AMI)</td>
<td>Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure/Facility Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of Slum and Blight</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Non-housing Community Development, Middle Income (120% AMI), Moderate Income (80% AMI), Low Income (50% AMI), Extremely Low Income (30% AMI)</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Neighborhood Stabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities Improvements</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Non-housing Community Development, Moderate Income (80% AMI), Low Income (50% AMI), Extremely Low Income (30% AMI)</td>
<td>Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure/Facility Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Affordable Housing Opportunities</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low Income (50% AMI), Moderate income (80% AMI), Extremely Low Income (30% AMI), Elderly, Public Housing Residents, Frail Elderly</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Activities</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income (30% AMI), Low Income (50% AMI), Families with Children, Elderly, Chronic Homelessness, Homeless Mentally Ill, Homeless Families with Children, Victims of Domestic Violence- Homeless</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Provision of Needed Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Programs</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Elderly, Persons with Mental Disabilities, Victims of Domestic Violence, Families with Children, Moderate Income (80% AMI), Low Income (50% AMI), Extremely Low Income (30% AMI)</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Provision of Needed Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Acquisition and Owner-Occupied Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income (30% AMI), Low Income (50% AMI), Large Families, Families with Children, Elderly, Frail Elderly</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation and Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50 – Priority Needs Summary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>End Year</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Geographical Area</th>
<th>Priority Needs Addressed</th>
<th>Funding Allocated (Five-Year Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Public Infrastructure/Facility Improvements</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Availability/Accessibility</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Public Improvements/Infrastructure, Public Facilities Improvements</td>
<td>$719,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Housing Rehabilitation and Services</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Provide Affordable Housing Opportunities</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Provision of Needed Services</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Availability/Accessibility</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Homeless Activities, Public Service Programs</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Neighborhood Stabilization</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Elimination of Slum and Blight</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5: Fair Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair Housing</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 6: Administration/Planning</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Availability/Accessibility</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>$171,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 52 – Anticipated Resources

Table 55 – Goals Summary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soldier Creek Park Improvements</td>
<td>Creation of a community event/gathering space at Soldier Creek Park through a series of improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Landwehr Plaza Improvements</td>
<td>Improvement of the subject property including the parcel to the north (i.e., former funeral home site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Ramps/Sidewalk Installation</td>
<td>Needed ADA sidewalk ramps and sidewalks will be constructed at various locations around the City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club Program Scholarships</td>
<td>Program scholarships for before and after school program services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG Program Administration</td>
<td>One Year of CDBG Program Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 60 – Project Summary Information (2019 Annual Action Plan)
Five-Year Consolidated Plan
Program Years 2019-2023
&
Annual Action Plan
Program Year 2019-2020

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds

DRAFT – MAY 2019

City of Sierra Vista
Cochise County, AZ

Mr. Matt McLachlan, Director
Community Development
1011 N. Coronado Drive
Sierra Vista, AZ  85635-6334
520.417.4413
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ES-05 Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION

The City of Sierra Vista, Arizona has completed the planning process for the 2019/2020-2023/2024 Five-Year Consolidated Plan (Consolidated Plan) as required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The purpose of the Consolidated Plan is to identify goals, objectives and strategies for addressing housing and community development needs, including those of the homeless and other special needs populations. The Consolidated Plan guides the use of City resources to address these needs over a five-year period. This amount totaled an average of approximately $227,549 per year over the previous five-years or a total of $1,137,748. In the most recent program year (2018), the City received an annual allocation of approximately $260,000 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds.

The Consolidated Plan is developed in a manner specified by HUD, and the City has followed the prescribed format in completing the plan. The Consolidated Plan was developed using HUD and U.S. Census data for demographics and housing, input from public meetings, City Council meetings, Non-Profit Agency workshop and past program performance. During the planning process, the City conducted public meetings with citizens and stakeholders, meetings and consultation with Non-profit groups, public meetings, and two public hearings with the City Council. The purpose of this process was to receive citizen input on the current housing and community development needs of the City.

There are four major areas of focus in the Consolidated Plan: Housing, Homelessness, Non-Housing Community Development and Non- Homeless Special Needs. The Consolidated Plan process requires the City to identify priority needs for each area and prepare an Annual Action Plan to address the priorities. For every priority, there are goals, objectives and strategies established to measure progress. The citizen input was critical in developing the goals, objectives and strategies of this Consolidated Plan. This Consolidated Plan not only presents goals to address the priority needs of the City, but also to address the statutory goals established by Federal law:
Decent Housing:

- Assist homeless persons to obtain affordable housing
- Assist persons at risk of becoming homeless
- Retain affordable housing stock
- Increase the availability of affordable housing in standard condition to low- and moderate-income families, particularly to economically disadvantaged persons (and without discrimination on the basis of race, creed, religion, color, age, sex, marital status, familial status, national origin, disability, gender identity or sexual orientation)
- Increase the supply of supportive housing which includes structural features and services to enable persons with special needs (including persons with HIV/AIDS) to live in dignity and independence
- Provide affordable housing that is accessible to job opportunities.

A Suitable Living Environment:

- Improve the safety and livability of neighborhoods Increase access to quality public and private facilities and services.

Expanded Economic Opportunities:

- Job creation and retention for low-income persons
- Availability of mortgage financing for low-income persons at reasonable rates using nondiscriminatory lending practices
- Empowerment and self-sufficiency for low-income persons to reduce generational poverty in federally assisted housing.

SUMMARY OF THE OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES IDENTIFIED IN THE PLAN NEEDS ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

The Five-Year Consolidated Plan identifies five goals, along with corresponding objectives and strategies, to address the City of Sierra Vista’s housing and community development needs. These goals are summarized as follows:
Goal: Public Infrastructure/Facility Improvements
Provide ADA improvements, public facility improvements, and infrastructure.

Goal: Neighborhood Stabilization
Eliminate slum and blight.

Goal: Housing Rehabilitation & Services
Provide housing rehabilitation and accessibility.

Goal: Provision of Needed Services
Provide community services for special needs populations (primarily for seniors and youth), mental health services, and homeless services.

Goal: Fair Housing
Eliminate discrimination in housing.

EVALUATION OF PAST PERFORMANCE
The previous five years have shown significant progress in the City of Sierra Vista’s efforts to implement HUD entitlement programs. The City complies with HUD regulations and continues to deliver community development services in an efficient manner.

The City has been successful in implementing infrastructure projects, blight elimination, emergency home repair, and several public services activities. The City will use CDBG funds to make these programs successful and to meet the goals and objectives identified in the Consolidated Plan.

SUMMARY OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PROCESS AND CONSULTATION PROCESS
Comments and concerns raised during the citizen participation process were taken into consideration when developing the Consolidated Plan's goals, objectives and strategies. The Consolidated Plan is a collaborative process that involves interviews with stakeholders and meetings with the public to determine areas of need. As part of this process, the City sought to identify the priority needs and strategies to address those needs. Priority needs were identified based on available housing data, public input, stakeholder consultation, and public meetings, and past program performance. In addition, the City consulted with the Carmichael Neighborhood Association, West End Commission, Commission on Disability Issues, City Departments, and the City Council to identify priority needs and develop corresponding strategies.
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Based on input and data received through an extensive citizen participation process, the following summarizes the public comments:

Comments Regarding Community Needs

Although there are many issues that the public felt are important, there are a few items that were stressed throughout the meeting as being of the highest priority:

Carmichael Neighborhood Association

At their meeting on February 7, 2019, the Carmichael Neighborhood Association ranked their top priorities as being (1) renovating Theater Drive to provide proper drainage and sidewalks; (2) removing blight/increasing code enforcement; (3) public facility improvements to neighborhood parks.

The West End Commission

At their meeting on February 11, 2019, the West End Commission ranked their top priorities by category as being: (1) public infrastructure; (2) slum blight remediation activities; (3) public facility improvements, and (4) public services. They further expressed support for the update to the Plan for Prosperity which includes West End Revitalization as one of six objectives.

Community Survey Results

There were 67 respondents to an online survey prepared and posted by the City on a range of housing and community issues. The vast majority were residents (61), followed by social service agency (4) and rental housing provider (3). Three-quarters of survey takers own their own home and identified as being white. Two-thirds of the survey takers have lived in Sierra Vista for more than 10 years.
Q: Please rank the most common housing problems our community faces using the choices below:

(Very Important, Important, Somewhat Important, Not a Concern)

✓ Homelessness
✓ Availability of affordable housing
✓ Unsafe/poor housing
✓ Code violations
✓ Unsafe or poor neighborhood conditions
✓ Other

Results: Three-quarters of respondents rated unsafe or poor neighborhood conditions; availability of affordable housing; and homelessness as very important or important housing problems confronting our community. Just over two-thirds of respondents (64%), felt that unsafe/poor housing and code violations are important or very important issues.

General Comments: Septic systems in Town & Country; open lots and washes near schools used by homeless...need shelter for them...; improving trailer parks off of 7th Street and behind Fry McDonald’s; yard house maintenance, cars parking next to the house/property line; a cross walk leading from the residential area to Tompkins park is needed (crossing 7th Street is dangerous); branding a city and bike racks are not as important as adding safety precautions; eyesores between nice neighborhoods; new developments; up keep of housing and landscaping; backyard hoarders; clean out the unsafe and falling down mobile home parks near the west end; multi-use paths need maintenance; stop pandering to the lazy; follow up on the code violations; the rentals are too high for the conditions of the house, condo, or townhouse – need more affordable housing for seniors; negligent landlords are a problem.

Q: Listed below are the general types of activities addressed by various City programs. Please share your opinion about how important the activities are to the low-and-moderate income persons in Sierra Vista:

(Very Important, Important, Somewhat Important, Not a Concern)

✓ Crime prevention
✓ Health Services
✓ Affordable Housing
✓ Public Facilities
✓ Employment training
✓ Substance abuse treatment
• Public Infrastructure  
• Economic Development  
• Community Services  
• Homeless Assistance  
• Services for persons with disabilities  
• Child care  
• Planning  
• Blight elimination  
• Housing counseling  
• Other

Results: Three-quarters of respondents rated the above issues as being important or very important. Crime prevention, health services, affordable housing, and public infrastructure scored the highest.

General Comments: Improve street lighting along Fry Blvd. for safety; common sense planning; eliminate backyard hoarding; ability for competition at the farmers market to help lower prices; concerned about recycling program failing; need small homes for seniors that are $80-90k; general health advisement on proper bathing and cleaning techniques.

Q. Homeownership Needs

• Down payment assistance  
• Rehabilitation assistance under $15,000  
• Rehabilitation assistance over $15,000  
• Affordable new housing construction  
• Energy efficiency improvements  
• Modifications for persons with disabilities  
• Lead-based paint screening/abatement  
• Green building for new construction

Results: The highest level of importance for homeownership needs (important or very important) are (1) modifications for persons with disabilities (94%); energy efficiency (76%); rehabilitation assistance under $15,000 (62%); and green building for new construction (61%).

General Comments: Retire the septic systems in Town and Country; rehabilitation of existing housing options prioritized over new construction; glad that the City and HUD are moving forward with affordable new houses for lower wage earners and lower rank military members.
Q. Affordable Rental Housing Needs

- Rehabilitation assistance under $15,000
- Rehabilitation assistance over $15,000
- Affordable new construction
- Section 8 rental assistance
- Preservation of existing affordable rental units
- Energy efficiency improvements
- Lead-based paint screening/abatement
- Rental housing for elderly
- Rental housing for disabled
- Rental housing for single persons
- Rental housing for small families (2-4 persons)
- Rental housing for large families (5 or more persons)

Results: The highest level of importance for affordable rental housing needs (important or very important) are: (1) rental housing for disabled (88%); rental housing for elderly (86%); preservation of existing affordable rental units (80%) and Section 8 rental assistance (71%).

General Comments: Splash pads in city parks for summer relief; families would be better served with affordable purchasing/ownership options; making it easier to get help with landlord issues.

Q. Housing for persons with special needs.

- Assisted living for the elderly
- Housing for persons with HIV/AIDS
- Housing for persons with alcohol/drug addiction
- Housing for persons with developmental disabilities
- Housing for persons with mental illness
- Other housing needs for persons with special needs

Results: The highest level of importance for housing for persons with special needs (important or very important are: (1) assisted living for the elderly (88%); (2) other housing needs for a person with special needs (83%); and housing for persons with mental illness (80%).

General Comments: Seniors living on social security, affordable small home community.
Q. Economic Development

- Land (sites, business/industrial parks, etc.) for business
- Buildings for business development
- Loan programs
- Job training programs
- Technical assistance for small businesses
- West End revitalization

- Job development/creation
- Retail development
- Small business loans
- Façade improvements
- Lending for community redevelopment

Results: The highest level of importance for economic development (important or very important are:
(1) job development/creation (86%); (2) job training programs (84%); (3) land for business (78%); and (4) lending for community redevelopment (72%).

General Comments: Do not place Fry on a lane diet; find ways to incentivize use of existing empty retail space v building more strip malls that will sit empty; bring in businesses people actually want and not restaurants and special interest businesses; the West End more than any other area represents what visitors and investors see in our City’s image.

Q. Infrastructure

- Improve existing water and sewer lines
- Expand or improve sewer treatment facilities
- Improve water supply and treatment facilities
- Provide or improve fire protection
- Improve telecommunications for public services
- Improve telecommunications for business and residents

- Improve streets or sidewalks
- Pave new roads
- Improve existing roads
- Improve existing storm drainage
- Construct new storm drainage systems
- Street lighting

Results: Over two-thirds of the respondents rated all the infrastructure categories as being important or very important with improving existing roads (90%); improving water supply and treatment facilities (88%); improving fire protection (86%) and improving telecommunications (86%) receiving the strongest support.
General Comments: Retire septic systems in the city; connect Town and County to sewer, expand natural gas to all neighborhoods; need additional cable provider; more highway lights on S.R. 90; our water management is one of the examples for the other cities in our state and others with lower rainfalls; keep streets and storm drains clean and clear of debris.

Q. Community Services for low - and moderate-income persons.

- Childcare services
- After-school care
- Youth counseling/mentoring programs
- Senior programs
- Adult daycare
- Physical health services
- Mental health services
- Drug/alcohol rehabilitation programs
- Prescription drug assistance
- Domestic violence/child abuse services
- Food banks/nutritional support
- Prenatal services
- Job training
- Employment assistance
- Financial training/counseling
- Case management
- Fair housing services
- Public safety programs
- Transportation to human services or jobs

Results: All community services are deemed to be relatively important or very important on the scale with senior programs (96%); job training (92%); domestic violence/child abuse services (90%); mental health services (88%); and youth counseling/mentoring programs (88%) receiving the strongest support.

General Comments: Improve lighting at transit center; connect public transportation to post on weekends express loop to mall post and Charleston crossings area; more bus stops especially at Tompkins park; after school programs and domestic child abuse have influence not only for our children, but for the City’s future...we want our families to stay in our city.
Q. Public Facilities for low- and moderate-income neighborhoods.

- Public safety facilities
- Health facilities
- Training centers
- Libraries
- Community centers
- Childcare facilities
- Senior centers or adult daycare centers
- Playgrounds and green spaces
- Accessibility of public buildings to the disabled
- Public transportation
- Beautification/enhanced public space

Results: With the exception of beautification, all public facilities were deemed to be important or very important by more than two-thirds of respondents with accessibility of public buildings to the disabled (88%); health facilities (86%); public safety facilities (84%) and public transportation (84%) receiving the strongest support.

General Comments: Fix cove waves and larger splash interaction for kids; a healthy and beautiful city is a thriving city; we are in need of a convention center (of course an appropriate size) for concerts, conferences, expos, shows and may other events to draw people to our beautiful city.

Q. Homeless needs

- Homeless prevention
- Emergency shelters for families
- Emergency shelters for men
- Emergency shelters for women
- Transitional housing for families
- Transitional housing for men
- Transitional housing for women
- Supportive services for families
- Supportive services for men
- Supportive services for women
- Operation/maintenance of existing facilities
- Job training for homeless
- Case management
- Life skills training
- Substance abuse treatment
- Mental health care
- Physical health care
- Housing placement
- Emergency financial assistance.
Results: All homeless needs were deemed to be important or very important by more than two-thirds of respondents with operation and maintenance of existing facilities (96%); homeless prevention (90%); emergency shelters for families (88%); mental health care (88%) receiving the strongest support.

Q. Elimination of blight

✓ Building code enforcement
✓ Demolition of commercial and industrial structures
✓ Demolition of residential structures

Results: Three-quarters of respondents rated building code enforcement as important or very important while just over half of respondents believe that demolition of commercial (58%) and residential (54%) is important or very important.

Q. Have you personally experienced housing discrimination in Sierra Vista?

Results: The vast majority (98%) of survey respondents have not experienced housing discrimination in Sierra Vista. Of the 13 respondents that did, none reported this housing discrimination. Of those, eight did not think it would make a difference or were not sure of their rights; one was afraid of retaliation, and one did not know where to report it. Areas reported to have housing discrimination problems are trailer parks, Fry Townsite; upper area near Tompkins park; Busby; lower income neighborhoods with rentals. Five respondents feel that housing discrimination in the community has become more of a concern.

Q. How well do you feel that the following types of persons in your community understand fair housing rights?

As shown in the following chart, survey respondents believe that more than three-quarters of real estate professionals and lenders understand fair housing rights well or moderately well. About a third of survey takers believe that buyers and sellers and apartment managers and owners have a poor understanding of fair housing laws.
Q. If residents in your community experienced housing discrimination, do you think they would know where or how to report it?
Q. Is there sufficient fair housing outreach and education in your community?

![Graph showing sufficiency of fair housing education]

Q. Are you familiar with fair housing laws and regulations?

Results: About two-thirds (64%) of survey respondents indicated that they are not familiar with fair housing laws and regulations suggesting that more education is needed.

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS OR VIEWS NOT ACCEPTED AND THE REASONS FOR NOT ACCEPTING THEM**

All comments received by the City of Sierra Vista were considered and are, generally or specifically, addressed by the Strategic Plan and/or Annual Action Plan.

**SUMMARY**

The Five-Year Consolidated Plan for years 2019/2020-2023/2024 identifies goals, objectives and strategies to address the City of Sierra Vista's housing and community development needs. These needs were identified through an extensive citizen participation process that involved neighborhood residents, service providers and other community partners. The Consolidated Plan guides the City's use of CDBG resources through five goals. These goals are summarized as Public Infrastructure/Facility Improvements, Housing Rehabilitation and Services, Provision of Needed Services, Neighborhood Stabilization, and Fair Housing. Over the next five years, the City of Sierra Vista will continue to deliver housing and community development services.
PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies

AGENCY/ENTITY RESPONSIBLE FOR PREPARING/ADMINISTERING THE CONSOLIDATED PLAN

The following are the agencies/entities responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source.

TABLE 1: RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department/Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>CITY OF SIERRA VISTA</td>
<td>Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Responsible Agencies

NARRATIVE

The City of Sierra Vista, AZ is the lead agency responsible for overseeing the development of the Five-Year Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan. The Department of Community Development is the internal department that is responsible for the day-to-day administration of CDBG funding.

The development of the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan was based on the previous Consolidated Plan and The Department of Community Development works closely with Public Works and the Finance Departments, as well as any other pertinent City Departments.

To maximize citizen participation, the City conducted outreach through a series of public notices, hearings, and meetings, as well as a community survey. As part of these efforts, low- and moderate-income residents, as well as service providers, were encouraged to provide input on the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan.

CONSOLIDATED PLAN PUBLIC CONTACT INFORMATION

Inquiries, comments or complaints concerning the Consolidated Plan, any amendments, or performance reports, can be conveyed by contacting City staff at:
Mr. Matt McLachlan, Director
Community Development Department
City of Sierra Vista
1011 N. Coronado Drive
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85635
Telephone: (520) 417-4413
Fax: (520) 452-7023
Matt.mclachlan@sierravistaaz.gov
Business hours: 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday

Inquiries, comments or complaints on the programs may also be offered at the public hearings. Written responses to all written complaints may also be made to the Arizona Office of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) at the following address:

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Community Planning and Development Division
One North Central Avenue, Suite 600
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-379-7100
Fax: 602-379-3985
TTY: 602-379-7181
PR-10 Consultation

SUMMARY OF THE JURISDICTION’S ACTIVITIES TO ENHANCE COORDINATION BETWEEN PUBLIC AND ASSISTED HOUSING PROVIDERS AND PRIVATE AND GOVERNMENTAL HEALTH, MENTAL HEALTH AND SERVICE AGENCIES

Institutional coordination of the Consolidated Plan establishes a unified vision for community development. The City uses a collaborative process to shape various programs into effective, coordinated strategies. This process also facilitates the opportunity for planning and citizen participation to take place in a comprehensive context, attempting to reduce duplication of effort at the local level.

The City will execute this Consolidated Plan in harmony with public, private and nonprofit agencies. Nonprofit agencies may include, but are not limited to, service providers and community housing development organizations. Private sector partners may include, but are not limited to, local financial institutions, developers and local businesses. The City works closely with its partners to design programs that address identified needs.

Table 2 outlines the types of agencies and organizations consulted throughout the program year and during the development of the City of Sierra Vista Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan.

DESCRIBE COORDINATION WITH THE CONTINUUM OF CARE AND EFFORTS TO ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF HOMELESS PERSONS (PARTICULARLY CHRONICALLY HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES, FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN, VETERANS, AND UNACCOMPANIED YOUTH) AND PERSONS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS

The City participates in Continuum of Care activities or programs, but does not fund any activities. The City has limited direct experience with not-for-profit community service providers and housing providers. Efforts have begun to build contacts and relationships with local, county and regional entities to support and implement CDBG programs. This has been done through the establishment of a Public Service Agency list. The City provides notices to agencies for the purposes of gathering input through meetings and surveys and the Notice if Funding Availability process.

In addition, completed surveys and input received at meetings is pivotal input in preparing the Needs Assessment and Strategic Plan components of the Consolidated Plan.
DESCRIBE CONSULTATION WITH THE CONTINUUM(S) OF CARE THAT SERVES THE JURISDICTION’S AREA IN DETERMINING HOW TO ALLOCATE ESG FUNDS, DEVELOP PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND EVALUATE OUTCOMES, AND DEVELOP FUNDING, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF HMIS.

As noted above, the City participates in Continuum of Care activities or programs but does not fund any activities. The City has limited direct experience with not-for-profit community service providers and housing providers. Continued efforts will begin to build contacts and relationships with local, county and regional entities to support and implement CDBG programs.

The City does not receive ESG funds, and no agencies received ESG funds.

IDENTIFY ANY AGENCY TYPES NOT CONSULTED AND PROVIDE RATIONALE FOR NOT CONSULTING

The City follows HUD rules and regulations for Citizen Participation, and therefore offers a number of participation and comment venues. Citizens are provided information via Notices published in the local newspaper, City website, and postings. The City has made a concerted effort to contact all known agencies and organizations involved in activities that are relevant to CDBG activities and programs. All Notices are sent directly to the Continuum of Care participants and an e-mail list of local social service agencies.

DESCRIBE COOPERATION AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER PUBLIC ENTITIES, INCLUDING THE STATE AND ANY ADJACENT UNITS OF GENERAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT, IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONSOLIDATED PLAN (91.215(L))

As noted above, the City will coordinate with a range of public entities in the development and execution of a range of programs and activities.

A wide range of stakeholders was consulted to determine the level of infrastructure, housing and social service needs. This included housing and social service agencies in addition to public agencies and private nonprofit organizations whose missions included the provision of affordable housing and human services to low- and moderate-income households and persons.
Table 2 indicates the wide range of entities consulted during the planning process through meetings, focus group sessions, e-mails, or telephone contact.

**TABLE 2: AGENCIES, GROUPS, ORGANIZATIONS WHO PARTICIPATED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Group/Organization</th>
<th>Agency/Group/Organization Type</th>
<th>What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?</th>
<th>How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Sierra Vista</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Slum and Blight Removal/Public Facility and Infrastructure Needs</td>
<td>Department Head Meetings/Discussions with Pertinent Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmichael Neighborhood Association (BG 3, CT 15.02, BG 1, CT 15.02, BG 2, CT 15.02)</td>
<td>Neighborhood Association (Residents/Churches)</td>
<td>Priority Needs</td>
<td>Public Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Commission (Target Areas west of 7th Street)</td>
<td>City Council appointed Commission</td>
<td>Priority Needs</td>
<td>Public Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Disabilities Issues</td>
<td>City Council appointed Commission</td>
<td>Priority Needs</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum of Care</td>
<td>Regional Public Service Providers</td>
<td>Public Service Needs</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service Agencies/Non-Profits*</td>
<td>Housing and Non-Housing Social Service</td>
<td>Public Service Needs</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Agencies consulted:
  - Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona, Inc.
  - Lori’s Place (Cochise Family Advocacy Center)
  - Arizona at Work
  - Arizona’s Children Association
  - Arizona Community Foundation
  - Arizona Counseling and Treatment Services
  - BNI Skill Builders
  - Boys and Girls Club of Sierra Vista
  - Calvary’s Rock Church
  - Cempatico Integrated Care
  - Cochise County Reentry Coalition
  - Community Food Bank
  - Discovery Forum Alliance
  - First Things First
  - Good Neighbor Alliance
  - Saint Andrews Church
  - Healthy Families Arizona
  - Housing Authority of Cochise County
  - Premier Alliances, Inc.
  - Southeastern Arizona Council of Governments
  - Legacy Foundation
  - National Alliance of Mental Illness
  - P. R. A. I. S. E. Ministries
  - Peach’s Pantry
  - Real Wishes Foundation
  - Salvation Army
  - Sierra Vista Dream Center
  - Sierra Vista Unified School District
  - Southern Arizona Children Association
  - Veteran Affairs
  - Wellness Connections
At a minimum, implicit in these goals is the City’s commitment to providing coordinated community, housing and supportive services to its low-income residents. These services are provided through partnerships with government and quasi-government agencies, as well as respective planning efforts shown in **Table 3**. The City of Sierra Vista will continue to encourage building partnerships between governments and advocates for low-income persons.

Many of the programs and activities that will be carried out by the City during the next five (5) years will involve coordination with a number of agencies and organizations.

**TABLE 3: OTHER CONSULTATIONS & COORDINATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Agency</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Arizona Governments Organization</td>
<td>Integrate efforts with regional planning initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochise County Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan provides overall direction for County growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Other Consultations & Coordination

**PR-15 Citizen Participation**

**SUMMARY OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PROCESS/EFFORTS MADE TO BROADEN CITIZEN PARTICIPATION**

The development of the Consolidated Plan requires extensive citizen participation. For the 2019/2020 – 2023/2024 Consolidated Plan, the City of Sierra Vista, AZ underwent an in-depth citizen participation process. HUD requires local jurisdictions to provide for citizen participation which encourages the development of the Consolidated Plan in cooperation with residents from every walk of life. In particular, HUD believes it is important to obtain the views of residents who live in low- and moderate-income areas, as well as service providers who deliver services to low-income and special needs residents.

The following section describes the public participation process that was completed for the City of Sierra Vista, AZ 2019/2020 – 2023/2024 Consolidated Plan. A summary of the public participation process is shown in **Table 4**.
## TABLE 4: CITIZEN PARTICIPATION OUTREACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Outreach</th>
<th>Target of Outreach</th>
<th>Summary of response/attendance</th>
<th>Summary of comments received</th>
<th>Summary of comments not accepted and reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Council Work Session</td>
<td>Non-Targeted/Broad Community</td>
<td>January 22, 2019;</td>
<td>Provided guidance and direction on Con Plan process</td>
<td>All comments addressed by Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Funding Availability Published</td>
<td>Non-Targeted/Broad Community</td>
<td>February 5, 2019</td>
<td>Receives applications for funding x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmichael Neighborhood Association – CDBG Priorities Discussion</td>
<td>Carmichael Neighborhood</td>
<td>February 7, 2019; 17 Attendees</td>
<td>Concentrate on improving public facilities and infrastructure (Theater Drive); ADA improvements; remediating slum blight.</td>
<td>All comments addressed by Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Online Survey and Funding Announcement in City Email Newsletter</td>
<td>Non-Targeted/Broad Community</td>
<td>February 11, 2019; 67 Responses</td>
<td>Summary provided on pages 4 through 13.</td>
<td>All comments addressed by Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Commission Meeting - CDBG Priorities Discussion</td>
<td>West End Neighborhood</td>
<td>February 11, 2019; 12 Attendees</td>
<td>Focus on (1) public infrastructure; (2) slum-blight removal; (3) public facilities; (4) public services. Implement Plan for Prosperity.</td>
<td>All comments addressed by Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Disabilities Issues</td>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>February 13, 2019</td>
<td>Continue implementing ADA accessibility projects throughout City.</td>
<td>All comments addressed by Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting with Social Services Providers</td>
<td>Social Service providers</td>
<td>February 15, 2019; 1 Attendee</td>
<td>Provided information to Arizona Community Foundation regarding CDBG funding application process and schedule.</td>
<td>All comments addressed by Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM Staff Meeting – Discussion on Recommended City Projects</td>
<td>Non-Targeted/Broad Community</td>
<td>March 5, 2019</td>
<td>Recommend undertaking fewer, larger infrastructure projects to reduce administrative burden on Staff.</td>
<td>All comments addressed by Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council Public Hearing – Tentative Selection of 2019-2020 Projects</td>
<td>Non-Targeted/Broad Community</td>
<td>March 14, 2019</td>
<td>Presentations from NAMI and Boys and Girls Club on PY 2019 funding requests.</td>
<td>All comments addressed by Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARIZE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PROCESS AND HOW IT IMPACTED GOAL-SETTING

Comments and concerns raised during the citizen participation process were taken into consideration when developing the Consolidated Plan’s goals, objectives and strategies. The Consolidated Plan is a collaborative process that involves interviews with stakeholders and meetings with the public to determine areas of need. As part of this process, the City sought to identify the priority needs and strategies to address those needs. Priority needs were identified based on available housing data, public input, non-profit agency meetings, questionnaires and past program performance. In addition, the City consulted with various City Departments to identify priority needs and develop corresponding strategies.

---

**Table 4 – Citizen Participation Outreach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Outreach</th>
<th>Target of Outreach</th>
<th>Summary of response/attendance</th>
<th>Summary of comments received</th>
<th>Summary of comments not accepted and reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing on Draft Consolidated Plan (Open 30-Day Public Comment Period)</td>
<td>Non-Targeted/Broad Community</td>
<td>May 9, 2019</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>To be received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorize Submission to HUD</td>
<td>Non-Targeted/Broad Community</td>
<td>June 13, 2019</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Adoption of the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEEDS ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

The Needs Assessment section of the Five-Year Consolidated Plan identifies the City of Sierra Vista’s communitywide housing and community development needs. Data from the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) database and the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (ACS) database are referenced in this section. Additionally, this section is supported with data from the local Public Housing Authority and other documentation from the City of Sierra Vista and its partners.

The Needs Assessment section evaluates the demand for housing and community development assistance by the following income groups based on Area Median Income (AMI):

- Extremely Low Income (60% of Section 8 very low-income limits)
- Very Low Income (30%-50% AMI)
- Low Income (50%-80% AMI)

AMI is based on the 2018 HUD Income Limits Documentation System, which is outlined in Table 5(A).

The median income is that in which one-half of incomes are above and one-half are below the figure. HUD makes adjustments to these figures based upon family size for specific areas across the country.
### TABLE 5(A): 2018 HUD INCOME LIMITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2018 Income Limit Area</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>FY 2018 Income Limit Category</th>
<th>1 Person</th>
<th>2 Persons</th>
<th>3 Persons</th>
<th>4 Persons</th>
<th>5 Persons</th>
<th>6 Persons</th>
<th>7 Persons</th>
<th>8 Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Vista-Douglas, AZ MSA</td>
<td>$58,400</td>
<td>Extremely Low (*)</td>
<td>12,250</td>
<td>16,460</td>
<td>20,780</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>29,420</td>
<td>33,740</td>
<td>36,250</td>
<td>38,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low (50%)</td>
<td>20,450</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>26,300</td>
<td>29,200</td>
<td>31,550</td>
<td>33,900</td>
<td>36,250</td>
<td>38,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low (80%)</td>
<td>32,700</td>
<td>37,400</td>
<td>42,050</td>
<td>46,700</td>
<td>50,450</td>
<td>54,200</td>
<td>57,950</td>
<td>61,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2018 HUD Income Limits Documentation System (2018); *Calculated as 30/50ths (60 %) of the Section 8 very low-income limits*

**Map 1** shows the 2010 Census Block Groups where 51% or more of the population is within the low- or moderate- income limit categories.
MAP 1 – CDBG Eligible Areas

Legend
- Outside City Limits
- CDBG Eligible
  - Low-Mod Block Group

Note: CDBG eligibility status is determined at the block group level where 51% of the population or greater are reported as low to moderate income status.

Basemap sourced from ESRI, HERE, Garmin, OpenStreetMap contributors, and GIS-user community
Data sourced from American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates (2013-2017) and the U.S. Housing and Urban Development Agency
NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment

**SUMMARY OF HOUSING NEEDS**

The data in the Housing Needs Assessment subsection provides the estimated number and type of households in need of housing assistance by income level, tenure type (owner or renter), household type, and housing problem (cost burdened, severely cost burdened, substandard housing, overcrowding, or geographic concentration of racial/ethnic groups). This section also integrates the needs identified during consultation and public outreach.

The Housing Needs Assessment includes the following sections:

1. Summary of Housing Needs
2. Demographics
3. Number of Households
4. Housing Problems 1
5. Housing Problems 2
6. Cost Burden > 30%
7. Cost Burden > 50%
8. Crowding Table (More than One Person Per Room)

This subsection also describes the characteristics of the City of Sierra Vista’s households and housing stock.

**Demographics**

Table 5(B) displays the population, number of households, and median income for the base year and most recent year, and the percentage of change over time. This data shows an overall population increase from 37,775 in the year 2000 to 43,585 at the time of the 2013-2017 ACS, an estimated 15% increase in population.
Moreover, the number of households increased by 2,857 households from 14,196 households in the year 2000 to 17,053 households at the time of the 2013-2017 ACS. This represents an estimated 20% increase in the number of households during that time.

Table 5(B) also identifies an estimated 53% increase in the median income, from $38,427 to $58,839.

**TABLE 5(B): HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT DEMOGRAPHICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Year</th>
<th>Interim Year</th>
<th>Most Recent Year</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>37,775</td>
<td>43,888</td>
<td>43,585</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>14,196</td>
<td>17,059</td>
<td>17,053</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$38,427</td>
<td>$54,059</td>
<td>$58,839</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2006-2010 ACS and 2010 Census (Interim Year); 2013-2017 ACS (Most Recent Year)*

**NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS AND TYPES**

Table 6 shows the number and type of households by HUD Adjusted Median Family Income (HAMFI). The default data source is the 2009-2013 CHAS database, developed by HUD.

The largest number of households is in the greater than 100% HAMFI group with 10,070 households. The second largest group is the >50-80% HAMFI group (2,370). This means that approximately 30.7% of all households in the City of Sierra Vista are below 80% of HAMFI.

Small family households are households that have a family with two to four members. The largest number of small family households is within the >100% HAMFI group (5,090). The second-largest number of small family households is within the >50-80% HAMFI group (975). There are 935 small family households below 50% HAMFI.

Large family households are households that have a family of five or more members. Again, the largest number of large family households is within the >100% HAMFI group (585). The second-largest number of large family households is within the >50-80% HAMFI group (235) and the third-largest number is
within the >80-100% HAMFI group (230). There are 235 large family households in the 0-30% and >30-50% income groups.

Table 6 also provides data on households that contain at least one person considered to be elderly. The data suggest that among income groups, the largest numbers of households with a person 62-74 years of age are within the >100% HAMFI income group (2,045). The largest number of households with a person 75 years or older (1,190) is also within the >100% HAMFI income group.

Finally, data provided in Table 6 shows the number of households with one or more children 6 years old or younger. Among the household income groups identified, the largest number of households with children 6 years or younger (1,090) is within the >100% HAMFI income category. The second largest number of households with children 6 years old or younger is within the >50-80% HAMFI group (525).

### Table 6: Total Households Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-30% HAMFI</th>
<th>&gt;30-50% HAMFI</th>
<th>&gt;50-80% HAMFI</th>
<th>&gt;80-100% HAMFI</th>
<th>&gt;100% HAMFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households *</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>10,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Family Households *</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>5,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Family Households *</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age*</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household contains at least one-person age 75 or older*</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger*</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI

Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: 2009-2013 CHAS

Table 6 – Total Households Table

### Housing Needs Summary Tables for Several Types of Housing Problems

**Housing Problems 1**

Table 7 displays the number of households with housing problems by tenure and HUD Adjusted Median
Family Income (HAMFI) according to the 2009-2013 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data developed by HUD.

As defined by HUD, housing problems include:

- Substandard housing lacking complete plumbing facilities
- Substandard housing lacking complete kitchen facilities
- Overcrowded households with 1.01 to 1.5 people per room, excluding bathrooms, porches, foyers, halls, or half-rooms
- Households with housing cost burden greater than 30% of income

As shown in Table 7, among the “housing problem” categories, households within Sierra Vista are most commonly impacted by severe housing cost burden (greater than 50% of income) and housing cost burden (greater than 30% of income).

Substandard housing is defined as a household without hot and cold piped water, a flush toilet and a bathtub or shower, and kitchen facilities that lack a sink with piped water, a range or stove, or a refrigerator. Table 7 identifies 75 renter households and 0 owner households that live in “substandard housing, lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities”.

There are two forms of overcrowding defined by HUD and identified in Table 7:

1. Severely overcrowded is defined as a household having complete kitchens and bathrooms but housing more than 1.51 persons per room excluding bathrooms, porches, foyers, halls, or half-rooms.
2. Overcrowded is defined as a household having complete kitchens and bathrooms but housing more than 1.01 to 1.5 persons per room excluding bathrooms, porches, foyers, halls, or half-rooms

As shown in Table 7, 205 renter households are experiencing some form of overcrowding while 65 owner occupied households are experiencing some form of overcrowding.

The final housing problem identified is cost burden. Cost burden is a fraction of a household’s total gross income spent on housing costs. For renters, housing costs include rent paid by the tenant plus utilities.
For owners, housing costs include mortgage payment, taxes, insurance, and utilities. Cost burden is broken into two categories based on severity:

- Severe housing cost burden greater than 50% of income
- Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income

As shown in Table 7, renter tenure households earning >50%-80% AMI (865) have a higher number of households with housing cost burden greater than 30% than those households in any other income group. Renter households earning 0%-30% AMI (800) have a higher number of households with housing cost burden greater than 50% than those households in any other income groups. Approximately, 1,630 renters are experiencing a cost burden greater than 30% of income and 1,250 renters are experiencing a cost burden greater than 50% of income.

Owner tenure households earning >80%-100% (245) have a higher number of households with housing cost burden greater than 30% than those households in any other income group. While owner tenure households earning >50%-80% AMI (245) have a higher number of households with housing cost burden greater than 50% than those households in any other income group. Approximately, 545 owners are experiencing a cost burden greater than 30% of income and 525 owners are experiencing a cost burden greater than 50% of income.

Overall, 2,175 households in the City of Sierra Vista are experiencing a cost burden greater than 30% of income and 1,775 households are experiencing a cost burden greater than 50% of income. Renters appear to be greatly affected by the cost of housing within the City of Sierra Vista. Of the 3,950 households experiencing a cost burden of some kind, 2,880 are renters.
### TABLE 7: HOUSING PROBLEMS TABLE (HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE OF THE LISTED NEEDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Overcrowded - With &gt;1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: 2009-2013 CHAS

**Table 7 – Housing Problems Table**
**Housing Problems 2**

Table 8 displays the number of households with no housing problems, one or more housing problems, and negative income by tenure and HUD Area Median Income (AMI). The Default Data Source is the 2009-2013 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data developed by HUD.

As the data reveals in Table 8, renters in the 0%-30% AMI group have the highest number of households (890) with one or more of housing problems identified. A total of 1,070 households below 30% AMI experience some form of housing problem. This is over half of all households experiencing housing problems. Among owner households, the 50%-80% AMI group has the highest number of households (275) with one or more of housing problems. Additionally, 60 renter households and 130 owner households within the 0%-30% AMI group have negative income but none of the other four identified housing problems.

**TABLE 8: HOUSING PROBLEMS 2 (HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE OR MORE SEVERE HOUSING PROBLEMS: LACKS KITCHEN OR COMPLETE PLUMBING, SEVERE OVERCROWDING, SEVERE COST BURDEN)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30%</td>
<td>&gt;30-50%</td>
<td>&gt;50-80%</td>
<td>&gt;80-100%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0-30%</td>
<td>&gt;30-50%</td>
<td>&gt;50-80%</td>
<td>&gt;80-100%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0-30%</td>
<td>&gt;30-50%</td>
<td>&gt;50-80%</td>
<td>&gt;80-100%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having 1 or more of four housing problems</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having none of four housing problems</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>2,745</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: 2009-2013 CHAS*

Table 8 – Housing Problems 2
**Cost Burden > 30% and > 50%**

Tables 9 and 10 display the number of households with housing cost burdens greater than 30% of income and greater than 50% of income, respectively, by household type, tenure, and household income (expressed as a percentage of Area Median Income (AMI)). The Default Data Source is the 2009-2013 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data developed by HUD.

Households are broken into four categories:

1. Small related – Family households with two to four related members
2. Large related – Family households with five or more related members
3. Elderly – A household whose head, spouse, or sole member is a person who is at least 62 years of age
4. Other – All other households

As shown in Tables 9, “Small Related” households are experiencing the highest degree of housing cost burden greater than 30% of income. Approximately 1,454 “Small Related” households have a cost burden greater than 30% of income. Most of these are renters (1,265). Additionally, 865 “Other” households and 934 “Elderly” households have a cost burden greater than 30% of income. Comparatively, “Large Related” households have the lowest degree of cost burden.

For renter households, the 0% - 30% AMI Income group has the most households (985) with a cost burden greater than 30% of income. Among owner households, the 50% - 80% AMI group has the most households (430) with a cost burden greater than 30% of income.
TABLE 9: COST BURDEN > 30%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Related</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Related</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total need by income</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: 2009-2013 CHAS

Table 9 – Cost Burden > 30%

As shown in Table 10, when compared to other types of households, more “Small Related” households are experiencing severe cost burden greater than 50% of income. Approximately 675 “Small Related” households experience a cost burden greater than 50% of income. Most of these are renters (595). Additionally, 450 “Other” households and 480 “Elderly” households have a cost burden greater than 50% of income. Comparatively, “Large Related” households have the lowest degree of cost burden.

For renter households, the 0% - 30% AMI income group has the most households (890) with a cost burden greater than 50% of income. Among owner households, the >50% - 80% AMI group has the most households (240) with a cost burden greater than 50% of income.
TABLE 10: COST BURDEN > 50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;50-80% AMI</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Related</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Related</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total need by income</strong></td>
<td><strong>890</strong></td>
<td><strong>410</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,370</strong></td>
<td><strong>185</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: 2009-2013 CHAS

**Crowding**

Table 11 displays the number of households that are overcrowded, defined as households with more than one person per room, excluding bathrooms, porches, foyers, halls, or half-rooms. The data is displayed by household type, tenure, and household income (expressed as a percentage of Area Median Income (AMI)). The Default Data Source is 2009-2013 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data developed by HUD.

As shown in Table 11, overcrowding is most prevalent in single family households. Approximately 149 single family renter households and 35 owner-occupied single-family homes experience overcrowding.

Multiple, unrelated family renter households experience the second-highest degree of crowding with a total of 59 households. This figure is higher than every category of owner-occupied households, suggesting that renters experience overcrowding more than owners.

Among owner-occupied households, the only households with overcrowding issues have incomes between 50% and 80% AMI and 80-100% AMI. There are no Other, non-family households, among renters or owners, that suffer from overcrowding in the City of Sierra Vista.
TABLE 11: CROWDING INFORMATION (MORE THAN ONE PERSON PER ROOM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th></th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-30% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;30-50% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;50-80% AMI</td>
<td>&gt;80-100% AMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family households</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple, unrelated family households</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, non-family households</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total need by income</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: 2009-2013 CHAS

Table 11 – Crowding Information

DESCRIBE THE NUMBER AND TYPE OF SINGLE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS IN NEED OF HOUSING ASSISTANCE.

According to the 2012 American Community Survey (ACS) data the City has a relatively high percentage of persons living alone (4,660 which is 27.3%), and less than half of these numbers are elderly (1,566). The HUD provided data shows that there are 114 Small Family Households in the 0 to 80 percent HAMFI categories. In addition, there are 345 elderly households in the 0-30% HAMFI range who could need housing assistance and 200 elderly in the 30-50% HAMFI category as well. Applying the 26.9 percent figure for single person households in the City to these figure yields 458 single person households who could need housing assistance.

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.

The City’s Police Department is the lead agency in addressing the issues of domestic violence and sexual assault. The Department does not maintain records about those possibly in need of housing assistance, but typically if one spouse is arrested, the other spouse and family will remain in the residence, at least
in the short-term. According to the Arizona Department of Economic Security, the average length of shelter stay for domestic violence victims is 40 days. Several organizations in the region serve victims of domestic violence, including Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona, which provides some housing assistance in the form of emergency shelter and transitional housing at Forgach House in Sierra Vista.

WHAT ARE THE MOST COMMON HOUSING PROBLEMS?

HUD has identified four housing problems, which are (1) overcrowding, (2) lack of complete kitchen, (3) lack of complete plumbing, and (4) cost burden. Overcrowding means that more than one person per room lives in a housing unit. The lack of complete kitchen or lack of plumbing are straightforward. By HUD’s definition, when households spend over 30 percent of their income on shelter they are “cost burdened,” and when they spend over 50 percent of their income for shelter, they are “severely cost burdened.” Expenditures for shelter include rent or mortgage payments and utility costs. An examination of the data presented above shows that “cost burden” is the most common housing problem in Sierra Vista. There are 985 extremely low-income renter households, 835 very low-income renter households, and 945 low-income renter households facing a cost burden of greater than 30 percent of income. At the same time there are 793 owner households facing a cost burden, and 50.3 percent of these households are elderly. These numbers far exceed the number of households affected by overcrowding or lack of kitchen or plumbing.

ARE ANY POPULATIONS/HOUSEHOLD TYPES MORE AFFECTED THAN OTHERS BY THESE PROBLEMS?

Cost burden is relatively well distributed throughout renter households, who are the most severely affected by cost burden. At the same time, extremely low-, very low-, and low-income owner households all face cost burden. In terms of household types, the data shows that Small Related Renter households constitute the largest number of households with a cost burden (>30%) and a severe cost burden (>50%) at 1,265 and 595 respectively. “Other” households constitute 27.6 percent of renter households with a cost burden greater than 30%. Among owner households facing a severe cost burden, Small Related and Elderly households constitute 74.1 percent of the total households facing this problem.
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

Low-income households at imminent risk of homelessness often have recently lost a job, seen their hours cut if still working, or have encountered a medical emergency, the effect of which is to cause them to spend any savings they might have and reduce or eliminate income. Such households may not have any support from friends or family, who may be in the same economic situation. Lacking education or skills, or facing medical situations, or lack of transportation, these persons cannot readily obtain new, better paying positions. Households facing the termination of re-housing assistance are in a similar situation. In order to obtain a stable housing situation, they need full-time employment, affordable child care, affordable housing, and transportation. Access to healthcare, life skills training, and additional education and/or training are valuable, if not necessary, in most situations.

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.

Persons at risk of homelessness are defined as individuals of families facing immediate eviction and who cannot relocate to another residence. Statistics on this population cannot be provided directly, but an examination of the data on overcrowding and upon cost burdened households provides some insight into the extent of the problem in Sierra Vista. Particular attention is accorded to households in the extremely low-income range as these represent the most stressed and vulnerable group. The data indicate that there are a total 170 low-income renter households with overcrowding (more than 1.01 persons per room), or severe overcrowding (> 1.51 persons per room). The situation among owner households is not as extreme – there are 65 low-income Owner households with overcrowding or severe overcrowding. It is interesting to note that there are no overcrowded conditions reported among the extremely low- and very low-income categories.

However, the number of extremely low-income Renter households with severe cost burden is 800 and another 410 very low-income renter households face a severe cost burden. Extremely low-income Owner households facing a severe cost burden number 180, another 70 very low-income owner
households, and 245 low-income owner households face a severe cost burden. Any of these households could be at risk of homelessness or other burdens.

**SPECIFY PARTICULAR HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS THAT HAVE BEEN LINKED WITH INSTABILITY AND AN INCREASED RISK OF HOMELESSNESS.**

Lack of affordable housing, especially among extremely low- and very low-income renters, is the principal risk linked to housing instability in Sierra Vista. However, poor housing maintenance can result in housing violations or findings of inhabitable living conditions among rental properties can force renters into homelessness. The issue of code violations and habitability standards can affect homeowners as well, especially the elderly who do not have the resources to maintain their homes. Lack of accessibility features can force both homeowners and renters out of their living situations.

**DISCUSSION**

Data from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey, made available in CHAS Table 6, indicates that there are 4,325 (42.9%) Sierra Vista owner households that contain persons with either an elderly person (62 or older) or a child under the age of six. Table 7 indicates that 3,950 households in the City of Sierra vista are experiencing some level of cost burden. These households, particularly those with an income less than 80% HAMFI are more susceptible to risks, including homelessness. They are also those who are likely in greatest need of housing assistance.
NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems

INTRODUCTION

A disproportionately greater need exists when the members of racial or ethnic groups at a specified income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percentage points or more) than the income level as a whole. For example, assume that 60% of all low-income households within a jurisdiction have a housing problem and 70% 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.

Again, as defined by HUD, housing problems include:

- Substandard housing lacking complete plumbing facilities
- Substandard housing lacking complete kitchen facilities
- Overcrowded households with 1.01 to 1.5 people per room, excluding bathrooms, porches, foyers, halls, or half-rooms
- Households with housing cost burden greater than 30% of income

The Disproportionately Greater Needs: Housing Problems section covers the following:

1. Introduction
2. Disproportionately Greater Need—Housing Problems 0-30% Area Median Income (AMI)
3. Disproportionately Greater Need—Housing Problems 30-50% AMI
4. Disproportionately Greater Need—Housing Problems 50-80% AMI
5. Disproportionately Greater Need—Housing Problems 80-100% AMI
6. Discussion

This section has four tables that capture the number of housing problems by income, race, and ethnicity. Each table provides data for a different income level (0–30%, 30–50%, 50–80%, and 80–100%
AMI). The default data source is the 2009-2013 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data developed by HUD.

**0% - 30% OF AREA MEDIAN INCOME**

Of all the income levels within the City of Sierra Vista, households within the 0%-30% AMI category have the second-highest number of households (1,250) with one or more of four housing problems. Approximately 75.3% of households in this income category have housing problems.

As shown in Table 12, when considering race by number for the 0%-30% AMI income category, White households have the highest number of households (690) with housing problems while American Indian, Alaska Native households have the second-highest number of households (70) with housing problems.

When considering race by rate for the 0%-30% AMI income category, American Indian, Alaska Native households (100%) have the highest rate of households with housing problems and White households (73.8%) have the second-highest rate of households with housing problems. Additionally, 38.7% of all Black/African American households earning 0%-30% AMI have housing problems.

When considering ethnicity for the 0%-30% AMI income category, 370 Hispanic households identify as experiencing one or more of four housing problems (86% of all Hispanic households earning 0%-30% AMI).
TABLE 12: DISPROPORTIONALLY GREATER NEED 0 - 30% AMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems*</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems*</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: 2009-2013 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%

30% - 50% OF AREA MEDIAN INCOME

Of all the income levels within the City of Sierra Vista, households within the 30%-50% AMI category have the third-highest number of households (940) with one or more of four housing problems. Approximately 83.2% of households in this income category have housing problems.

As shown in Table 13, when considering race by number for the 30%-50% AMI income category, White households have the highest number of households (670) with housing problems and Black/African American households have the second-highest number of households (59) with housing problems.

When considering race by rate for the 30%-50% AMI income category, Black/African American households (100%) and Asian households (100%) have the highest rate of households with housing problems. Additionally, 79.3% of all White households and 40% of all Pacific Islander households earning 30%-50% AMI have housing problems.
When considering ethnicity and this income category, 175 Hispanic households have housing problems (100% of all Hispanic households earning 30%-50% AMI).

### TABLE 13: DISPROPORTIONALLY GREATER NEED 30 - 50% AMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems*</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems*</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: 2009-2013 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%*

**Table 13 – Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI**

### 50% - 80% OF AREA MEDIAN INCOME

Of all the income levels within the City of Sierra Vista, households within the 50%-80% AMI category have the highest number of households (1,480) with one or more of four housing problems. Approximately 62.5% of households in this income category have housing problems.

As shown in Table 14, when considering race by number for the 50%-80% AMI income category, White households have the highest number of households (790) with housing problems and Black/African American households have the second-highest number of households (95) with housing problems.

When considering race by rate for the 50%-80% AMI income category, Pacific Islander households (100%) have the highest rate of households with housing problems, Black/African American households (82.6%) have the second-highest rate, and White households (57.7%) have the third highest rate of
households with housing problems. Additionally, 50% of all Asian households, 50% of all American Indian, Alaska Native households earning 30%-50% AMI have housing problems.

When considering ethnicity and this income category, 500 Hispanic households have housing problems (69% of all Hispanic households earning 50%-80% AMI).

### TABLE 14: DISPROPORTIONALLY GREATER NEED 50 - 80% AMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems*</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems*</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>1,480 (62.5%)</td>
<td>889 (37.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>790 (57.7%)</td>
<td>579 (42.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>95 (82.6%)</td>
<td>20 (17.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>45 (50%)</td>
<td>45 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>25 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>500 (69%)</td>
<td>225 (31%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: 2009-2013 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%

80% - 100% OF AREA MEDIAN INCOME

Of all the income levels within the City of Sierra Vista, households within the 80%-100% AMI category have the lowest number of households (620) with one or more of four housing problems. Approximately 40% of households in this income category have housing problems.

As shown in Table 15, when considering race by number for the 80%-100% AMI income category, White households have the highest number of households (320) with housing problems and Black/African American households have the second-highest number of households (35) with housing problems.
When considering race by rate for the 80%-100% AMI income category, Asian households (44.4%) have the highest rate of households with housing problems and White households (40.3%) have the second-highest rate of household with housing problems. Additionally, 33.3% of all Black/African American households earning 80%-100% AMI have housing problems.

When considering ethnicity and this income category, 250 Hispanic households have housing problems (55.6% of all Hispanic households earning 80%-100% AMI).

### TABLE 15: DISPROPORTIONALLY GREATER NEED 80 - 100% AMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four housing problems*</th>
<th>Has none of the four housing problems*</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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%

Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: 2009-2013 CHAS

Table 15 – Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI
DISCUSSION

Of all households in the 0%-30% AMI category, 75.3% have one or more of four housing problems. In terms of disproportionate need, both the American Indian, Alaska Native (100%) and Hispanic (86%) households have a percentage of housing problems that is more than 10 percentage points higher than the income level as a whole. However, the majority (73.8%) of White households in this income category have housing problems.

Of all households in the 30%-50% AMI category, 83.2% have one or more of four housing problems. In terms of disproportionate need, Black/African American (100%), Asian (100%), and Hispanic (100%) households have a percentage of housing problems that is more than 10 percentage points higher than the income level as a whole. However, the majority (79.3%) of White households in this income category have housing problems.

Of all households in the 50%-80% AMI category, 62.5% have one or more of four housing problems. In terms of disproportionate need, Black/African American (82.6%) and Pacific Islander (100%) households have a percentage of housing problems that is more than 10 percentage points higher than the income level as a whole. However, over half of all Hispanic households (69%) and White households (57.7%) income category also have housing problems. Half of all Asian (50%) and American Indian, Alaska Native (50%) households in this income category have housing problems.

Of all households in the 80%-100% AMI category, 40% have one or more of four housing problems. In terms of disproportionate need, only Hispanic (55.6%) households have a percentage of housing problems that is more than 10 percentage points higher than the income level as a whole. However, White (40.3%), Black/African American (33.3%), and Asian households (44.4%) are all within 7% of the jurisdiction as a whole.
NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems

INTRODUCTION
As noted in the previous section, a disproportionately greater need exists when the members of racial or ethnic group at an income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percentage points or more) than the income level as a whole. 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.

Severe housing problems include:
- Severely overcrowded households with more than 1.5 persons per room, not including bathrooms, porches, foyers, halls, or half-rooms
- Households with severe cost burden of more than 50 percent of income

This section includes:
1. Introduction
2. Disproportionately Greater Need—Severe Housing Problems 0-30% AMI
3. Disproportionately Greater Need—Severe Housing Problems 30-50% AMI
4. Disproportionately Greater Need—Severe Housing Problems 50-80% AMI
5. Disproportionately Greater Need—Severe Housing Problems 80-100% AMI
6. Discussion

This section has four tables that capture the number of severe housing problems by income, race, and ethnicity. Each table provides data for a different income level (0–30%, 30–50%, 50–80%, and 80–100% AMI). The Default Data Source is the 2009-2013 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data developed by HUD.
0% - 30% OF AREA MEDIAN INCOME

Of all the income levels within the City of Sierra Vista, households within the 0%-30% AMI category have the highest number of households (1,070) with one or more severe housing problems. Approximately 64.5% of households in this income category have severe housing problems.

As shown in Table 16, when considering race by number for the 0%-30% AMI income category, White households have the highest number of households (600) with severe housing problems and American Indian, Alaska Native households have the second-highest number of households (70) with severe housing problems. Additionally, 60 Black/African American households have severe housing problems.

When considering race by rate for the 0%-30% AMI income category, American Indian, Alaska Native households (100%) have the highest rate of households with severe housing problems and White households (64.2%) have the second-highest rate of households with severe housing problems. Additionally, 38.7% of all Black/African American households earning 0%-30% AMI have severe housing problems.

When considering ethnicity and this income category, 295 Hispanic households have severe housing problems (68.6% of all Hispanic households earning 0%-30% AMI).
TABLE 16: SEVERE HOUSING PROBLEMS 0 - 30% AMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four severe housing problems*</th>
<th>Has none of the four severe housing problems*</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>% Total (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: 2009-2013 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%

Table 16 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI

30% - 50% OF AREA MEDIAN INCOME

Of all the income levels within the City of Sierra Vista, households within the 30%-50% AMI category have the second-highest number of households (525) with one or more severe housing problems. Approximately 46.5% of households in this income category have severe housing problems.

As shown in Table 17, when considering race by number for the 30%-50% AMI income category, White households have the highest number of households (385) with severe housing and Black/African American households have the second-highest number of households (15) with severe housing problems.

When considering race by rate for the 30%-50% AMI income category, White households (45.3%) have the highest rate of households with severe housing problems and Pacific Islander households (40%) have the second-highest rate of households with severe housing problems. Additionally, 25.4% of all Black/African American households earning 30%-50% AMI have severe housing problems.
When considering ethnicity and this income category, 105 Hispanic households have severe housing problems (60% of all Hispanic households earning 30%-50% AMI).

**TABLE 17: SEVERE HOUSING PROBLEMS 30 - 50% AMI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four severe housing problems*</th>
<th>Has none of the four severe housing problems*</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: 2009-2013 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%

Table 17 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI

**50% - 80% OF AREA MEDIAN INCOME**

Of all the income levels within the City of Sierra Vista, households within the 50%-80% AMI category have the third-highest number of households (425) with one or more severe housing problems. Approximately 17.9% of households in this income category have severe housing problems.

As shown in Table 18, when considering race by number for the 50%-80% AMI income category, White households have the highest number of households (285) with severe housing problems and Pacific Islander households have the second-highest number of households (25) with severe housing problems.

When considering race by rate for the 50%-80% AMI income category, Pacific Islander households (100%) have the highest rate of households with severe housing problems and American Indian, Alaska
Native household (50%) have the second-highest rate of households with severe housing problems. Additionally, 21% of all White households, 11.1% of all Asian households, and 8.7% of all Black/African American households earning 50%-80% AMI have severe housing problems.

When considering ethnicity and this income category, 85 Hispanic households have severe housing problems (11.7% of all Hispanic households earning 50%-80% AMI).

**TABLE 18: SEVERE HOUSING PROBLEMS 50 - 80% AMI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four severe housing problems</th>
<th>Has none of the four severe housing problems</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018, 2009-2013 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%*

**Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI**

**80% - 100% OF AREA MEDIAN INCOME**

Of all the income levels within the City of Sierra Vista, households within the 80%-100% AMI income category have the lowest number of households (95) with one or more severe housing problems. Approximately 6.1% of households in this income category have severe housing problems.

As shown in Table 19, when considering race by number for the 80%-100% AMI income category, White households have the highest number of households (75) with severe housing problems and
Black/African American households have the second-highest number of households (20) with severe housing problems.

When considering race by rate for the 80%-100% AMI income category, Black/African American households (19%) have the highest rate of households with severe housing problems and White households (9.5%) have the second-highest rate of households with severe housing problems. No other race in the 80%-100% AMI income category experiences severe housing problems.

When considering ethnicity and this income category, 0 Hispanic households have severe housing problems (0% of all Hispanic households earning 80%-100% AMI).

**TABLE 19: SEVERE HOUSING PROBLEMS 80 - 100% AMI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Problems</th>
<th>Has one or more of four severe housing problems*</th>
<th>Has none of the four severe housing problems*</th>
<th>Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018, 2009-2013 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%

**DISCUSSION**

Of all households in the 0%-30% AMI category, 64.5% have one or more severe housing problems. In terms of disproportionate need, only American Indian, Alaska Native households (100%) have a
percentage of severe housing problems that is more than 10 percentage points higher than the income level as a whole. However, the majority of White (64.2%) and Hispanic (68.6%) households in this income category have severe housing problems. Less than half of Black/African American households (38.7%) in this income category have severe housing problems.

Of all households in the 30%-50% AMI category, 46.5% have one or more severe housing problems. In terms of disproportionate need, only Hispanic households (60%) have a percentage of severe housing problems that is more than 10 percentage points higher than the income level as a whole. Less than half of White (45.3%) and Pacific Islander households (40%) and a quarter (25.4%) of Black/African American households in this income category have severe housing problems.

Of all households in the 50%-80% AMI category, 17.9% have one or more severe housing problems. In terms of disproportionate need, Asian (50%) and Pacific Islander (100%) households have a percentage of severe housing problems that is more than 10 percentage points higher than the income level as a whole. However, 21% of White households, 17.7% Hispanic households, 11.1% of Asian households, 8.7% of Black/African American households in this income category have severe housing problems.

Of all households in the 80%-100% AMI category, only 6.1% have one or more severe housing problems. In terms of disproportionate need, only Black/African American (19%) households have a percentage of severe housing problems that is more than 10 percentage points higher than the income level as a whole. A small percentage of White households (9.5%) in this income category have severe housing problems.
NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens

Again, a disproportionately greater need exists when the members of racial or ethnic group at an income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percentage points or more) than the income level as a whole. 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.

This section includes:

1. Introduction
2. Disproportionately Greater Need—Housing Cost Burden
3. Discussion

Table 20 displays cost burden information for the City of Sierra Vista and each racial and ethnic group, including no cost burden (less than 30%), cost burden (30-50%), severe cost burden (more than 50%), and no/negative income. The default data source for this data is the 2009-2013 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data developed by HUD.

As the data in Table 20 suggests, a small number of households (2,720 or 16.2%) are cost burdened within their current housing situation. White households (1,450) have the highest number of cost burdened households and Hispanic households (865) have the second-highest number of cost burdened households. Hispanic households (26.9%) have the highest rate of cost burdened household and Black/African American households (17.1%) have the second-highest rate of cost burdened households.

An even smaller number of households (1,965 or 11.7%) are severely cost burdened within their current housing situation. White households (1,295) have the highest number of severely cost burdened households and Hispanic households (435) have the second-highest number of severely cost burdened households. American Indian, Alaska Native households (56%) have the highest rate of severely cost burdened households and Pacific Islander households (20%) have the second-highest rate of severely cost burdened households.
TABLE 20: GREATER NEED: HOUSING COST BURDENS AMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Cost Burden</th>
<th>No Cost Burden (&lt;=30%)</th>
<th>Cost Burden (30-50%)</th>
<th>Severe Cost Burden (&gt;50%)</th>
<th>No / Negative Income</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction as a whole</td>
<td>11,890</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>1,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8,205</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>1,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: 2009-2013 CHAS

Table 20 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

DISCUSSION

Within the City of Sierra Vista, 70.9% of households do not presently experience cost burden, while 16.2% experience cost burden, 11.7% experience severe cost burden, and 1.1% have no/negative income.

Overall, 27.9% of households are either cost burdened or severely cost burdened (30%-50% or >50%). Only the American Indian, Alaska Native (64%) and Hispanic (40.4%) households experience a cost burden or severe cost burden in a disproportionate percentage (greater than 10%) to the income level as a whole. It should be noted that Hispanic households (3,220) have the second-highest total number of households. All other households experience approximately a quarter or less percent cost burden or severe cost burdened.

Of all households within the City of Sierra Vista 16.2% are cost burdened (30-50%). Hispanic households (26.9%) are the only racial or ethnic category that experiences a cost burden in a disproportionate percentage (greater than 10%) to the income level as a whole.
Of all households within the City of Sierra Vista, 11.7% experience severe cost burden (>50%). Only the American Indian, Alaska Native households (56%) experiences a severe cost burden in a disproportionate percentage (greater than 10%) to the income level as a whole. It should be noted that this number equates to only 70 households Additionally, 20% of Pacific Islander households experience severe cost burden. It should be noted that this number equated to only 10 households.

Of all households within the City of Sierra Vista, 1.1% has no/negative income. No race or ethnicity experiences no/negative income in a disproportionate percentage (greater than 10%) to the income level as a whole.
NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion

INCOME CATEGORIES IN WHICH A RACIAL OR ETHNIC GROUP HAS DISPROPORTIONATELY GREATER NEED

As indicated in the previous sections, several racial or ethnic groups were identified as having a disproportionately greater housing need in comparison to the income level as a whole. As detailed below, these include the Black/African American, Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, Pacific Islander, and Hispanic racial or ethnic groups.

The Black/African American group experiences a disproportionately greater need in terms of the following:

- Housing problems in the 30-50% AMI category (100% versus 83.2% as a whole)
- Housing problems in the 50-80% AMI category (82.6% versus 62.5% as a whole)
- Severe housing problems 80-100% AMI category (19% versus 6.1% as a whole)

The Asian group experiences a disproportionately greater need in terms of the following:

- Housing problems in the 30-50% AMI category (100% versus 83.2% as a whole)
- Severe housing problems 50-80% AMI category (50% versus 17.9% as a whole)

The American Indian/Alaska Native group experiences a disproportionately greater need in terms of the following:

- Housing problems in the 0-30% AMI category (100% versus 75% as a whole)
- Severe housing problems 0-30% AMI category (100% versus 64.5% as a whole)
- Severe Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (56% versus 11.7% as a whole)

The Pacific Islander group experiences a disproportionately greater need in terms of the following:

- Housing problems in the 50-80% AMI category (100% versus 62.5% as a whole)
- Severe housing problems 50-80% AMI category (100% versus 17.9% as a whole)

The Hispanic group experiences a disproportionately greater need in terms of the following:

- Housing problems in the 0-30% AMI category (86% versus 75% as a whole)
- Housing problems in the 30-50% AMI category (100% versus 83.2% as a whole)
- Housing problems in the 80-100% AMI category (55.6% versus 40% as a whole)
- Severe housing problems 30-50% AMI category (60% versus 46.5% as a whole)
- Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (26.9% versus 16.2% as a whole)

There are 4,209 households with one or more of the four identified housing problems. Of these households 2,470 or 58.7% are White households, 249 or 5.9% are Black/African American households, and 1,295 or 30.8% are Hispanic households. White, Black/African American, and Hispanic households account for the majority of households experiencing one or more of the four identified housing problems.

There are 2,050 households experiencing one or more severe housing problems. Of these households, 1,345 or 65.6% are White households, 95 or 4.6% are Black/African American households, and 4485 or 23.6% are Hispanic households. White, Black/African American, and Hispanic households account for the majority of households experiencing one or more severe housing problems.

There are 2,640 households with cost burden (30%-50% of income). Of these households, 1,450 or 55% are White households, 210 or 8% are Black/African American households, and 865 or 32.8% are Hispanic households. White, Black/African American, and Hispanic households account for the majority of households with cost burden.

There are 1,930 households with severe cost burden (>50% of income). Of these households, 1,295 or 67.1% are White households, 110 or 5.7% are Black/African American households, and 435 or 22.5% are Hispanic households. White, Black/African American, and Hispanic households account for the majority of households with severe cost burden.

NEEDS NOT PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED

Based on input and data received through an extensive citizen participation process, the greatest housing needs are:
- Housing demolition (e.g. removal of abandoned and blighted housing stock)
- Modifications for persons with disabilities
- Energy efficiency
• Rehabilitation assistance under $15,000
• Green building for new construction
• Assisted living for the elderly
• Housing needs for a person with special needs
• Housing for persons with mental illness

ARE ANY OF THOSE RACIAL OR ETHNIC GROUPS LOCATED IN SPECIFIC AREAS OR NEIGHBORHOODS IN YOUR COMMUNITY?

Approximately 14 of the City’s 38 Block Groups have a low- and moderate-income percentage of 51% or greater, signifying that approximately 36% of the City’s neighborhoods are CDBG-eligible.

As a whole, the City of Sierra Vista has a racial minority population of approximately 42%. A disproportionately greater (10 percentage points more or higher) concentration of racial minority population does not exist within any Census Tract/Block Groups. Each Census Tract/Block Group has a significantly lower percentage of minority population than the overall population, ranging from 0% to approximately 18.5%.

As a whole, the City of Sierra Vista has an ethnic minority population of approximately 25.5%. A disproportionately greater (10 percentage points more or higher) concentration of ethnic minority population exists within the following Census Tract/Block Groups:

• Census Tract 1501.1, 38.7% Hispanic or Latino
• Census Tract 1501.2, 41.2% Hispanic or Latino
• Census Tract 1502.1, 42.9% Hispanic or Latino
• Census Tract 1502.2, 43.4% Hispanic or Latino
• Census Tract 1601.1, 40.5% Hispanic or Latino
• Census Tract 1601.2, 36.2% Hispanic or Latino
• Census Tract 1601.3, 37.2% Hispanic or Latino
• Census Tract 1702.2, 36.5% Hispanic or Latino
• Census Tract 2001.1, 39.7% Hispanic or Latino
• Census Tract 2001.2, 36.1% Hispanic or Latino

The block groups 15.01-2,15.01-2,15.02-2,17.02-2, 20.01-1, and 20.01-2 are identified as having high concentrations of minority populations, but also have a high percentage of low- and moderate-income households. The data seem to indicate a correlation between concentrations of low income and minority race or ethnicity. As indicated in the previous sections, a person’s race, income, and disability status are strong indicators for needing housing assistance through various public housing program types. Although a disproportionate need is shown throughout for minority low income households, the data provided show that White, Black/African American, and Hispanic groups have a high demand for supportive housing of different types.

**NA-35 Public Housing**

**INTRODUCTION**

The Consolidated Plan must provide a concise summary of the needs of public housing residents. Information is collected through consultations with the public housing agency or agencies located within the City’s boundaries. The Public Housing portion of this report contains the following sections:

- Introduction
- Totals in Use
- Characteristics of Residents
- Race of Residents
- Ethnicity of Residents
- Additional Narrative

Currently, there is no public housing authority located in the City of Sierra Vista and there are no low rent public housing authority units located in the City. There are two Place-based Section 8 complexes in the City: Mountain View Apartments (80 units of 2, 3, and 4 bedroom units) and Bonita Vista Apartment (99 one-bedroom units for seniors). However, the City does not have information about the need for accessible units.

The following data provided in this chapter covers several program types and types of vouchers in use. These vouchers are defined below:

- Certificate: The total number of Section 8 certificates administered by the Public Housing Authority (PHA).
- **Mod-Rehab**: The total number of units in developments that were funded under the moderate rehabilitation program administered locally by PHAs.
- **Public Housing**: The total number of units in developments operated by the PHAs within the jurisdiction.
- **Total**: The total number of Section 8 vouchers administered by the PHA (project based plus tenant based)
- **Project Based**: The total number of project-based Section 8 vouchers administered by the PHA
- **Tenant Based**: The total number of tenant-based Section 8 vouchers administered by the PHA.
- **Special Purpose Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing**: The HUD–Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing program combines Housing Choice Voucher rental assistance for homeless veterans with case management and clinical services provided by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA).
- **Special Purpose Family Unification Program**: Family Unification Program funding is allocated through a competitive process; therefore, not all PHAs administer the program.
- **Special Purpose Disabled**: In this context, disabled includes non-elderly disabled, mainstream 1-year, mainstream 5-year, and nursing home transition.

**TOTALS IN USE**

Table 21 displays the number of vouchers and units by public housing program type. According to the PIH Information Center (PIC), there are a total of 0 public housing units. There are 495 public housing vouchers in use. Tenant-based vouchers are by far the most used program with 482 vouchers currently in use. Veteran Affairs Supportive Housing only accounts for 13 of the vouchers in use. The total number of vouchers in use, excluding project-based vouchers, is 495.

Currently, there is no public housing authority located in the City of Sierra Vista and there are no low rent public housing authority units located in the City. There are two Place-based Section 8 complexes in the City: Mountain View Apartments (80 units of 2, 3, and 4 bedroom units) and Bonita Vista Apartment (99 one-bedroom units for seniors). However, the City does not have information about the need for accessible units.
TABLE 21: PUBLIC HOUSING BY PROGRAM TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Mod-Rehab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Project - based</th>
<th>Tenant - based</th>
<th>Special Purpose Voucher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>495</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: Public Information Center (PIC) Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH)

Table 21 – Public Housing by Program Type

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESIDENTS

Table 22 displays the characteristics of public housing residents by public housing program type. As expected, the average income for all programs is very low with the lowest average income at $4,346 and the highest being $11,061. The average household size is also very low (two persons per household).

Elderly program participants comprise 25.2% of assisted residents and a large number of assisted families are disabled. All families assisted (495) by are requesting accessibility features. The number of families requesting accessibility features is equivalent to the total number of vouchers in use. These data show that a substantial amount of families (37.5%) need housing assistance/vouchers are also disabled or in need of housing accessibility features. No HIV/AIDS participants or victims of domestic violence were counted.
### TABLE 22: CHARACTERISTICS OF PUBLIC HOUSING RESIDENTS BY PROGRAM TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Mod-Rehab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Project-based</th>
<th>Tenant-based</th>
<th>Special Purpose Voucher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterans Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Unification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,885</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,061</td>
<td>4,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of stay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household size</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Homeless at admission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Elderly Program Participants (&gt;62)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Disabled Families</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Families requesting accessibility features</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of HIV/AIDS program participants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of DV victims</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: Public Information Center (PIC) Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH)

Table 22 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type
RACE OF RESIDENTS

Table 23 displays the racial composition of residents for each public housing program. The data in Table 23 show that a high number of tenant-based vouchers or Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing are utilized by White (417 or 84%). Black/African American residents (58) account for 12% of tenant-based vouchers or Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing in use. Less than 5% of the available assistance is utilized by Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, Pacific Islander, or another race of resident. All of the Asian and Pacific Islander residents assisted by these programs are using tenant-based vouchers.

**TABLE 23: RACE OF PUBLIC HOUSING RESIDENTS BY PROGRAM TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Mod-Rehab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Project-based</th>
<th>Tenant-based</th>
<th>Special Purpose Voucher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Source:** HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: Public Information Center (PIC) Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH)
**ETHNICITY OF RESIDENTS**

Table 24 displays the ethnic composition of residents for each assisted housing program. The ethnic groups defined as “Not Hispanic” utilize the majority (69%) of units or vouchers available. Residents reporting as “Hispanic” utilize less than a third of the units or vouchers available.

**TABLE 24: ETHNICITY OF PUBLIC HOUSING RESIDENTS BY PROGRAM TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Mod- Rehab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Project-based</th>
<th>Tenant-based</th>
<th>Special Purpose Voucher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Source: HUD IDIS Output, December 2018: Public Information Center (PIC) Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH)
Section 504 Needs Assessment

NEEDS OF PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS AND APPLICANTS ON THE WAITING LIST FOR ACCESSIBLE UNITS

Currently, there is no public housing authority located in the City of Sierra Vista and there are no low rent public housing authority units located in the City. There are two Place-based Section 8 complexes in the City: Mountain View Apartments (80 units of 2, 3, and 4 bedroom units) and Bonita Vista Apartment (99 one-bedroom units for seniors). However, the City does not have information about the need for accessible units.

The figures presented above indicate a substantial need for accessibility for households with Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV). There are 186 HCV families with disabilities and 125 elderly HCV families, many of whom likely have some disability. In addition, there are 495 families requesting accessibility features.

Data from the 2013-2017 American Community Survey, indicates that there are 5,921 persons with a disability in Sierra Vista, of which 5,456 are over the age of 18 years. Approximately 19% percent of Sierra Vista’s adult population has a disability. The greatest number of these persons have an ambulatory limitation, and the greatest number of households are in the <30% HAMFI income range. Occupied housing units with one or more housing problems comprise 4,773 housing units, or 28% percent of all housing units (17,053) in the City. It is estimated that as many as 1,000 housing units with one or more housing problems may be occupied by a person with a disability.

Please note that the definition of a disability used by the Census Bureau periodically changes and the figures presented in the ACS and CHAS data may not match those in later Census reports.

MOST IMMEDIATE NEEDS OF RESIDENTS OF PUBLIC HOUSING AND HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER HOLDERS

The most immediate housing needs of Housing Choice Voucher Holders with respect to accessibility issues appear to be for additional accessible units. The increasing number of elderly and younger disabled persons creates additional need for accessible units.

In broader terms, these households often need jobs, improved job skills, and support services, such as access to day care, health care, and transportation to improve their employment situation and
prospects. The Cochise County Housing Authority reports that there are 43 families on the Section 8 waiting list, 37 extremely low-income families and 6 very low-income families.

**HOW DO THESE NEEDS COMPARE TO THE HOUSING NEEDS OF THE POPULATION AT LARGE**

These needs are like those faced by most low-income households in the City. However, these needs are often exacerbated by having fewer resources and lower-income levels than the population at large.

**DISCUSSION**

Please see the responses above.
INTRODUCTION

Homelessness and the prevention of homelessness are on-going problems in Sierra Vista. The homeless population continues to increase because of continued unemployment, high housing costs, the continuing effects of the recession, and recent spending cuts in defense spending. However, the City is working with local and regional organizations to identify and meet the needs of homeless persons and those threatened with homelessness.

The needs of homeless persons are complex and require a wide range of specialized services. The City does not possess its own resources to address this problem. The City continues to rely upon other entities and agencies to provide services such as housing, mental health counseling, employment training, and case work services.

There are two homeless emergency shelters in the City. The Good Neighbor Alliance facility is for men and families, and Forgach House is a Domestic Crisis Shelter serving only women. There is also a children’s crisis center, the Cochise County Children’s Crisis Center in Huachuca City. The Forgach House has 40 beds and is 75 percent occupied much of the time. The Good Neighbor Alliance facility has a total capacity of 14 persons. There are 6 beds for men and room for three families. Occupancy is 90 to 100 percent and the facility has developed a wait list policy. Within Cochise County, several organizations provide permanent supportive housing or rapid re-housing. These include the American Red Cross, Community Partnership of Southern Arizona, and the Southern Arizona VA Health Care System (VASH Cochise).

HOMELESS NEEDS ASSESSMENT

In general, there are two types of persons who are homeless in Sierra Vista: 1) Families and individuals who have fallen into homelessness because of financial or personal crises leading to eviction; and 2) Chronically homeless single individuals living on the streets and in shelters. There is also a small number of individuals who have opted to live in the desert, but who come to the City for supplies, and, occasionally, shelter. These persons might be considered chronically homeless. In addition to the
chronically homeless, there is a small, but unknown number of individuals and families living in area motels and hotels.

**TABLE 25(A): HOMELESS NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
<th>Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night</th>
<th>Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year</th>
<th>Estimate the # becoming homeless each year</th>
<th>Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year</th>
<th>Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Households with Only Children</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Households with Only Adults</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless Individuals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless Families</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccompanied Child</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with HIV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: January 23, 2018 PIT Survey, supplied by the Arizona Balance of State Continuum of Care*

Table 25(A) – Homeless Needs Assessment
HOMELESS POPULATION TYPES INCLUDING CHRONICALLY HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES, FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN, VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND UNACCOMPANIED YOUTH

The 2018 PIT was conducted between January 23, 2018 and January 28, 2018. Respondents interviewed for the PIT were specifically asked about where they were physically staying and their personal status on the night of Tuesday, January 23, 2018.

The 2018 AZBoSCoC identified 2,187 persons experiencing homelessness in Balance of State Communities. This is a 24% increase over the prior year count. 1,085 of all persons (49.6%) were unsheltered, a 53% increase over 2017’s PIT results. 2018 PIT count numbers were up for almost every sub population compared to 2017.

The data in the County reports is focused on the individuals and their household members who were unsheltered on the night of January 23, 2018. The 2018 PIT resulted in 78 households completed surveys within Cochise County. More specifically, 44 households reside within the City of Sierra Vista. The 2018 PIT county specifically states that 33 persons within Cochise County are chronically homeless.

Chronically homeless

HUD defines a person as chronically homeless if they have been homeless for one year or longer or have had four or more episodes of homelessness within the past three years and have a disabling condition. National studies have found that when all costs are factored in, chronically homeless persons account for approximately 50 percent of the total expenditures for homeless services. This percent of expenditure is based on a national average of just fewer than 24% of all homeless persons being considered as chronically homeless. The 2018 PIT report identifies 43 households as having been without a home for more than a year. Additionally, seven households stated that they have been they have experienced homelessness four or more times.

Families

The vast majority of households counted during the 2018 PIT count were individuals. Only one household identified as having a child.
Veterans
The 2018 PIT count identifies 12 persons that are homeless and have served in the military within Cochise County.

Unaccompanied Youth
There were no unaccompanied youth counted in the 2018 PIT count within Cochise County.

FAMILIES IN NEED OF HOUSING ASSISTANCE
The 2018 PIT count shows that the vast majority of homeless household within Cochise County are individuals and not families.

NATURE AND EXTENT OF HOMELESSNESS BY RACIAL AND ETHNIC GROUP
The 2018 PIT county provides data specific to the homeless population and the racial/ethnic group they identify with. Of the 78 households that response 69 identified as White, 3 are African American, 1 is Asian, 3 are Native American, and 2 are multi-racial households. This is a total of 83 persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Sheltered</th>
<th>Unsheltered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: January 23, 2018 PIT Survey, supplied by the Arizona Balance of State Continuum of Care.

Table 25(B) – Homelessness by Racial and Ethnic Group

Table 26 – RESERVED
NATURE AND EXTENT OF UNSHELTERED AND SHELTERED HOMELESSNESS

The Arizona Balance of State counts included in the HUD 2018 Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Programs Homeless Populations and Subpopulations Report and Department of Economic Security Annual Reports identify 19 persons being sheltered. This is 5.25% of the sheltered population in the State of Arizona. The number of unsheltered homeless persons for Coshise County is 83. This comprises 7.65% of the unsheltered population in the State of Arizona.

DISCUSSION

Please reference above responses.
NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment

INTRODUCTION

Non-Homeless Special Needs is a broad category that applies to any population that is presumed to be low to moderate income and in need of public services, non-homeless special needs include those of the mentally ill, developmentally disabled, at-risk youth, elderly, and other groups such as persons with HIV/AIDS. These special needs are often addressed by non-profit agencies, usually in coordination with the City of Sierra Vista or Cochise County.

Certain population groups require supportive services and/or supportive housing, either on a permanent basis, or on a temporary basis. Many special needs populations are very low-income households (below 50% of Median Family Income) because they are not able to work or can only work on a part-time basis. Special population groups include the elderly and frail elderly, the physically and developmentally disabled, severely mentally ill persons, and those with substance abuse issues.

Many disabled individuals rely on Supplemental Security Income (SSI) for financial support. SSI provides income support to persons 65 years and over, the blind, and the disabled. Since many disabled persons have limited incomes, finding affordable and accessible housing is often a serious challenge. Even when new affordable rental housing is developed, the rental rates for the housing units are often too high for many disabled persons.

In addition, these persons often require various types of special assistance, program activities to enhance their quality of life, and respite care for their caregivers. Support for municipal programs as well as assistance to not-for-profit organizations is necessary for the implementation of these types of activities.

HUD has identified special needs populations and has provided data on several of these through the data. However, detailed information on some special needs populations is often not available from census or HUD data sources. This document has used information from reliable sources or calculations from entities such as ARC (for the developmentally disabled), the National Institutes of Mental Health, or the National Institute of Alcohol and Alcohol Abuse to estimate the numbers of persons in those categories. Where possible, figures from reliable local sources are used to support these analyses.
While the City’s resources are insufficient to address the needs of all these groups, the City is committed to supporting other entities in their efforts to provide needed resources. At this time, the City is developing relationships with community service organizations, not-for-profit service providers, housing developers, and other state and regional agencies to determine how the City can best assist in providing needed resources to the special needs population.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SPECIAL NEEDS POPULATIONS
Understanding the characteristics of its special needs populations will help the City of Sierra Vista to better evaluate public facilities and services directed toward such needs.

*Elderly & Frail Elderly*

According to HUD’s Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), HUD defines “elderly” as individuals over the age of 62 and “frail elderly” as individuals over the age of 75. The elderly, especially in very low-income households, face housing difficulties based upon their housing needs (size of units, and types of fixtures and amenities), and based on the cost burden they bear for housing and the fact that most are limited by fixed incomes. The Frail Elderly, those 75 and over, may need additional assistance to live independently and have additional requirements for their housing, such as elevators, grab bars in the bathroom, and special types of kitchen and bathroom fixtures.

According to the 2013-2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, there are 3,555 individuals over the age of 75 living in City of Sierra Vista. Due to age, the frail elderly may be unable to care for themselves adequately and may have one or more disabilities or need assistance to perform the routine activities of daily life. There are 1,045 individuals between 65 and 74 years of age with disabilities and 1,731 frail elderly individuals over the age of 75 with disabilities.

*Youth and Young Adults*

Approximately 10,976 children live in the City of Sierra Vista. According to the 2013-2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, 25% of the City of Sierra Vista’s population is less than 18 years of age. Of the population less than 18 years of age, 20% or 2,205 children are living in poverty. Approximately 32.3% of households within the City are households with children. According to the 2017 ACS 1-Year Supplemental Estimates, female-headed households comprise 20% of family households living within the City and 20% of female-headed households are below poverty level.
**Physically & Developmentally Disabled**

According to the 2013-2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates, disabilities are categorized into six types: hearing difficulty, vision difficulty, cognitive ability, ambulatory difficulty, self-care difficulty, and independent living difficulty. Data from 2013-2017 ACS estimates that 6,639 or 15% of people in City of Sierra Vista reported having a disability. While most disabled persons (3,483 people) are between 65 years and older, a high percentage (nearly 38%) of persons 18-64 years are disabled. The 2013-2017 figures for disability indicate that 15.2 percent of the City’s population has some disability. This represents 6,639 persons.

The preferred housing options for the developmentally and physically disabled are those that present a choice and integrate them into the community. This includes supervised apartments, supported living, skilled development homes, and family care homes.

Physical disabilities can be defined as hearing difficulty, vision difficulty, or ambulatory difficulty. The number of persons under the age of 18 with a physical disability is 205, while the number of persons aged 18 to 64 with physical disabilities is 2,470, or 11.5% of the total number or persons in that age group. The number of persons 65 and over with a physical disability is 3,487 or 48.4 percent of that age group.

Deducting the number of physically disabled persons from the census figure for disabled persons gives an approximate figure of 477 persons who may be developmentally disabled. Persons that claim to have a disability may have a combination of physical and developmental disabilities. Developmental disabilities include a cognitive difficulty, self-care difficulty, or independent-living difficulty.

Persons with physical disabilities may require assistance with daily living, and additional requirements for their housing including, for example, special types of kitchen and bathroom fixtures and special fire alarms.

**Mental Illness & Substance Abuse**

The Department of Housing and Urban Development, in the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) manual, defines severe mental illness as a persistent mental or emotional impairment.
that significantly limits a person’s ability to live independently. According to the national statistics, approximately one percent of the adult population meets the definition of severely mentally ill.

Persons with Alcohol and Drug Dependencies - The City has no direct data upon which to reliably estimate the number of persons with alcohol/other drug addiction problems. However, various organizations and bodies have supplied figures on this topic from a national perspective.

The National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (accessed February 2019) estimates that 8.4 percent of the men population over the age of 18 has a drinking problem and that 4.2 percent of women over the age of 18 has this problem. Therefore, it can be estimated that there are approximately 1,316 men and 710 women in the City of Sierra Vista need supportive services for alcohol alone.

HOUSING AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICE NEEDS AND DETERMINATION

Please see the preceding responses.

PUBLIC SIZE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF POPULATION WITH HIV / AIDS

Figures for HIV/AIDS are not available for Sierra Vista specifically. However, data from the Arizona Department of Health Services provides information about the prevalence and incidence of HIV/AIDS at the County level. As of 2017, there are 228 cases of HIV/AIDS in Cochise County. Since 2007, the prevalence of HIV/AIDS has risen by 82 cases from 146 to 228. Similar data from AIDSvu.org for the year 2015 indicates that 172 of every 100,000 people in Cochise County are living with HIV/AIDS; therefore, the estimated population with HIV/AIDS in Sierra Vista is approximately 75 persons.

Cochise County was a recipient of HOPWA grant funding through February 28, 2018. During their grant expenditure period, the County primarily served people with an income of 0-30% AMI. As of February 2019, Cochise County is not an active participant of HOPWA programming.

DISCUSSION

Non-Homeless Special Needs is a broad category that applies to any population that is presumed to be low to moderate income and in need of public services. The category covers a large population, including the mentally ill, developmentally disabled, elderly, and other groups.
Based on input and the data received through the citizen participation process, the highest priorities identified by the public are:

- Senior programs
- Job training
- Domestic violence/child abuse services
- Mental health services
- Youth counseling/mentoring programs

Services to address these needs are often provided by non-profit agencies, usually in coordination with the City of Sierra Vista or Cochise County; however, many of these agencies are overburdened and continue to need funding assistance for service delivery.
NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs

PUBLIC FACILITIES NEEDS
The primary objective of the City’s non-housing community development activities is the provision of a suitable living environment and the provision of services for low- and moderate-income persons. This definition includes a wide range of programs and activities, focusing on housing conditions and infrastructure improvements. The City possesses several relatively new public facilities and parks as well as older public facilities and parks that require improvements. For example, Soldier Creek Park would benefit from the creation of a community event/gathering space, and James Landwehr Plaza needs general updating/improvements toward usability, including the property to the north of the plaza. Improvements to these two existing public facilities would also help to bolster the City’s West End revitalization effort. However, the City does not have a pressing need or the resources for the development of new public facilities.

PUBLIC FACILITIES NEED DETERMINATION
Non-housing Community Development needs and priorities were identified in the course of preparing this Consolidated Plan through the input of community leaders, citizen participation, and requests and ideas from service providers and public agencies. These inputs were provided in meetings and public hearings, as well as the survey, described in the public participation section of this Plan.

Further, the Community Development Department is in contact with County and State departments and agencies that often raise issues and concerns or make requests about improvements or conditions in the low/mod neighborhoods.

The City will consider the many and varied needs, and the funding and project selection process reflects the input and weighing of needs and requests considering the overall objective.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS NEEDS
The City has been active in developing and maintaining public improvements considering the many needs of the City and the limited resources available. Public improvements and infrastructure receive a High priority ranking here because they are a means to make significant improvements in the quality of life in the distressed neighborhoods. These improvements include Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) improvements, including ADA ramps and sidewalk installation in the City’s CDBG-eligible neighborhoods.
PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS NEED DETERMINATION

Public Improvement needs and priorities were identified through the input of community leaders, citizen participation, and requests and ideas from service providers and public agencies. These inputs were provided in the meetings and public hearings, as well as staff input. Information from County and State departments and agencies helps to leverage resources and coordinate efforts for improvements in the low/mod neighborhoods.

The City will consider the many and varied needs, and the funding and project selection process will reflect the input and weighing of needs and requests considering the overall objective.

PUBLIC SERVICES NEEDS

The City wishes to do all that it can to improve the quality of life for its most vulnerable low- and moderate-income populations, including the elderly, the disabled, and the homeless. As noted in the meeting, hearings, and survey discussion, there is a significant need for programs and assistance for homeless activities including prevention and mental health care, and public service programs including youth, elderly, domestic violence, job opportunity, and mental health services.

PUBLIC SERVICES NEED DETERMINATION

Discussions at the public hearings and meetings, as well as information collected by survey, noted the wide range of needs for different segments of the population and relatively small amount of funds to work with. Leveraging of resources was a common theme in many of the meetings, but it is difficult to determine priorities with limited funds and organizational structure. As a new entitlement community, the City does not yet possess the network of contacts or the administrative capacity to solicit and evaluate applications and to monitor projects from community development entities. The necessary policies and procedures, as well as the establishment of the necessary knowledge about these providers, will be developed during the period of this Consolidated Plan.
MA-05 Overview

HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS OVERVIEW

The purpose of the Market Analysis is to provide a clear picture of the environment in which Sierra Vista must administer its programs over the course of the Consolidated Plan. In conjunction with the Needs Assessment, the Market Analysis will provide the basis for the Strategic Plan and the programs and projects to be administered. Most of the data tables in this section are populated with a default data set based on the most recent data available. Additional data has been obtained from various sources, including more current American Community Survey (ACS) estimates and local data sources such as the City of Sierra Vista and Cochise County. This section covers the following broad topics:

- **General Characteristics of the Housing Market:** The general characteristics of the City’s housing market, including supply, demand, and condition and cost of housing, are described in the following sections: Number of Housing Units (MA-10); Cost of Housing (MA-15); and, Condition of Housing (MA-20).

- **Lead-based Paint Hazards:** The Condition of Housing (MA-10) section provides an estimate of the number of housing units within Sierra Vista that are occupied by low-income families or moderate-income families that contain lead-based paint hazards.

- **Public and Assisted Housing:** A description and identification of the public housing developments and public housing units in Sierra Vista is provided in the Public and Assisted Housing (MA-25) section. This narrative details the physical condition of such units, the restoration and revitalization needs, Section 504 needs, and the public housing agency’s strategy for improving the management and operation of public housing and the living conditions of low- and moderate-income families in public housing.

- **Assisted Housing:** The information collected in the Number of Housing Units (MA-10) section describes the number and targeting (income level and type of family served) of units currently assisted by local, state, or Federally funded programs and an assessment of whether any such units are expected to be lost from the assisted housing inventory for any reason, such as expiration of Section 8 contracts.
• **Facilities, Housing, and Services for Homeless Persons:** A brief inventory of facilities, housing, and services that meet the needs of homeless persons within the City is provided in the Homeless Facilities and Services (MA-30) section. A particular emphasis is given to chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth. The inventory includes services directly targeted to homeless persons, as well as mainstream services, such as health, mental health, and employment services to the extent those services are used to complement services targeted to homeless persons.

• **Special Need Facilities and Services:** The Special Needs Facilities and Services (MA-35) section describes the housing stock available to serve persons with disabilities and other low-income persons with special needs, including persons with HIV/AIDS and their families. The section further describes the facilities and services that assist persons who are not homeless, but who require supportive housing and programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing.

• **Barriers to Affordable Housing:** This section (MA-40) provides an assessment of the regulatory barriers to affordable housing that exist within Sierra Vista. These regulatory barriers may include tax policies affecting land and other property, land use controls, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limits, and policies that affect the return on residential investment.

Population growth follows job growth and the demand for housing will be influenced by the location, type, and wage levels of the City. The affordability component of housing demand, however, is based upon local wages and salaries that are translated into household incomes. The availability of an existing supply of various housing types and price levels must be maintained to meet the housing demand of the variety of occupations that comprise the local economic base. The following market analysis will demonstrate that low incomes and limited job opportunities for “living wage” jobs keep household incomes low in the face of increasing rents. The rent figures continue to increase as the population grows and the supply of units remains stable. At the same time, demands for increased down payment and stricter lending criteria keep many households from purchasing homes, which also increases the pressure on the rental market.
MA-10 Number of Housing Units – 91.210(a) & (b) (2)

INTRODUCTION

The total number of housing units in Sierra Vista has increased over the past decade. The City had a total of 17,158 housing units at the time of the 2007 U.S Census and 20,012 housing units at the time of the 2017 U.S. Census. Between 2007 and 2017, the total number of housing units in the City grew by approximately 16%. According to data provided in the 2013-2017 ACS, an estimated total of 20,012 housing units are located within Sierra Vista presently.

TABLE 28: ALL RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES BY NUMBER OF UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-unit detached structure</td>
<td>13,330</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-unit, attached structure</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 units</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19 units</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more units</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc.</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,012</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: 2013-2017 ACS

Table 28 – Residential Properties by Unit Number

As shown in Table 28, data from the 2013-2017 ACS show that the majority of residential properties are single units (a total of 14,202 or 71%). Single-unit properties are either detached structures (13,330 or 67%) or attached structures (872 or 4%). Residential properties are further categorized into properties within 2-4 unit structures (884 or 4.4%), properties within 5-19 unit structures (1,287 or 7%), and properties within 20 or more unit structures (2,442 or 12%). These categories comprise 94% of the City’s housing stock. The remainder of residential properties in the City is classified as mobile home, boat, RV, van, etc. (1,197 or 6%).
TABLE 29: UNIT SIZE BY TENURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owners</th>
<th></th>
<th>Renters</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No bedroom</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>14.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedrooms</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>12.65%</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>23.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>8,103</td>
<td>86.12%</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>55.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,409</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>7,644</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Equals more than 100% due to rounding.

Table 29 – Unit Size by Tenure

As shown in Table 29, there are an estimated 17,053 occupied housing units within the City. Of this total, 9,409 or 55% are owner-occupied and 7,644 or 45% are renter-occupied.

Of all owner-occupied units, most contain 2 or 3 or more bedrooms (6,433 or 68.37%). Only a small number of owner-occupied units have 1 bedroom (74 or 0.79%) or are without bedrooms (42 or 0.45%).

Of all renter-occupied units, most contain 2 or 3 or more bedrooms (5,005 or 65.48%). In contrast to owner-occupied units, a significant percentage of renter-occupied units have 1 bedroom (1,136 or 14.86%). Only a small percentage of renter-occupied units are without bedrooms (498 or 6.51%).

DESCRIBE THE NUMBER AND TARGETING (INCOME LEVEL/TYPE OF FAMILY SERVED) OF UNITS ASSISTED WITH FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL PROGRAMS.

At this time, as a new entitlement community, the City is developing relationships with community service organizations, not-for-profit service providers, housing developers, housing lenders, and other state and regional agencies to determine how the City can best assist in providing needed housing assistance and programs to the City’s low/mod population.

The current housing programs in Sierra Vista are administered by the County. There are 495 Housing Choice Vouchers of which 482 are Tenant-based and 13 are Veterans Supportive Housing according to the HUD provided figures. All are extremely low- or very low-income households. Approximately 125 (25%) of the voucher holders are elderly and 186 (38%) of the voucher holders are disabled.
PROVIDE AN ASSESSMENT OF UNITS EXPECTED TO BE LOST FROM THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING INVENTORY FOR ANY REASON, SUCH AS EXPIRATION OF SECTION 8 CONTRACTS.

Approximately 30 percent of Cochise County’s Housing Choice Vouchers are administered within the City of Sierra Vista. There are two Section 8 complexes in Sierra Vista: Bonita Vista Apartments (99 assisted units, one-bedroom units only, expires May 2023 – FY 2023) and Mountain View Apartments (60 assisted units – 2, 3, and 4 bedroom units, expires December 2024 – FY 2025).

DOES THE AVAILABILITY OF HOUSING UNITS MEET THE NEEDS OF THE POPULATION?

The percentages of units by property type in Sierra Vista are very close to national figures, though Sierra Vista has a slightly higher percentage of one-unit structures, with 70% compared to the United States 67.5%. However, ACS figures indicate that the ratio of owner-occupied units to renter-occupied units varies from the national figures in that the percentage of renter units in Sierra Vista is 10 percent more than the national figures of 34.5%. This may reflect the presence of the military base and the presence of off-base personnel and of contractors and consultants for the base operations. Overcrowding is not a major concern for either renter or owner households. Thus, the availability of units appears to meet the needs of the population.

DESCRIBE THE NEED FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF HOUSING:

Considering the apparent balance, there is no need for any specific types of housing.

DISCUSSION

Please see the preceding responses.
MA-15 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing – 91.210(a)

INTRODUCTION

This section provides an overall picture of housing costs within the City of Sierra Vista. Specifically, the section describes housing cost trends, rent trends, fair market rents, and affordability.

### TABLE 30: COST OF HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base Year: 2000</th>
<th>Most Recent Year: 2017</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Value</td>
<td>$105,300</td>
<td>$180,400</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Contract Rent</td>
<td>$460</td>
<td>$810</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2013-2017 ACS (Most Recent Year)*

Table 30 – Cost of Housing

### TABLE 31: RENT PAID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent Paid</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $500</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500-999</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000-1,499</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500-1,999</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000 or more</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,469</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: 2013-2017 ACS (Most Recent Year) Table 31 – Rent Paid*

The costs of housing trends for Sierra Vista are displayed in Table 30. According to the 2013-2017 ACS, the current median home value for Sierra Vista is estimated to be $180,400. This figure represents a 71% increase from the 2000 U.S. Census median home value of $105,300. Between the 2000 U.S. Census and the 2013-2017 ACS, the median contract rent within the City increased by 76%, from $460 to $810.

The distribution of estimated rents paid within Sierra Vista is detailed in Table 31, according to 2013-2017 ACS data. Of all 7,469 rental units within the City, the majority (3,890 or 52%) have a rent between $500 and $999. A significant percentage of rental units have a rent between $1,000 and $1,499 (2,714 or 36%), while 508 or 7% have a rent that exceeds $1,500. Only 5% of the City’s rental units have a rent less than $500.
TABLE 32: HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Units affordable to Households</th>
<th>Renter</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30% HAMFI</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% HAMFI</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% HAMFI</td>
<td>4,149</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% HAMFI</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>1,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,584</td>
<td>2,865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: 2009-2013 CHAS*

Table 32 – Housing Affordability

The overall housing affordability within Sierra Vista is detailed in Table 32. According to HUD, a unit is considered affordable if gross rent, including utilities, is no more than 30% of the household income. The table, based on 2009-2013 CHAS data, first divides households into four income ranges: less than or equal to 30% HUD Adjusted Median Family Income (HAMFI), less than or equal to 50% HAMFI, less than or equal to 80% HAMFI, and less than or equal to 100% HAMFI. The table also separates housing units into either rental units or owner units.

For households with incomes less than or equal to 30% HAMFI, a total of 300 available rental units are considered to be affordable, while no data is available for owner units. For households with incomes less than or equal to 50% HAMFI, a total of 1,135 affordable rental units are available, while 200 affordable owner units are available. For households with incomes less than or equal to 80% HAMFI, a total of 4,149 affordable rental units are available, while 895 affordable owner units are available. Finally, for households with incomes less than or equal to 100% HAMFI, a total of 1,770 affordable owner units are available, while no data is provided for affordable rental units.

As noted previously in Table 29, an estimated 7,644 renter-occupied housing units are located within Sierra Vista (2013-2017 ACS). Of this total, only 4% of renter-occupied housing units are affordable to the lowest income households (less or equal to 30% AMFI) and 15% are affordable to households earning less than or equal to 50% AMFI. A much larger percentage (54%) of renter-occupied housing units are affordable to households earning less than or equal to 80% AMFI.

An estimated 9,409 owner-occupied housing units are located within Sierra Vista (see Table 29). Of this total, 2% are affordable to households earning less than or equal to 50% HAMFI, 9.5% are affordable to
households earning less than or equal to 80% HAMFI, and 18.8% are affordable to households earning less than or equal to 100% HAMFI.

**TABLE 33: MONTHLY RENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Rent ($)</th>
<th>Efficiency (no)</th>
<th>1 Bedroom</th>
<th>2 Bedroom</th>
<th>3 Bedroom</th>
<th>4 Bedroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair Market Rent</td>
<td>$638</td>
<td>$642</td>
<td>$823</td>
<td>$1,190</td>
<td>$1,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High HOME Rent</td>
<td>$617</td>
<td>$621</td>
<td>$779</td>
<td>$1,009</td>
<td>$1,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low HOME Rent</td>
<td>$511</td>
<td>$548</td>
<td>$657</td>
<td>$759</td>
<td>$847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: HUD FY2019 FMR and 2018 HOME Rents for Sierra Vista-Douglas, AZ MSA*

Table 33 shows HUD Fair Market Rents and HUD HOME Rents within the Sierra Vista-Douglas, AZ Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). Fair Market Rents (FMRs) are gross rent estimates that include rent plus the cost of all tenant-paid utilities. FMRs are set to the dollar amount at which 40% of the standard-quality rental housing units are rented, excluding non-market rental housing (e.g. public housing). High HOME Rents are equal to the FMR or 30% of the adjusted income of a family whose income equals 65% AMI, whichever is lower. Low HOME Rents are equal to 30% of the adjusted income of a family whose income equals 50% AMI.

**IS THERE SUFFICIENT HOUSING FOR HOUSEHOLDS AT ALL INCOME LEVELS?**

A comparison of the total number of households at the various income levels (see Table 6) and the total number of affordable housing units available for the various income levels (see Table 32) can reveal surpluses or shortages of affordable housing.

According to 2009-2013 CHAS data, there are 1,635 units available to households in the extremely low- (30% HAMFI) and very low-income (50% HAMFI) categories and there are about 2,790 households in those lower income ranges. Thus, there is a significant shortage of units affordable to those households in the extremely low- and very low-income ranges. This shortage does not exist for households with moderate income (80% HAMFI).

**HOW IS AFFORDABILITY OF HOUSING LIKELY TO CHANGE CONSIDERING CHANGES TO HOME VALUES AND/OR RENTS?**

The estimated median home value within the City of Sierra Vista increased from $105,300 in 2000 to $180,400 in 2017 according to the ACS for those years. Moreover, the long-term trend in housing value
has been positive growth, as evidenced by the City’s 71% increase in median home value between the 2000 U.S. Census and the 2013-2017 ACS. Over this same period, the City’s median contract rent increased 76% from $460 to $810. The median contract rent in Sierra Vista was $810 in 2017, which was only slightly lower than the national median contract rent of $827.

The City’s median household income has increased 53.1% between the 2000 Census and the 2013-2017 ACS, increasing from $38,427 to $58,839. If trends continue, where the median housing values increase at a slightly faster rate than median household incomes, it can be anticipated that housing within the City will generally become less affordable to households.

**HOW DO HOME RENTS / FAIR MARKET RENT COMPARE TO AREA MEDIAN RENT? HOW MIGHT THIS IMPACT YOUR STRATEGY TO PRODUCE OR PRESERVE AFFORDABLE HOUSING?**

The City’s current median contract rent is estimated to be $810 (according to the 2013-2017 ACS). This median contract rent is lower than the Fair Market Rents for 2, 3, and 4 bedroom units, but is higher than the Fair Market Rents for efficiency and 1 bedroom units. The median contract rent is higher than the High HOME Rent for efficiency, 1 bedroom, and 2 bedroom units. The median contract rent is higher than the Low HOME Rent for all unit sizes listed except for 4 bedroom units.

**DISCUSSION:**

Within the City of Sierra Vista, there is a potential shortage of units affordable to very low- and low-income households. While household incomes have increased by 53.1 percent, the cost of housing has increased by over 70% during the past decade. As housing costs outpace household incomes, housing may become less affordable to low- and moderate-income households.
MA-20 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing – 91.210(a)

INTRODUCTION

This section describes the significant characteristics of the housing market in terms of supply, demand, condition, and the cost of housing. Additionally, it provides a summary of the housing stock available to serve persons with disabilities and persons with HIV/AIDS and their families.

DEFINITIONS

The following definitions pertain to this section:

- “Standard condition” – A housing unit that meets HUD Housing Quality Standards (HQS) and all applicable state and local codes.
- “Substandard condition but suitable for rehabilitation” – A housing unit that contains one or more housing condition (defined below), contains a lead-based paint hazard, and/or is condemned as unfit for human habitation but is both structurally and financially feasible to rehabilitate.
- “Substandard condition not suitable for rehabilitation” – A housing unit that contains one or more housing condition (defined below), contains a lead-based paint hazard, and/or is condemned as unfit for human habitation and is not structurally or financially feasible to rehabilitate.

Additionally, the term “abandoned vacant unit” is defined by HUD as:

- A housing unit that has been foreclosed upon and vacant for at least 90 days.
- A housing unit where no mortgage or tax payments have been made by the property owner for at least 90 days.
- A housing unit where a code enforcement inspection has determined that the property is not habitable, and the owner has taken no corrective actions within 90 days of the notification of the deficiencies.
### Table 34: Condition of Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition of Units</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With one selected Condition</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With two selected Conditions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With three selected Conditions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With four selected Conditions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No selected Conditions</td>
<td>7,894</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,409</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: 2013-2017 ACS Table 34 – Condition of Units
*Equals less than 100% due to rounding.

Table 34 shows the condition of occupied housing units within Sierra Vista, with a breakdown of owner-occupied units and renter-occupied units. As defined by HUD, a housing “condition” includes the following:

- A housing unit that lacks complete plumbing facilities
- A housing unit that lacks complete kitchen facilities
- A housing unit with more than one person per room
- A housing unit with a cost burden greater than 30% of the occupant’s household income

According to 2013-2017 ACS data, the majority (7,894 or 84%) of owner-occupied housing units have no housing conditions. Of the remaining owner-occupied housing units, all feature one housing condition (1,515 or 16%). No owner-occupied housing units have more one housing conditions.

Of the estimated 7,644 renter-occupied housing units in the City, the majority (4,386 or 57%) have no housing conditions. Less than half (3,082 or 40%) of renter-occupied units have one housing condition. Only 2% of renter-occupied units have two housing conditions. No renter-occupied housing units have more than two housing conditions.
TABLE 35: YEAR UNIT BUILT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Unit Built</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 or later</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1999</td>
<td>3,146</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1979</td>
<td>3,035</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1950</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,409</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: 2013-2017 ACS

Table 35 – Year Unit Built

The age of housing within Sierra Vista is detailed in Table 35. Of the 9,409 owner-occupied housing units, 3,035 or 32.3% were built between 1950 and 1979, 3,146 or 33.4% were built between 1980 and 1999, and 3,186 or 33.9% were built during 2000 or later. A very small number (42 or .04%) of owner-occupied housing units were built before 1950.

Of the 7,644 renter-occupied housing units, 2,379 or 31.1% were built between 1950 and 1979, 2,967 or 38.8% were built between 1980 and 1999, and 2,226 or 29.1% were built during 2000 or later. A very small number (72 or less than 1%) of renter-occupied units were built before 1950.

TABLE 36: RISK OF LEAD-BASED PAINT HAZARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Units Built Before 1980</td>
<td>3,077</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units built before 1980 with children present</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: 2013-2017 ACS (Total Units); 2009-2013 CHAS (Units with Children present)

Table 36 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint

The risk of lead-based paint hazards within Sierra Vista is estimated in Table 36. Because the actual number of housing units in the City with lead-based paint is not available, an assumption must be made. For the purposes of this plan, a housing unit built before 1980 is presumed to have a higher risk of lead-based paint. Therefore, the table shows the total number of owner-occupied and renter-occupied units that were built before 1980, as well as those built before 1980 with children present. The data for this table is from the 2013-2017 ACS and 2009-2013 CHAS.
As shown in Table 36, 3,047 or 32% of owner-occupied housing units in the City were built prior to 1980, while 435 or 4.6% were built before 1980 and have children present. For renter-occupied housing units, 2,451 or 32% were built prior to 1980, while 445 or 5.8% were built prior to 1980 and have children present.

**TABLE 37: VACANT UNITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suitable for Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Not Suitable for Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Units</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned Vacant Units</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REO Properties</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned REO Properties</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Data Source: 2013-2017 ACS_

Table 37 – Vacant Units

According to 2013-2017 ACS data, there are a total of 20,012 housing units within Sierra Vista. Of these, 2,959 or 14.8% are vacant. As defined in the American Community Survey a housing unit is vacant if no one is living in it at the time of interview. Units occupied at the time of interview entirely by persons who are staying two months or less and who have a more permanent residence elsewhere are considered to be temporarily occupied and are classified as “vacant.” Units suitable for rehabilitation are those units which were constructed prior to 1980.

According to the foreclosure database maintained by RealtyTrac.com, as accessed in February 2019, a total of 60 properties are in some state of foreclosure (i.e., default, auction, pre-foreclosure or bank owned). The foreclosure rate in Sierra Vista was 29% lower than the previous month, and 9% lower than the same time last year. The rates are lower than countywide foreclosure rates but are comparable to statewide and national foreclosure rates.

**NEED FOR OWNER AND RENTAL REHABILITATION**

In terms of housing quality, 16% of owner-occupied housing units in the City have at least one housing condition, while 40% of renter-occupied housing units have at least one housing condition (see Table 34). Relative to the age of housing, less than 1% of the City’s owner- and renter-occupied units were built prior to 1950 (see Table 35). Although the exact number of homes with lead-based paint is not known, it is assumed that housing units in the City built prior to 1980 have a higher risk of lead-based
paint hazards. About 33% of owner-occupied homes and about 32% of renter-occupied homes were built prior to 1980. Generally, these statistics point toward the need for Sierra Vista to facilitate both owner-unit and rental-unit rehabilitations within its jurisdiction where necessary.

**ESTIMATED NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS OCCUPIED BY LOW- OR MODERATE-INCOME FAMILIES WITH LBP HAZARDS**

Table 36 notes that, in Sierra Vista, 3,077 owner-occupied housing units were built prior to 1980 and 2,451 renter-occupied housing units were built prior to 1980. These units are assumed to have a higher risk of lead-based paint hazards.

As of the 2013-2017 ACS, there are an estimated 17,053 occupied housing units within Sierra Vista. Approximately 5,528 occupied units or 32% of occupied housing units are assumed to have a higher risk of lead-based paint hazards, having been built prior to 1970. According to HUD 2009-2013 CHAS data, 5,160 low- or moderate-income households (earning less than or equal to 80% HAMFI) reside in Sierra Vista. Therefore, approximately 1,651 housing units, or 32% of housing units occupied by low- and moderate-income families, may have a higher risk of lead-based paint hazards.

The 2013-2017 ACS estimates that in Sierra Vista there are 20,012 housing units (either occupied or vacant). Studies have shown that the lead-based paint hazard lessens with newer construction. That is, a unit constructed between 1960 and 1979 has a 62 percent chance of having this hazard; units built from 1940 to 1959 have an eighty (80) percent chance; units built prior to 1940 have a ninety (90) percent chance. Using this formula, the City has approximately 6,688 housing units with the presence of lead-based paint in them, but it should be noted that the bulk of these units (68%) were constructed after 1970 and have the lowest possibility of lead-based paint. However, the CHAS data provided in Table 36 indicates that there are 880 pre-1980 housing units with children present.

**DISCUSSION**

In terms of housing conditions, owner-occupied units have more housing conditions than renter-occupied units. The majority of the City's housing units were built after 1980. Due to, primarily, the housing conditions there is a need for Sierra Vista to facilitate both owner-unit and rental-unit rehabilitations. It is estimated that approximately 1,651 housing units, or 32% of housing units occupied by low- and moderate-income families, may have a higher risk of lead-based paint hazards.
MA-25 Public and Assisted Housing – 91.210(b)

INTRODUCTION:

The City does not have any public housing developments. The Housing Authority of Cochise County administers the Housing Choice Vouchers in the City, which total approximately 518 vouchers, including some Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers (93).

### TABLE 38: TOTALS NUMBER OF UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Vouchers</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Mod-Rehab</th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Project-based</th>
<th>Tenant-based</th>
<th>Special Purpose Voucher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Unification Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| # of units vouchers available | 518 | 482 | 93 |
| # of accessible units        |     |     |    |

*Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)*

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

**Table 38 – Total Number of Units by Program Type**

DESCRIBE THE SUPPLY OF PUBLIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS:

The City does not have any public housing developments. The Housing Authority of Cochise County administers the Housing Choice Vouchers in the City, which total approximately 518 vouchers, including some Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers (93).

DESCRIBE THE NUMBER AND PHYSICAL CONDITION OF PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS IN THE JURISDICTION, INCLUDING THOSE THAT ARE PARTICIPATING IN AN APPROVED PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY PLAN:

The City does not have any public housing developments. The Housing Authority of Cochise County administers the Housing Choice Vouchers in the City, which total approximately 500 vouchers, including some Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing vouchers.
TABLE 39: PUBLIC HOUSING CONDITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Housing Development</th>
<th>Inspection Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39 – Public Housing Condition

DESCRIBE THE RESTORATION AND REVITALIZATION NEEDS OF PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS IN THE JURISDICTION:

Not applicable.

DESCRIBE THE PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY’S STRATEGY FOR IMPROVING THE LIVING ENVIRONMENT OF LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME FAMILIES RESIDING IN PUBLIC HOUSING:

Not applicable.

DISCUSSION:

Not applicable.
MA-30 Homeless Facilities and Services – 91.210(c)

INTRODUCTION

The needs of homeless persons are complex and require a wide range of specialized services and the City of Sierra Vista does not possess the resources to address this problem. The City continues to rely upon other entities and agencies to provide services such as housing, mental health counseling, employment training, and case work services. The City is within the Arizona Balance of State Continuum of Care (CoC) which includes Sierra Vista as well as other areas of Arizona not within major metropolitan regions.

There are two homeless emergency shelters in Sierra Vista. The Good Neighbor Alliance serves men and families, and the Forgach House is a Domestic Crisis Shelter operated by Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona. There is a children’s crisis center, the Cochise County Children’s Crisis Center in Huachuca City. Other services for the homeless are in Bisbee and Benson. Cochise County has two permanent supportive housing facilities by the Community Partnership of Southern Arizona and the Southern Arizona VA Health Care System (VASH Cochise). Additionally, the American Red Cross has a Rapid Re-Housing program in Cochise County.

Priorities related to homelessness identified during the citizen participation process included improved operation and maintenance of existing homeless facilities, homeless prevention activities, emergency shelters for families, and mental health care.
TABLE 40: FACILITIES AND HOUSING TARGETED TO HOMELESS HOUSEHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emergency Shelter Beds</th>
<th>Transitional Housing Beds</th>
<th>Permanent Supportive Housing Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Year Round Beds (Current &amp; New)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds</strong></td>
<td><strong>Current &amp; New</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Only Adults</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Homeless Households</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccompanied Youth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40 – Facilities and Housing Targeted to Homeless Households

Data Source: January 23, 2018 PIT Survey, supplied by the Arizona Balance of State Continuum of Care, and HUD 2018 Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Programs Housing Inventory County Report. *Permanent Supportive Housing is provided within Cochise County; count includes Rapid Re-Housing beds. **While no emergency shelter beds are specifically allocated to veterans, several organizations list veterans as a secondary target population.

DESCRIBE MAINSTREAM SERVICES, SUCH AS HEALTH, MENTAL HEALTH, AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES TO THE EXTENT THOSE SERVICES ARE USED TO COMPLEMENT SERVICES TARGETED TO HOMELESS PERSONS.

The city has only a limited number of services and these often provide some level of services to the homeless. This includes providing food, clothing, meals, financial assistance and transportation.

Medical/Healthcare Resources

- Benson Community Center (705 W. Union St. Benson, AZ) – provides free meals to those in need.
- Benson Area Food Bank (370 S. Huachuca St. Denson, AZ) – donates emergency food boxes for people in need.
- Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona, Inc. (Sierra Vista) – Senior Nutrition and home delivered meals.

Employment Resources

- Cochise County Reentry Coalition – Provides resources for gaining employment and provides shelter.
- Arizona@Work Southeastern Arizona (2600 E. Wilcox Drive, Sierra Vista) – provides resources and services to pursue employment opportunities.
Fort Huachuca Army Community Service – provides information about social services available on base and in the community to active duty and retired military personnel.

LIST AND DESCRIBE SERVICES AND FACILITIES THAT MEET THE NEEDS OF HOMELESS PERSONS, PARTICULARLY CHRONICALLY HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES, FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN, VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND UNACCOMPANIED YOUTH. IF THE SERVICES AND FACILITIES ARE LISTED ON SCREEN SP-40 INSTITUTIONAL DELIVERY STRUCTURE OR SCREEN MA-35 SPECIAL NEEDS FACILITIES AND SERVICES, DESCRIBE HOW THESE FACILITIES AND SERVICES SPECIFICALLY ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF THESE POPULATIONS.

As noted in the preceding response, the City possesses limited services for the homeless. However, the Cochise County Resources Guide lists several organizations and agencies that provide food, clothing, financial assistance, healthcare and transportation assistance. These include State and county agencies, and organizations such as the St. Vincent DePaul Society, the Salvation Army, Family to Family Sierra Vista, Catholic Community Services Meals Programs, and St. Andrew the Apostle Church.

Facilities and programs serving the homeless in the City of Sierra Vista or Cochise County include Forgach House by Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona; Samaritan Station by Good Neighbor Alliance; S+C Rural Cochise by Community Partnership of Southern Arizona; VASH Cochise by Southern Arizona VA Health Care System; and RRH-SSVF Cochise County by American Red Cross.
MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services – 91.210(d)

INTRODUCTION

This section describes facilities and services that assist persons who are not homeless but require supportive housing and programs. These populations may include elderly and frail elderly, persons with disabilities, persons with alcohol or drug addictions, persons with HIV/AIDS, or other groups. Such facilities and services include units that are barrier-free and physically accessible, units with on-site supportive services such as case management, counseling and healthcare, and units that are affordable to persons on a fixed or limited income.

The City has a range of facilities and services to assist persons and families with special needs. As discussed above, these include State and county agencies, and organizations such as the St. Vincent de Paul Society, the Salvation Army, Catholic Community Services of Southeastern Arizona, and St. Andrew the Apostle Church. These organizations provide financial assistance, shelter, counseling, meals and food, and other aid.

INCLUDING THE ELDERLY, FRAIL ELDERLY, PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES (MENTAL, PHYSICAL, DEVELOPMENTAL), PERSONS WITH ALCOHOL OR OTHER DRUG ADDICTIONS, PERSONS WITH HIV/AIDS AND THEIR FAMILIES, PUBLIC HOUSING RESIDENTS AND ANY OTHER CATEGORIES THE JURISDICTION MAY SPECIFY, AND DESCRIBE THEIR SUPPORTIVE HOUSING NEEDS.

Elderly & Frail Elderly

The elderly, and particularly the frail elderly, require supportive housing, including units that are barrier-free and accessible to the disabled, units with on-site supportive services, and units that are affordable to persons on a fixed-income. Please reference the preceding response.

Persons with Disabilities (Mental, Physical, Developmental)

Disabled persons require barrier-free housing that is also affordable. Accessibility retrofits tend to be expensive and homes with such features tend to be higher in value. In contrast, income levels for the disabled (mentally, physically or developmentally) tend to be lower than median area income, resulting in affordability concerns. While new multi-family units are required to have accessibility for such populations, older units tend to be lacking such features. Moreover, persons with mental or developmental disabilities often require supportive housing that includes on-site services.
**Persons with Alcohol or Drug Addictions**

Persons with addictions may require temporary housing and treatment. This type of housing can include beds for extended stay and counseling rooms for on-site services. The primary agencies serving those with addictions in Sierra Vista are Southeastern Arizona Behavioral Health Services, Inc, Arizona Counseling and Consultation Services, and Community Bridges. Arizona Counseling and Consultation Services, and Southeastern Arizona Behavioral Health Services both have a location within the City of Sierra Vista, and other treatment centers are in surrounding areas within the County. Each of these treatment centers specialize in the rehabilitation of alcohol and drug abuse.

**Persons with HIV/AIDS**

Persons living with HIV/AIDS face particular challenges with regard to supportive housing. Many are experiencing physical disability, loss of employment, and lack of income resulting in a need for more stable housing. There are currently very limited services for persons with HIV/AIDS within the City of Sierra Vista. Cochise County Department of Health and Social Services offers information/resources on HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases.

**Other Groups**

Persons leaving a violent domestic situation are often homeless at first. The availability of emergency and transitional housing is critical to prevent their return to such a situation. Most of the needs for this group are related to shelter and counseling. Runaway youth require similar housing and counseling services.

**DESCRIBE PROGRAMS FOR ENSURING THAT PERSONS RETURNING FROM MENTAL AND PHYSICAL HEALTH INSTITUTIONS RECEIVE APPROPRIATE SUPPORTIVE HOUSING**

Households with mental or physical health issues face barriers to safe, decent and affordable housing. Often, persons with mental or physical issues are discharged from institutions but are then unable to find independent housing that they can afford or reasonably maintain. Neither the City nor any of the organizations mentioned above are involved in supportive housing for discharged persons.
SPECIFY THE ACTIVITIES THAT THE JURISDICTION PLANS TO UNDERTAKE DURING THE NEXT YEAR TO ADDRESS THE HOUSING AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES NEEDS IDENTIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH 91.215(E) WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO ARE NOT HOMELESS BUT HAVE OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS. LINK TO ONE-YEAR GOALS. 91.315(E)

The City will consider pursuing activities to address the housing and supportive service needs of persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. However, at this time, the city does not have the procedures, policies or mechanisms in place to assist organizations providing these types of services.

FOR ENTITLEMENT/CONSORTIA GRANTEES: SPECIFY THE ACTIVITIES THAT THE JURISDICTION PLANS TO UNDERTAKE DURING THE NEXT YEAR TO ADDRESS THE HOUSING AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES NEEDS IDENTIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH 91.215(E) WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO ARE NOT HOMELESS BUT HAVE OTHER SPECIAL NEEDS. LINK TO ONE-YEAR GOALS. (91.220(2))

Not applicable.
MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing – 91.210(e)

DESCRIBE ANY NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF PUBLIC POLICIES ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND RESIDENTIAL INVESTMENT.

This section requires the jurisdiction to explain whether the cost of housing or the incentives to develop, maintain, or improve affordable housing are affected by public policies, particularly those of the local jurisdiction. Such policies include land use controls, zoning ordinances, building codes, and policies that affect the return on residential investment. Sierra Vista does not put any limitations on growth. Through vehicles such as zoning ordinances, subdivision controls, permit systems, and housing codes and standards, the City has attempted to ensure the health, safety, and quality of life of its residents while minimizing the barriers that may impede the development of affordable housing.

The most important impediment to affordable housing revolves around the lack of Federal and State resources for affordable housing initiatives. The lack of programs and resources to reduce excessive rent or mortgage burdens to qualified persons is a key factor. The City has used, and is willing to make available, a range of incentives and assistance to developers wishing to build affordable housing. These elements include the use of Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, the waiver of development and re-zoning fees, and the phasing of impact fees. However, the State application process favors urban projects as additional points are available for meeting transportation requirements, which a community such as Sierra Vista cannot easily do.

Despite the recent slowdown in the housing market nationally and locally, housing prices, both purchase and rental, remain relatively high, especially for lower income households.

The Housing Needs Assessment noted that criteria in the mortgage origination process, have made ownership increasingly difficult for persons at all income levels. This factor is outside the scope and control of City policy. In some instances, issues revolving around personal finances (lack of down payment, credit history, employment history) affect the availability of affordable housing for Sierra Vista lower income residents.
MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets – 91.215 (f)

INTRODUCTION

The Consolidated Plan provides a concise summary of the City’s priority non-housing community development needs that are eligible for assistance. The following section describes the economic development needs of the City.

This section also provides data regarding the local economic condition of the jurisdiction and compares the ability of the local work force to satisfy the needs of local businesses. Much of this data can be used to describe the level of housing demand in the local market.

This section discusses the following topics:

- Business by Sector
- Labor Force
- Occupations by Sector
- Travel Time to Work
- Educational Attainment
- Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months
- Additional Narrative

The City has a number of needs in order to support economic development, which is critical to the growth and revitalization of Sierra Vista. As noted in the Housing Needs Assessment and the Housing Market Analysis, good, well-paying jobs are the means to secure economic stability, improve neighborhoods and obtain decent housing. The City’s economic development needs center upon obtaining new jobs and providing the workforce to take those jobs. Education and job training (and retraining) are crucial to having a competitive workforce. At the same time, the City needs to make some investments in infrastructure to be competitive in attracting new businesses.
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MARKET ANALYSIS

TABLE 41: BUSINESS ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business by Sector</th>
<th>Number of Workers</th>
<th>Number of Jobs</th>
<th>Share of Workers</th>
<th>Share of Jobs</th>
<th>Jobs less workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, Hunting, And Mining, Oil &amp; Gas Extraction</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, Recreation Accommodations, and Food Service</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Health Care Services, and Social Assistance</td>
<td>3,297</td>
<td>3,935</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate, and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services, except public administration</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, Management Services, Administrative, and Waste Management</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,977</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>1,946</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing, and utilities</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,591</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,176</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: 2013-2017 ACS (Workers), 2015 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (Jobs)
*Equals more than 100% due to rounding.

Table 41 – Business Activity

Information provided in Table 41 identifies workers and jobs within Sierra Vista by sector. This information is divided into 13 sectors by number of workers, number of jobs and then calculations of the ratio of workers to jobs by business sector. According to 2013-2017 ACS, there are 15,591 workers within all business sectors identified in Sierra Vista. The number of jobs within all sectors is estimated to be 13,176 according to 2015 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics data published by the U.S. Census Bureau.

The largest percentages of workers are within the Education and Health Care Services sector (21%) and Public administration (21%). Workers in the Retail Trade sector comprise 11% and workers in the Arts, Entertainment, and Accommodations sector comprise 10%. Workers in the Agriculture, Mining, Oil and Gas Extraction sector comprise the smallest percentage or workers (0.2%).
In regard to the share of jobs, the largest share of jobs is within the Education and Health Care Services sector (30%). Jobs in the Professional, Scientific, Management Services, Administrative, and Waste Management Services (23%); Retail Trade (15%); and Arts, Entertainment, and Accommodations (14%) sectors are also well-represented. The Public Administration; Agriculture, Mining, Oil and Gas Extraction; Information; and Manufacturing sectors account for the smallest percentages of jobs.

By comparing the share of workers to share of jobs, it can be determined within which sectors there are deficiencies to be addressed. The data below identifies the “jobs less workers.” This is determined by the percentage of jobs less the percentage of workers. A negative number reflects an oversupply of labor for the sector. As Table 41 shows, within Sierra Vista there are fewer jobs than workers within four (4) business sectors: Manufacturing; Other Services except Public Administration; Public Administration; and Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities. This means that workers in these four (4) business sectors may have more difficulty finding a job that matches their skillset. In contrast, there may be more jobs than workers in six (6) business sectors: Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodations, and Food Service; Construction; Education, Health Care Services, and Social Assistance; Finance, Insurance, Real Estate, and Rental and Leasing; Professional, Scientific, Management Services, Administrative, and Waste Management Services; and Retail Trade. This means that workers from outside Sierra Vista may be meeting the needs of the local job market in these six (6) business sectors.

**TABLE 42: LABOR FORCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force*</th>
<th>16,795</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over</td>
<td>15,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: 2013-2017 ACS

*Universe: population 16 years and over

Table 42 – Labor Force

Table 42 portrays the labor force within Sierra Vista. According to the 2013-2017 ACS the total population within the City in the civilian labor force is 16,795. This number includes the number of civilian workers plus those actively seeking employment and does not include those who are not actively seeking employment.
The number of the civilian population 16 years and over who are employed totals 15,591. According to 2013-207 ACS estimates, the City’s unemployment rate is 7.2%. The unemployment rate for ages 16-24 is much higher than for the City as a whole. The unemployment rate for those between the ages of 16-24 is approximately 16.2% while for ages 25-65 the unemployment rate is approximately 5.9%.

**TABLE 43: OCCUPATIONS BY SECTOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations by Sector</th>
<th>Number of People*</th>
<th>Median Earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management, business and financial</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>$76,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>3,545</td>
<td>$20,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office</td>
<td>3,759</td>
<td>$25,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation and material moving</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>$29,032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: 2013-2017 ACS
*Universe: Civilian employed population 16 years and over with earnings (past 12 months)

Table 43 displays occupations by Sector within Sierra Vista according to the 2013-2017 ACS: Sales and office (3,759), Service (3,545), and Management, business and financial (2,018) occupations are well-represented in the City. The least represented occupations in Sierra Vista are Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations (4). Of these occupations, median earnings are highest in the Management, business, science, and arts occupations ($76,500), whereas median earnings are lowest in the Service occupations ($20,706).
### Table 44: Travel Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time</th>
<th>Number*</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 Minutes</td>
<td>15,544</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-59 Minutes</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or More Minutes</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,835</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: 2013-2017 ACS  
*Universe: population not working at home

Table 44 – Travel Time

As shown in Table 44, the vast majority of Sierra Vista residents commute less than 30 minutes to work (87%). A small percentage travel 30-59 minutes (9%) and a small percentage commuting more than one hour (4%). In Sierra Vista, 77% of workers drive to work alone and 9% carpool. According to 2013-2017 ACS estimates, for those who commute to work the average travel time is 17.9 minutes one-way.

### Education:

#### Table 45: Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment*</th>
<th>In Labor Force</th>
<th>Not in Labor Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civilian Employed</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school graduate</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or Associate’s degree</td>
<td>6,138</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>4,599</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: 2013-2017 ACS  
*Universe: population 25 to 64 years (Civilian)

Table 45 – Educational Attainment by Employment Status

Table 45 displays Educational Attainment by Employment Status. Within Sierra Vista, the highest numbers of employed are those with some college or an Associate’s degree (6,138) and with a Bachelor’s degree or higher (4,599). A significant number of employed also are high school graduates (1,887). About 540 or 4% of the civilian employed population never graduated from high school.

The highest number of unemployed are those with some college or an Associate’s degree (451). High school graduates account for 22% of the unemployed population; and 17% of the unemployed population has a Bachelor’s degree or higher. Approximately 7% of the unemployed population never graduated from high school.
When looking at the civilian labor force ages 16 years and over, 15,591 are employed, 1,204 are unemployed, and 13,149 are not in the labor force and are not actively seeking employment.

**TABLE 46: EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT BY AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age*</th>
<th>18–24 yrs</th>
<th>25–34 yrs</th>
<th>35–44 yrs</th>
<th>45–65 yrs</th>
<th>65+ yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th grade, no diploma</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate, GED, or alternative</td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>2,372</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>2,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>1,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: 2013-2017 ACS*

*Universe: population age 18 years and over*

Table 46 – Educational Attainment by Age

**Table 46** shows Educational Attainment by Age. A small population over the age of 18 (2,561 or 8%) in Sierra Vista did not graduate from high school. A significant number of adults (17,008 or 52.2%) graduated from high school or have some college education but no college degree. Combined, nearly 51.6% of the population 18 years or older (16,181 adults) have an Associate’s degree, or higher.

**TABLE 47: EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT – MEDIAN EARNINGS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school graduate</td>
<td>$19,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>$26,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or Associate’s degree</td>
<td>$36,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>$63,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>$62,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: 2013-2017 ACS*

*Universe = population 25 years and over w/earnings*

**2013 inflation-adjusted dollars**

Table 47 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

**Table 47** identifies income over a 12-month period as it relates to educational attainment in Sierra Vista. The data shown is based on 2013-2017 ACS estimates. Greater educational attainment strongly correlates with increased income over a 12-month period, except once a Bachelor’s degree is attained. In Sierra Vista, persons having a graduate or professional degree have an estimated median income of $62,423 and persons having a Bachelor’s degree have a median income of $63,849. In Sierra Vista, once
a Bachelor’s degree is attained, attaining a graduate or professional degree does not guarantee an increase in income. In contrast, persons with some college or an Associate’s degree have a median of $36,652. Similarly, those with a high school diploma or equivalency have a median income of $26,790 and those without a high school diploma or equivalency have a median income of $19,470.

**BASED ON THE BUSINESS ACTIVITY TABLE ABOVE, WHAT ARE THE MAJOR EMPLOYMENT SECTORS WITHIN YOUR JURISDICTION?**

The major employment sectors within the City of Sierra Vista are Management, Business, and Financial; Sales and Office; and Service.

**DESCRIBE THE WORKFORCE AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS OF THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY:**

The greatest need for the City in terms of economic development is the creation or attraction of new jobs for City residents that pay a living wage. However, these jobs can only be created if there is an adequate, trained workforce in place to fill them. To this end the City supports education and job training programs, and the assisting young persons in the development of life skills, though the City lacks resources to undertake or financially support such programs. The City’s infrastructure is relatively new and not in need of major upgrades.

**DESCRIBE ANY MAJOR CHANGES THAT MAY HAVE AN ECONOMIC IMPACT, SUCH AS PLANNED LOCAL OR REGIONAL PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SECTOR INVESTMENTS OR INITIATIVES THAT HAVE AFFECTED OR MAY AFFECT JOB AND BUSINESS GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES DURING THE PLANNING PERIOD. DESCRIBE ANY NEEDS FOR WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, BUSINESS SUPPORT OR INFRASTRUCTURE THESE CHANGES MAY CREATE.**

The City’s economic development efforts are focused on diversification, tourism, and revitalizing the West End. Historically, the City has channeled a large percentage of Community Development Block Grant funds towards improving the West End, which formed the original settlement of the town when it was first incorporated in 1956. The West End has struggled to compete with more modern suburban type retail and office centers on Highways 90 and 92 that followed the City’s residential growth (with more affluent households) to the south and east. Because the area developed prior to the City’s development codes taking effect, much of the public investment in the West End has been directed towards “fixing the basics” – correcting drainage problems, constructing missing sidewalks and making them handicapped accessible, adding street lights, extending sewer service, and turning dirt lots into usable parks. In recent years, the City has been more proactive in enforcing minimum building and
property maintenance codes to eliminate public nuisances. Still, there has not been the major transformational type investment needed to reposition or elevate the West End’s status in the local marketplace. The average commercial building was constructed 50 years ago, which is generally the age that buildings need to be substantially renovated or replaced. The West end has the highest commercial vacancy rate in the City. Fifteen percent of the 3.3 million square feet of commercial floor area located in the West End is currently vacant, which represents more than half of the vacant square footage in the City as a whole.¹

On November 9, 2017, the City Council declared a finding of necessity to establish a redevelopment area covering 23-acres of property along Fry Boulevard, between North Garden Avenue and South Carmichael Avenue. On February 14, 2019, the City Council authorized an expansion to the boundaries of the redevelopment area to include 29-acres of contiguous property to the originally approved redevelopment area. On March 28, 2019, the City Council adopted the West Sierra Vista Redevelopment Area Plan – approving a course of action to correct negative conditions and encourage economic reuse and redevelopment. The City has funded the “West Sierra Vista Partnership Program”, which provides matching grant assistance to property owners and tenants for projects such as storefront improvements, building and site infrastructure, quality signage, ADA accessibility, landscaping and public art, and other beneficial improvements.

The City’s Economic Development Staff is active in business retention and recruitment activities that aid in diversifying the City’s economic base. In 2017, the Defense Department awarded the City of Sierra Vista a grant of more than $720,000, to carry out two initiatives dedicated to diversifying the local economy to make it less reliant on the defense sector over the next two years.

That grant total includes a local match of nearly $80,000, which is being provided by the City of Sierra Vista largely through the use of existing staff to support the new initiatives. These initiatives are the Sierra Vista Airport Diversification Study and Strategy and the Sierra Vista Technical Assistance Program.

The airport study and strategy, which has been completed, explored how to foster better commercial use of the Sierra Vista Municipal Airport to enhance job creation. The study provides direction on how the City can best use about 10 acres of unused or underused land, as well as analyze ways in which existing buildings could be best used for economic development. The study assessed potential users for

¹ City of Sierra Vista Business Inventory, Conducted by the City of Sierra Vista Community Development Department in November 2018
the City’s portion of the joint-use airport as shared with Libby Army Airfield, identified potential infrastructure improvements, and outlined market-driven strategies for increasing commercial aviation-related activities.

The Sierra Vista Technical Assistance Program, which is in the final stage, offers technical support to local companies seeking to expand in areas not tied to the defense sector. Companies were selected through a competitive application process, with an emphasis on technology-based businesses and those that can create local jobs. The consultant, Sun Corridor Inc. will be providing a final report to City Staff and Council regarding new projects that were pursued, employees that were added, and growth that was achieved as a result of the program in the Fall 2019.

**HOW DO THE SKILLS AND EDUCATION OF THE CURRENT WORKFORCE CORRESPOND TO EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN THE JURISDICTION?**

The skills and education of the City’s workforce match well to the economic structure of the City in that there is a good supply of educated workers, as well as workers with specific skill sets. There may be an oversupply of labor in industries such as Manufacturing; Services; Public Administration; and Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities. Industries with employment needs that are unmet by the City’s current population include Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodations, and Food Services; Construction; Education, Health Care Services and Social Assistance; Finance, Insurance, Real Estate, and Rental and Leasing; Professional, Scientific, Management Services, Administrative, and Waste Management Services; and Retail Trade. Job training and employment assistance toward these industries may be benefit the City’s low- and moderate-income population.

**DESCRIBE ANY CURRENT WORKFORCE TRAINING INITIATIVES, INCLUDING THOSE SUPPORTED BY WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARDS, COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS. DESCRIBE HOW THESE EFFORTS WILL SUPPORT THE JURISDICTION’S CONSOLIDATED PLAN.**

The Arizona workforce Connection aids persons seeking employment in Sierra Vista, and the Small Business Development Center of Cochise College as recently received a grant to provide cyber-security training to youth. These programs are the key element in the City’s efforts to eliminate poverty and create jobs.
DOES YOUR JURISDICTION PARTicipate in a comprehensive economic development strategy (CEDS)?

Yes.

IF SO, WHAT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES ARE YOU UNDERTAKING THAT MAY BE COORDINATED WITH THE CONSOLIDATED PLAN? IF NOT, DESCRIBE OTHER LOCAL/REGIONAL PLANS OR INITIATIVES THAT IMPACT ECONOMIC GROWTH.

The Southeast Arizona Government Organization has prepared and updates a CEDS for the Southeast Arizona Economic Development District. Sierra Vista is a member of the organization and provides input for the CEDS. The City’s revitalization efforts, while focusing on the needs of the City, are in consonance with the objectives of the CEDS. The City is in the process of hiring an economic development person who will focus on business retention, expansion, and recruitment. The Sierra Vista Development Foundation focuses its efforts on the attraction of large businesses and industry to the area.

DISCUSSION

Please see the preceding responses.
MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

ARE THERE AREAS WHERE HOUSEHOLDS WITH MULTIPLE HOUSING PROBLEMS ARE CONCENTRATED? (INCLUDE A DEFINITION OF "CONCENTRATION")

Cost burden and severe cost burden represent the most prevalent housing problem in Sierra Vista. Over 30 percent of the City’s households are in the three lowest HUD income categories and face difficulties in obtaining affordable housing that is decent and safe. Small related households, other households, and elderly households report housing problems, primarily cost burden.

Because poverty is spread throughout the City, it may be reasonably asserted that households with multiple housing problems are not concentrated in any area. There is a need for reinvestment through owner and rental housing rehabilitation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Households w/Housing Problems</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income Households</th>
<th>Low Income Households</th>
<th>Moderate Income Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;75%</td>
<td>1501, 1502, 1701, 1800</td>
<td>1402, 1601, 1800</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD CPD Maps, Accessed February 2019

Table 48 – Concentrations of Households with Housing Problems

Because of the relatively young age of Sierra Vista’s housing stock, housing problems are distributed throughout the City’s limits. Geographically, housing problems affecting extremely low-income households are the most widespread. The majority of extremely low-income households have some type of housing problem, regardless of their location. Housing problems affecting low- and extremely low-income households are most concentrated in the city’s center. Housing problems affecting moderate income households are most concentrated in the center as well, but to a much lesser extent.

ARE THERE ANY AREAS IN THE JURISDICTION WHERE RACIAL OR ETHNIC MINORITIES OR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES ARE CONCENTRATED? (INCLUDE A DEFINITION OF "CONCENTRATION")

The lowest income areas of Sierra Vista are most affected by housing problems and in need of community investment. Unfortunately, these areas are widespread. 14 of the City’s 38 Census Tracts have a low- and moderate-income population of 51% or greater.
The following Block Groups have populations where racial or ethnic minorities comprise 10% or more of the population:

Hispanic/Latino:

- Census Tract 1401, Block Group 1; 15.0% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1401, Block Group 2; 25.2% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1402, Block Group 3; 17.3% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1501, Block Group 1; 38.7% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1501, Block Group 2; 41.2% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1501, Block Group 3; 32.2% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1502, Block Group 1; 42.9% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1502, Block Group 2; 43.4% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1502, Block Group 3; 30.6% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1601, Block Group 1; 40.5% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1601, Block Group 2; 36.2% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1601, Block Group 3; 37.2% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1602, Block Group 1; 34.0% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1602, Block Group 2; 23.5% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1602, Block Group 3; 27.7% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1602, Block Group 4; 18.1% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1701, Block Group 1; 31.6% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1701, Block Group 3; 33.9% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1701, Block Group 4; 14.6% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1702, Block Group 1; 28.3% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1702, Block Group 2; 36.5% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1703, Block Group 1; 21.4% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1703, Block Group 2; 24.2% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1800, Block Group 1; 24.5% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1800, Block Group 2; 20.5% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1800, Block Group 3; 22.2% Hispanic or Latino
- Census Tract 1900, Block Group 1; 20.8% Hispanic or Latino
WHAT ARE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MARKET IN THESE AREAS/NEIGHBORHOODS?

There are pockets of poverty and poor housing, characterized by older housing, often in need of repair or renovation. Single-family owner units in these areas are available at relatively low prices, but the market is weak because of the need for extensive and expensive renovation in many of the structures, as well as stricter loan standards and higher down payment requirements that limit the number of potential buyers. More affluent buyers will tend to favor newer construction in other more attractive neighborhoods.

The rental market in these neighborhoods is strong in the face of increased demand, especially for more modern or better kept buildings. Rents tend to increase, even for poorer buildings, exacerbating the cost burden issue for low-income households.

ARE THERE ANY COMMUNITY ASSETS IN THESE AREAS/NEIGHBORHOODS?

The City has worked very hard to maintain and improve housing conditions, and to provide community facilities and infrastructure in the low/mod neighborhoods. As noted, the needs are great and diverse
and the resources available are limited. The City has historically used its CDBG resources across these neighborhoods, rehabilitating homes and improving streets, sidewalks, and streetscapes.

**ARE THERE OTHER STRATEGIC OPPORTUNITIES IN ANY OF THESE AREAS?**

The City continues to identify opportunities in these areas.
SP-05 Overview

STRATEGIC PLAN OVERVIEW

The Consolidated Plan process requires the City to identify priority needs and a Strategic Plan to meet those needs over the next five years. For every priority, there are goals and objectives established to measure progress, as well as strategies to address them. There are essentially four major topics of focus in the Consolidated Plan:

- Housing
- Homelessness
- Community Development
- Non-Homeless Special Needs

The City of Sierra Vista establishes no specific target areas, as all low- and moderate-income areas citywide have high levels of poverty and the needs for improved housing, public services, and infrastructure or facilities.

The highest priority needs for City’s low- and moderate-population are public improvements/infrastructure, elimination of slum and blight, and public facilities. There is also a need for public service programs, housing rehabilitation, and Fair Housing information.

As a new entitlement community, the City does not have an institutional delivery system in place. However, the City of Sierra Vista Community Development Department does have contacts with many organizations and agencies and will work to enhance its outreach and information efforts; to make its project selection process transparent; and to ensure coordination, collaboration, and information sharing among the various entities responsible for program delivery.

The City of Sierra Vista will develop and implement a set of procedures to monitor all its federal activities, programs, and projects and to ensure long-term compliance with applicable program requirements and comprehensive planning. The goal of the monitoring procedures set forth by the City is to enhance performance of the federally funded activities in order to maximize their benefit the City's
low- and moderate-income community. The City of Sierra Vista Community Development Department will work to ensure that approved projects meet the purpose of the Consolidated Plan and that available funds are distributed in a timely manner. Monitoring includes programs operated directly by the City and those carried out by any sub-recipients.

The program goals, as described in detail below, address the objectives of providing decent affordable housing, creating a suitable living environment, and creating economic opportunity.

**Housing Needs**

The City has identified several barriers to affordable housing including the high cost of housing (both rental and owner) relative to income and stringent mortgage criteria.

Based on input and the data received through the citizen participation process, the housing needs and priorities identified are:

- Affordable housing opportunities
- Housing rehabilitation (e.g. modifications for persons with disabilities, energy efficiency, etc.)
- Rental acquisition and rehabilitation (e.g. preservation of existing rental units and rental assistance)
- New rentals
- Fair Housing information

Considering these priorities, the following two goals related to housing are presented:

**Goal: Housing Rehabilitation & Services**

*Provide housing rehabilitation, rental assistance, homeownership, and accessibility.*

**Goal: Fair Housing**

*Eliminate discrimination in housing.*

**Homeless Needs & Non-Homeless Special Needs**

Meeting homelessness challenges is a collaborative effort comprising numerous individuals, agencies and organizations. The City’s homelessness strategy will be an approach that emphasizes homelessness prevention, immediate assistance and re-housing to those who do become homeless; support for
persons and families as they transition to economic and housing stability; and efforts to prevent those persons from returning to homelessness.

Non-Homeless Special Needs is a broad category that applies to any population that is presumed to be low- and moderate-income and in need of public services. The category covers a large population, including the mentally ill, developmentally disabled, elderly, and other groups.

Based on input and the data received through the citizen participation process, the need and priorities identified by the City’s homeless and special needs populations are:

- Homeless activities (e.g. prevention, emergency shelter for families, mental health)
- Affordable housing units for disabled and elderly persons
- Public service programs (e.g. medical, mental health, seniors/youth, domestic violence, etc.)

Considering these priorities, the following goal related to homeless and special needs is presented:

**Goal: Provision of Needed Services**

*Provide community services for special needs populations (primarily for seniors and youth), mental health services, and homeless services.*

**Non-Housing Community Development Needs**

Non-Housing Community Development is a broad category of spending that covers many types of public facilities and improvements such as roads, sewer improvements, water improvements, wastewater improvements, lighting, drainage, community centers, parks, and virtually any other public project that benefits low- and moderate-income neighborhoods.

Additionally, the City’s anti-poverty strategy will be part of a coordinated effort to create jobs and improve the local economy. The creation of economic opportunities is not an isolated solution to alleviating poverty, and the City will work with community partners to identify educational, life skills and training needs, and provide opportunities for self-empowerment that will enable low- and moderate-income residents to become and continue to be self-sufficient and economically independent.

Based input and the data received through the citizen participation process, the needs and priorities identified for community development are:
• Public improvements/infrastructure (e.g. roads, water/sewer, fire protection, parks, etc.)
• Public facilities improvements (e.g. ADA accessibility, public safety, transportation, etc.)
• Elimination of slum and blight (i.e., unsafe or poor conditions, code violations, etc.)
• Economic development (e.g. job creation, job training, lending and resources)

Considering these priorities, the following two goals related to community development are presented:

**Goal: Public Infrastructure/Facility Improvements**  
Provide ADA improvements, public facility improvements, and infrastructure.

**Goal: Neighborhood Stabilization**  
Eliminate slum and blight.

### SP-10 Geographic Priorities

**GENERAL ALLOCATION PRIORITIES**  
Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the City.

The City of Sierra Vista establishes no specific Target Areas, as all low- and moderate-income areas citywide have high levels of poverty and the need for improved housing, public services, and infrastructure or facilities. The City will allocate investments geographically to the City's low- and moderate-income areas and to individuals citywide based on income eligibility or special needs status (see Planning Sector Maps and Table 49).

The City of Sierra Vista will use CDBG funds throughout the jurisdiction to serve low- and moderate-income persons. The City’s basis for allocating CDBG funding geographically will be to areas with the highest percentage of low- and moderate-income persons. The City is designated as an entitlement grantee by HUD. For a Census Block Group to qualify as low- and moderate-income, a Block Group in the City must contain 51% or more low- and moderate-income persons. All low- and moderate-income areas citywide have high levels of poverty and the needs for improved housing, public services, and infrastructure or facilities. These areas have been areas of concern in the past and were confirmed by examining the data and public input of this updated Five-Year Consolidated Plan.
### CDBG TARGET AREAS - NORTHWEST PLANNING SECTOR

#### NORTHWEST PLANNING SECTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLOCK GROUP/CENSUS TRACT</th>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD</th>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION</th>
<th>AGE 65+</th>
<th>MINORITY</th>
<th>LIMITED</th>
<th>NO VEHICLE</th>
<th>LOW-MOD INCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BG 3, CT 15.02</td>
<td>GARDEN CANYON</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>417%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG 2, CT 15.02</td>
<td>FRY TOWNSITE</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CDBG TARGET AREAS - EAST CENTRAL PLANNING SECTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLOCK GROUP/CENSUS TRACT (COCHISE, ARIZONA)</th>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD</th>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION</th>
<th>AGE 65%</th>
<th>MINORITY</th>
<th>LIMITED</th>
<th>NO VEHICLE</th>
<th>LOW-MOD INCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BG 2, CT 17.02</td>
<td>MONTEBELLO</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG 4, CT 17.01</td>
<td>KINGS MANOR</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>112%</td>
<td>614%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG 1 CT 17.01</td>
<td>CLOUD 9</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG 2, CT 17.01</td>
<td>PDS</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CDBG TARGET AREAS - SOUTH PLANNING SECTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLOCK GROUP/CENSUS TRACT (COCHISE, ARIZONA)</th>
<th>SOUTH PLANNING SECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbohood</td>
<td>Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2G 2, CT 20.01</td>
<td>HOLIDAY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 49: GEOGRAPHIC AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Area Name: Citywide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Type:</strong> Other, Other Target Area Description: Benefit low/mod population and all residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals citywide based on income eligibility or special needs status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All low- and moderate-income areas citywide have high levels of poverty and the needs for improved housing, public services, and infrastructure or facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These populations have been populations of need in the past and were confirmed by examining the data and public input of this updated Five-Year Consolidated Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify the needs in this target area.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The highest priority needs for City’s low- and moderate-income and special needs populations citywide are public improvements/infrastructure, elimination of slum and blight, and public facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is also a need for public service programs, housing rehabilitation, and Fair Housing information citywide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding, resources, lack of institutional delivery structure/system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Area Name: Low/Mod Neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Type:</strong> Low- and moderate-income neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Groups having 51% or more low/mod population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All low- and moderate-income areas citywide have high levels of poverty and the needs for improved housing, public services, and infrastructure or facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These areas have been areas of need in the past and were confirmed by examining the data and public input of this updated Five-Year Consolidated Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify the needs in this target area.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The highest priority needs for City’s low- and moderate-income neighborhoods are public improvements/infrastructure, elimination of slum and blight, and public facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is also a need for public service programs, housing rehabilitation, and Fair Housing information in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding, resources, lack of institutional delivery structure/system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49 – Geographic Priority Areas
SP-25 Priority Needs

The Five-Year Consolidated Plan must indicate the general priorities for allocating investment of available resources among different needs. Priority needs are those that will be addressed by the goals outlined in the Strategic Plan. For each priority, the City of Sierra Vista has indicated one or more populations to be served, as well as an assigned priority level indicating relative importance among the needs listed (see Table 50).
### TABLE 50: PRIORITY NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Need Name</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Geographic Areas</th>
<th>Goals Addressing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Improvements/Infrastructure</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Non-housing Community Development, Moderate Income (80% AMI), Low Income (50% AMI), Extremely Low Income (30% AMI)</td>
<td>Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure/Facility Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of Slum and Blight</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Non-housing Community Development, Middle Income (120% AMI), Moderate Income (80% AMI), Low Income (50% AMI), Extremely Low Income (30% AMI)</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Neighborhood Stabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities Improvements</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Non-housing Community Development, Moderate Income (80% AMI), Low Income (50% AMI), Extremely Low Income (30% AMI)</td>
<td>Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure/Facility Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Affordable Housing Opportunities</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low Income (50% AMI), Moderate Income (80% AMI), Extremely Low Income (30% AMI), Elderly, Public Housing Residents, Frail Elderly</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Activities</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income (30% AMI), Low Income (50% AMI), Families with Children, Elderly, Chronic Homelessness, Homeless Mentally Ill, Homeless Families with Children, Victims of Domestic Violence - Homeless</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Provision of Needed Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Programs</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Elderly, Persons with Mental Disabilities, Victims of Domestic Violence, Families with Children, Moderate Income (80% AMI), Low Income (50% AMI), Extremely Low Income (30% AMI)</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Provision of Needed Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Acquisition and Owner-Occupied Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Extremely Low Income (30% AMI), Low Income (50% AMI), Large Families, Families with Children, Elderly, Frail Elderly</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation and Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 50 – Priority Needs Summary

Discussion (Optional)

The needs in the target areas are numerous and varied. The principal needs are public improvements/infrastructure; elimination of slum and blight; and public facilities. Additionally, public service programs; housing rehabilitation; and Fair Housing were also principal needs, although not rated as high.

Public infrastructure and facility improvements receive a High ranking here because they are a means to make significant improvements in the quality of life in the distressed neighborhoods. With proper planning and coordination, the City can leverage CDBG funds with both the State and other federal programs to provide the funds needed for these projects.

The City believes that the elimination of blight and slum is a High priority, as these efforts keep people in affordable neighborhoods and improve the quality of life, especially for extremely low-income and other burdened homeowners.

While the City supports programs for affordable homeownership, the opportunities for homeownership among the City’s low-income residents are limited by the poor economy, job uncertainty, strict lending criteria and significant down payment requirements.

Because of the difficult economic situation in parts of the City, the provision of Public Service Programs receives a Low priority rank. The need for a wide range of services, including programs for the homeless, seniors and youth, feeding programs, and child care, is present in each of these areas. However, the City must develop the necessary policies, procedures and capacity to receive applications, make selections, and monitor activities before undertaking projects in this area.
Rental Acquisition and Rehabilitation and New Rental Construction receive a Low ranking because these are resource intensive types of projects, which, though important, are not practical given the City’s limited resources.

**SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions**

**TABLE 51: INFLUENCE OF MARKET CONDITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordable Housing Type</th>
<th>Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)</td>
<td>According to the Needs Assessment and Housing Market Analysis, the greatest housing problem in Sierra Vista is cost burden, and many of the households in the lowest income categories are severely cost burdened. Rental assistance thus ranks very high among program strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs</td>
<td>Rental assistance for the non-homeless special needs group will focus on the elderly and extremely low-income small households as these are the two groups that emerged as most vulnerable both from the analysis of data and from discussion in the public meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Unit Production</td>
<td>The City does not currently envision supporting new unit production because of the limited resources available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of both owner and renter units in the City’s low-income areas is a High priority as part of the effort to keep households in affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition, including preservation</td>
<td>Because of the limited funds available, the City will not emphasize the acquisition and rehabilitation of rental units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 51 – Influence of Market Conditions*
SP-35 Anticipated Resources

INTRODUCTION

The Five-Year Consolidated Plan must identify the federal, state, local and private resources expected to be available to the City to address priority needs and specific objectives identified in the Strategic Plan. These resources are summarized in Table 52.

The City is faced with the difficult task of meeting increasing needs with limited resources. The figures shown below in the table are estimates. First year figures are based upon the known HUD allocation. The figure for “Expected Amount Available Remainder of Consolidated Plan” multiples the current figures by four (4) years to arrive at an estimate for the remainder of the Consolidated Plan.
## TABLE 52: ANTICIPATED RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Uses of Funds</th>
<th>Expected Amount Available Year 1</th>
<th>Expected Amount Available Remainder of Consolidated Plan $</th>
<th>Narrative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Public, Federal</td>
<td>Acquisition; Admin and Planning; Economic Development; Housing; Public Improvements; Public Services</td>
<td>$271,174 $0 $0 $271,174</td>
<td>$868,826</td>
<td>Additional resources for leveraging may include other State and Federal grants, City Departments, public or social service providers or other sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 52 – Anticipated Resources
EXPLAIN HOW FEDERAL FUNDS WILL LEVERAGE THOSE ADDITIONAL RESOURCES (PRIVATE, STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS), INCLUDING A DESCRIPTION OF HOW MATCHING REQUIREMENTS WILL BE SATISFIED.

The City will cultivate funding partners who can match the City's investment of CDBG funds. The City administration recognizes that the City's annual entitlement and formula allocations are not enough to meet all its needs. Additional funds need to be raised to ensure that more infrastructure improvements, affordable housing, and community services are available for those in need. Matching requirements will be satisfied with other eligible financial resources and/or in-kind services, and the City will continue to seek this type of matching as well as financial matches.

The City has received funds from a variety of other sources over the past decade. These include HOME funds, and NADBank grant for a major sewer project, County funds for emergency repairs and other projects, as well as an Energy Efficiency Block Grant for lighting in a low- and moderate-income neighborhood. The Community Partnership of Southern Arizona, based in Tucson, has several programs in Sierra Vista, including assisting two persons receiving HOGAR housing assistance, nine persons receiving Casas Primeras assistance and five persons receiving Shelter Plus Care assistance. The City uses general fund resources for infrastructure and community service activities on a regular basis, but such funds are becoming increasingly limited considering other needs and priorities across the City. While the City actively seeks additional funding from a range of sources, many of these sources are applications for highly competitive grants, and there is no assurance of receiving these funds.

IF APPROPRIATE, DESCRIBE PUBLICALLY OWNED LAND OR PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN THE JURISDICTION THAT MAY BE USED TO ADDRESS THE NEEDS IDENTIFIED IN THE PLAN.

The City does not own any property or land that could be used to address the needs identified in this plan.

DISCUSSION

Please see the preceding responses.
SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure

EXPLAIN THE INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE THROUGH WHICH THE JURISDICTION WILL CARRY OUT ITS CONSOLIDATED PLAN INCLUDING PRIVATE INDUSTRY, NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS, AND PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.

TABLE 53: INSTITUTIONAL DELIVERY STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Entity</th>
<th>Responsible Entity Type</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Geographic Area Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Sierra Vista Community Development Department</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Planning/ Community Development</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of Cochise County (HACC)</td>
<td>PHA</td>
<td>Affordable Housing/ Rental/Public Housing</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochise County</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Planning/Community Development</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Arizona</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Planning/ Affordable Housing/ Homelessness/ Non-Homeless Special Needs/ Community Development</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Balance of State Continuum of Care</td>
<td>Continuum of Care</td>
<td>Homelessness/ Non-Homeless Special Needs</td>
<td>Region/State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 53 – Institutional Delivery Structure

ASSESS THE STRENGTHS AND GAPS OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DELIVERY STRUCTURE

As a participant in the state CDBG program, the City has developed relationships and contacts with a number of service providers, not-for-profit organizations, housing developers and lenders, and agencies at the state, regional and local levels. The Community Development Department understands its role in the delivery system and will work to develop and formalize an organized and effective delivery system including as many of the entities responsible for program delivery as possible.
TABLE 54: AVAILABILITY OF SERVICES TARGETED TO HOMELESS PERSONS AND PERSONS WITH HIV AND MAINSTREAM SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homelessness Prevention Services</th>
<th>Available in the Community</th>
<th>Targeted to Homeless</th>
<th>Targeted to People with HIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homelessness Prevention Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Advocacy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Assistance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Assistance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities Assistance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Outreach Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Clinics</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Street Outreach Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol &amp; Drug Abuse</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Employment Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Counseling</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Banks/Nutrition Programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 54 – Homeless Prevention Services Summary
DESCRIBE HOW THE SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE SERVICES LISTED ABOVE MEET THE NEEDS OF HOMELESS PERSONS (PARTICULARLY CHRONICALLY HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES, FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN, VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND UNACCOMPANIED YOUTH)

At present the City is does not directly support or coordinate the local homeless program delivery system. Going forward, the City will use a variety of programs and partners to first prevent low-income persons from becoming homeless and, second, to support homeless persons and families in obtaining safe, affordable and sustainable housing. These efforts will include a continuum of programs ranging from emergency shelters to transitional housing to permanent supportive housing services. The extent of activity will be dependent upon the level of funding available in the face of many competing needs. As noted, the City does not directly support these services, though over $450,000 in CDBG funds from the State have been applied to Good Neighbor Alliance projects over the past fifteen years. The City does know that, despite the availability of these services, they do not completely meet the needs of the homeless in the City.

Most of the prevention and outreach services are available in Sierra Vista. For example, rental and utility assistance are available and the police department is active and involved in addressing domestic violence, homelessness, and homeless persons. However, the most significant concern is that many of the supportive services require the persons or families to travel some distance (e.g., Bisbee) to receive them. Considering the lack of public transportation and the fact that homeless families may not have adequate transportation, there is a significant gap in the ability to provide these services as needed.

DESCRIBE THE STRENGTHS AND GAPS OF THE SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM FOR SPECIAL NEEDS POPULATION AND PERSONS EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE SERVICES LISTED ABOVE.

As noted, there currently is no service delivery system as such for these populations. Local organizations have coordinated their service systems among themselves.
PROVIDE A SUMMARY OF THE STRATEGY FOR OVERCOMING GAPS IN THE INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE AND SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM TO ADDRESS PRIORITY NEEDS.

The City will seek partners in the development of a service delivery system and will seek to enhance the relationship with existing partners in City departments and social service agencies to coordinate the delivery of programs and services. Also, the City will seek opportunities to leverage the limited available resources.
## SP-45 Goals Summary

**TABLE 55: FIVE-YEAR GOALS SUMMARY INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>End Year</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>Priority Needs Addressed</th>
<th>Funding Allocated (Five-Year Total)</th>
<th>Goal Outcome Indicator</th>
<th>Quantity (Five-Year Total)</th>
<th>Unit of Measure (UoM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1: Public Infrastructure/Facility Improvements</td>
<td>ADA Improvements, Public Facility Improvements, and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Availability/Accessibility</td>
<td>Create Suitable Living Environments</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Public Improvements/Infrastructure, Public Facilities Improvements</td>
<td>$ 719,000</td>
<td>Public facility or infrastructure activities other than low/moderate-income housing benefit</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2: Housing Rehabilitation and Services</td>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation and Accessibility</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>Provide Decent Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Provide Affordable Housing Opportunities</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>Homeowner housing rehabilitated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Household/Housing Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3: Provision of Needed Services</td>
<td>Community Services; Special Needs Populations (primarily for seniors and youth); Mental Health and Homeless Services</td>
<td>Non-homeless Homeless Community Development, Homeless</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Availability/Accessibility</td>
<td>Create Suitable Living Environments</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Homeless Activities, Public Service Programs</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>Public service activities other than low/moderate income housing benefit</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4: Neighborhood Stabilization</td>
<td>Elimination of slum and blight</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Create Suitable Living Environments</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Elimination of Slum and Blight</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>Buildings demolished</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 5: Fair Housing</td>
<td>Eliminate Discrimination in housing</td>
<td>Fair Housing</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Availability/Accessibility</td>
<td>Provide Decent Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Fair Housing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 6: Administration/Planning</td>
<td>CDBG Admin</td>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Availability/Accessibility</td>
<td>Create Suitable Living Environments</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>$ 171,000</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Year of Admin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** A cap of 20% of CDBG Entitlement Grant can be reserved for Administration and Planning Activities
ESTIMATE THE NUMBER OF EXTREMELY LOW-INCOME, LOW-INCOME, AND MODERATE-INCOME FAMILIES TO WHOM THE JURISDICTION WILL PROVIDE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AS DEFINED BY HOME 91.315(B)(2)

The Five-Year Consolidated Plan must summarize the City’s priorities and the specific goals it intends to initiate and/or complete within the five-year term of the Strategic Plan. These goals are described in quantitative terms in this section (SP-45). The City plans to assist 10,000 persons with public facility/infrastructure activities and 100 persons with public service activities. Additionally, the City plans to demolish five (5) buildings to eliminate slum/blight and to help stabilize existing neighborhoods. The City does not currently administer an affordable housing program for new housing units; however, during the five-year period, the City plans to provide housing rehabilitation assistance to 10 eligible low- and moderate-income households to improve the quality of existing housing units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Goal Name</th>
<th>Public Infrastructure/Facility Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Description</td>
<td>ADA Improvements, Public Facility Improvements, and Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goal Name</td>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Description</td>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation and Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Goal Name</td>
<td>Provision of Needed Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Description</td>
<td>Community Services; Special Needs Populations (primarily for seniors and youth); Mental Health and Homeless services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Goal Name</td>
<td>Neighborhood Stabilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Description</td>
<td>Elimination of slum and blight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Goal Name</td>
<td>Fair Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Description</td>
<td>Eliminate discrimination in housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Goal Name</td>
<td>Administration/Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Description</td>
<td>CDBG Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement

NEED TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF ACCESSIBLE UNITS (IF REQUIRED BY A SECTION 504 VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE AGREEMENT)

Currently, there is no public housing authority located in the City of Sierra Vista and there are no low rent public housing authority units located in the City. The Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program is administered by the Housing Authority of Cochise County. The figures in the Needs Assessment section of this Plan indicate a need for an increased number of accessible HCV units, but it is beyond the City’s capability to increase this number.

ACTIVITIES TO INCREASE RESIDENT INVOLVEMENTS

Not Applicable.

IS THE PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY DESIGNATED AS TROUBLED UNDER 24 CFR PART 902?

No.

IF APPLICABLE, PLAN TO REMOVE THE ‘TROUBLED’ DESIGNATION

Not Applicable.

SP-55 Barriers to Affordable Housing

BARRIERS TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING

This section requires the jurisdiction to explain whether the cost of housing or the incentives to develop, maintain, or improve affordable housing are affected by public policies, particularly those of the local jurisdiction. Such policies include land use controls, zoning ordinances, building codes, and policies that affect the return on residential investment.

Sierra Vista does not put any limitations on growth. Through vehicles such as zoning ordinances, subdivision controls, permit systems, and housing codes and standards, the City has attempted to ensure the health, safety, and quality of life of its residents while minimizing the barriers that may impede the development of affordable housing.

The most important impediment to affordable housing revolves around the lack of Federal and State resources for affordable housing initiatives. The lack of programs and resources to reduce excessive rent...
or mortgage burdens to qualified persons is a key factor. The City has used, and is willing to make available, a range of incentives and assistance to developers wishing to build affordable housing. These elements include the use of Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, the waiver of development and re-zoning fees, and the phasing of impact fees. However, the State application process favors urban projects as additional points are available for meeting transportation requirements, which a community such as Sierra Vista cannot easily do.

Despite the recent downturn in the housing market nationally and locally, housing prices, both purchase and rental, remain relatively high, especially for lower income households.

The Housing Needs Assessment also noted that stringent criteria in the mortgage origination process due to the foreclosure crisis, have made ownership increasingly difficult for persons at all income levels. This factor is outside the scope and control of City policy. In some instances, issues revolving around personal finances (lack of down payment, credit history, employment history) affect the availability of affordable housing for Sierra Vista residents.

**STRATEGY TO REMOVE OR AMELIORATE THE BARRIERS TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

The most important impediment to affordable housing revolves around the lack of Federal and State resources for affordable housing initiatives. The lack of programs and resources to reduce excessive rent or mortgage burdens to qualified persons is a key factor.

Despite the recent downturn in the housing market nationally and locally, housing prices, both purchase and rental, remain relatively high, especially for lower income households.

The primary means to address this issue in Sierra Vista will be a housing rehabilitation program (and an emergency repair program) for both owner and renter properties in order to keep persons in their homes. The City will provide rental assistance and seek to develop affordable housing projects. The latter efforts will be limited because of the amount of funds available and the many competing needs.
**SP-60 Homelessness Strategy**

**REACHING OUT TO HOMELESS PERSONS (ESPECIALLY UNSHELTERED PERSONS) AND ASSESSING THEIR INDIVIDUAL NEEDS**

The needs of homeless persons are complex and require a wide range of specialized services. Numerous agencies are often involved in the care of a homeless person, providing distinct services such as housing, mental health counseling, employment training, and case work services.

As noted above, the City has several programs and resources, operated by not-for-profit organizations, to assist the homeless. The City itself has not directly provided assistance or services for the homeless but recognizes this as a high priority need.

As the CDBG program develops the City will assess how it can use the limited available CDBG funds to address the needs of the homeless. At present, it appears that the use of CDBG funds to prevent homelessness (housing rehab, emergency assistance, and rental assistance) may be the most judicious approach to this complex issue.

**ADDRESSING THE EMERGENCY AND TRANSITIONAL HOUSING NEEDS OF HOMELESS PERSONS**

The needs of homeless persons are complex and require a wide range of specialized services. Numerous agencies are often involved in the care of a homeless person, providing distinct services such as housing, mental health counseling, employment training, and case work services.

As noted above, the City has several programs and resources, operated by not-for-profit organizations, to assist the homeless. The City itself has not directly provided assistance or services for the homeless but recognizes this as a high priority need.

As the CDBG program develops the City will assess how it can use the limited available CDBG funds to address the needs of the homeless. At present, it appears that the use of CDBG funds to prevent homelessness (housing rehab, emergency assistance, and rental assistance) may be the most judicious approach to this complex issue.
HELPING HOMELESS PERSONS (ESPECIALLY CHRONICALLY HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES, FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN, VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND UNACCOMPANIED YOUTH) MAKE THE TRANSITION TO PERMANENT HOUSING AND INDEPENDENT LIVING, INCLUDING SHORTENING THE PERIOD OF TIME THAT INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES EXPERIENCE HOMELESSNESS, FACILITATING ACCESS FOR HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS, AND PREVENTING INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES WHO WERE RECENTLY HOMELESS FROM BECOMING HOMELESS AGAIN.

The needs of homeless persons are complex and require a wide range of specialized services. Numerous agencies are often involved in the care of a homeless person, providing distinct services such as housing, mental health counseling, employment training, and case work services.

As noted above, the City has several programs and resources, operated by not-for-profit organizations, to assist the homeless. The City itself has not directly provided assistance or services for the homeless but recognizes this as a high priority need.

As the CDBG program develops the City will assess how it can use the limited available CDBG funds to address the needs of the homeless. At present, it appears that the use of CDBG funds to prevent homelessness (housing rehab, emergency assistance, and rental assistance) may be the most judicious approach to this complex issue.

HELP LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES AVOID BECOMING HOMELESS, ESPECIALLY EXTREMELY LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES WHO ARE LIKELY TO BECOME HOMELESS AFTER BEING DISCHARGED FROM A PUBLICLY FUNDED INSTITUTION OR SYSTEM OF CARE, OR WHO ARE RECEIVING ASSISTANCE FROM PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES THAT ADDRESS HOUSING, HEALTH, SOCIAL SERVICES, EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION OR YOUTH NEEDS

The needs of homeless persons are complex and require a wide range of specialized services. Numerous agencies are often involved in the care of a homeless person, providing distinct services such as housing, mental health counseling, employment training, and case work services.

As noted above, the City has several programs and resources, operated by not-for-profit organizations, to assist the homeless. The City itself has not directly provided assistance or services for the homeless but recognizes this as a high priority need.
As the CDBG program develops the City will assess how it can use the limited available CDBG funds to address the needs of the homeless. At present, it appears that the use of CDBG funds to prevent homelessness (housing rehab, emergency assistance, and rental assistance) may be the most judicious approach to this complex issue.
SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards

**ACTIONS TO ADDRESS LBP HAZARDS AND INCREASE ACCESS TO HOUSING WITHOUT LBP HAZARDS**

Lead was used as a pigment and drying agent in “alkyd” oil-based paint in most homes built before 1978. Lead may be present on any interior or exterior surface, particularly on woodwork, doors, and windows. In 1978, the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission lowered the legal maximum lead content in most kinds of paint to 0.06% (a trace amount). According to the Commission, about two-thirds of homes built before 1940, one-half of the homes built from 1940 to 1960, and a large number of homes built after 1960 contain heavily-leaded paint. Using the HUD formula for assessing the extent of lead-based paint in homes, the City of Sierra Vista has approximately 5,528 occupied housing units and 6,688 total housing units with the possible presence of lead-based paint in them. The HUD CHAS data indicates that there are 880 pre-1980 housing units with children in them.

Federal regulations effective September 2000 implemented lead-based paint requirements for all housing activities undertaken by recipients of HUD funds. These regulations require multiple approaches to evaluate, control and/or abate lead-based paint. Since inception of the CDBG program, all homes older than 1978 scheduled for rehabilitation activities receive lead-based paint testing to determine the extent of lead hazards.

**HOW ARE THE ACTIONS LISTED ABOVE RELATED TO THE EXTENT OF LEAD POISONING AND HAZARDS?**

Approximately ten years ago the Housing Authority of Cochise County conducted a lead-based paint abatement program in the City but could not find housing units that met the criteria (age of structure, presence of children) to execute the program.

**HOW ARE THE ACTIONS LISTED ABOVE INTEGRATED INTO HOUSING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES?**

The City’s housing rehabilitation programs take a number of steps to meet lead-based paint requirements including:

- Distributing the “Protect Your Family from Lead in Your Home” pamphlet to homeowners receiving housing rehabilitation services or homebuyer assistance;
• Identification of potential lead hazards for all houses which were built before 1978 which receive HUD-funded rehabilitation/homebuyer assistance;
• Treatment of lead hazards on HUD funded rehabilitation projects as mandated by HUD and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations and requirements and;
• Ensuring that all contractors comply with the most recent regulatory changes.
SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy

JURISDICTION GOALS, PROGRAMS AND POLICIES FOR REDUCING THE NUMBER OF POVERTY-LEVEL FAMILIES

According to the 2009-2013 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates, 30.4% of people living in the City of Sierra Vista are at poverty level or below. The City of Sierra Vista recognizes that the core of many social and housing problems relates to poverty. The objective of poverty reduction requires programming for broad areas including increased accessibility of resources, job training and placement, public services, education, and basic skills development. It is only through comprehensive, coordinated strategies that nurture skills and provide opportunities to gain and retain employment and thus improve the quality of life that people can improve their situation.

HOW ARE THE JURISDICTION POVERTY REDUCING GOALS, PROGRAMS, AND POLICIES COORDINATED WITH THIS AFFORDABLE HOUSING PLAN.

Because the nature of poverty is complex and multi-faceted, the City will attempt to allocate CDBG funds for services to very low-income households. Research shows that some of these services may have a direct impact on lowering the poverty rate for family households. Therefore, as a primary goal, the City will attempt to fund programs that provide job training, education and other employment related services, and child care services for working families.

CDBG can provide funding for meeting these critical basic needs, but these efforts will be constrained by the amount of funds available and competing priority needs.

The City's anti-poverty efforts complement its plans to preserve and improve existing affordable housing by providing additional stability and resources to low-income households.
SP-80 Monitoring

DESCRIBE THE STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES THAT THE JURISDICTION WILL USE TO MONITOR ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT IN FURTHERANCE OF THE PLAN AND WILL USE TO ENSURE LONG-TERM COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROGRAMS INVOLVED, INCLUDING MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH AND THE COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

Monitoring is an integral management control technique to ensure the effective and proper use of Federal dollars. In addition, it is an ongoing process that assesses the quality of a program participant’s performance over a period of time. This program performance relates to external and internal clients, as well as City staff who will be managing the programs. Monitoring provides information about program participants that is critical for making informed judgments about program effectiveness and management efficiency. It also helps in identifying instances of fraud, waste and abuse.

As a newer entitlement community, the City of Sierra Vista has developed monitoring standards and procedures. The City has access to models from other jurisdictions and has begun to develop its own set of monitoring procedures.

The Community Development Department views its monitoring responsibilities as an ongoing process, involving continuing communication, evaluation, and follow-up. The process involves frequent telephone contacts, written communications, the analyses of reports, audits, and periodic meetings with the sub-grantee. The Department’s staff will stay informed concerning compliance with program requirements and the extent to which technical assistance is needed. To execute its monitoring program the Community Development Department will develop and implement monitoring procedures to ensure that recipients and sub-recipients of HUD funds are in compliance with Federal regulations and program guidelines.

The overriding goal of monitoring is to identify deficiencies and promote corrections in order to improve and reinforce performance. Deficiencies are corrected through discussion, negotiation, or technical assistance. The three stages utilized for addressing problem areas are early identification of problems, intervention for more serious or persistent problems, and sanctions.

Non-profit organizations that receive CDBG funds will be required to submit monthly financial and performance reports prior to reimbursement of expenditures. These reports will provide sufficient information to document compliance with timely expenditures and performance objectives.
Performance objectives and outcomes will be required of all nonprofits receiving funding and will be incorporated in the contract agreement with the City. Monthly reports will allow for monthly “desk monitoring” throughout the program year. The Community Development Department will review these reports on a monthly basis.

If developed in Sierra Vista, Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs) will submit monthly performance and matching reports to the department to ensure ongoing compliance and goal accomplishments. These organizations will be subject to annual CHDO certification and annual monitoring when new projects begin, or when deemed necessary through a risk assessment.

City staff will provide technical assistance to social service and housing organizations that receive Federal funds either by phone, email, or on-site visits whenever a change in program staff or other operational concerns develop.

For the initial years of the City’s participation in the CDBG program, the City will manage all CDBG funds from within the City government fiscal system, which complies with OMB and HUD standards for tracking expenses and payments. All HUD and cross cutting requirements will be followed including Davis Bacon wage standards. The City has used state CDBG funds and is familiar with the administrative requirements for documenting Davis Bacon requirements and other HUD policies, procedures and standards.
INTRODUCTION

The Five-Year Consolidated Plan identifies the federal, state, local and private resources expected to be available to the City of Sierra Vista to address priority needs and specific objectives identified in the Strategic Plan. These resources are summarized in SP-35.

Allocations for each CDBG entitlement grantee are determined annually by HUD following the adoption of the federal budget by Congress. HUD grants these funds to the communities to carry out a wide range of community development activities directed towards revitalizing neighborhoods, increasing economic development, and improving community facilities and services. Grantees must give maximum priority to activities that benefit low- and moderate-income persons, aid in the prevention or elimination of slums or blight and meet urgent community development needs that pose a serious threat to health or welfare of the community. Grantees have wide flexibility to develop their own programs, activities, and funding priorities so long as they meet one of these national objectives. The City of Sierra Vista City Council establishes the allocations for the use of CDBG funding based on the priorities set forth in the Consolidated Plan.

The City of Sierra Vista anticipates a total allocation of $271,174 in CDBG funding for the 2019/2020 program year. No program income for CDBG is expected. CDBG funds will be used for community development activities such as public facility, park, sidewalk, and ADA accessibility improvements, as well as public services for low- and moderate-income youth, and administration of the City’s CDBG program.

Anticipated resources are summarized in Table 56.
### TABLE 56: ANTICIPATED RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Uses of Funds</th>
<th>Expected Amount Available Year 1</th>
<th>Expected Amount Available Remainder of Consolidated Plan</th>
<th>Narrative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>Public, Federal</td>
<td>Acquisition; Admin and Planning; Economic Development; Housing; Public Improvements; Public Services</td>
<td>Annual Allocation: $271,174</td>
<td>Program Income: $0</td>
<td>Prior Year Resources: $0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*HUD 2019 Formula Allocation

Table 56 – Anticipated Resources

The Annual Action Plan must summarize the City’s priorities and the specific goals it intends to initiate and/or complete within the first-year of the Strategic Plan. These goals must be described in quantitative terms. City of Sierra Vista has selected goal outcome indicators and quantities based on the anticipated performance measures of the 2019/2023 Annual Action Plan. See Table 57 and Table 58.
EXPLAIN HOW FEDERAL FUNDS WILL LEVERAGE THOSE ADDITIONAL RESOURCES (PRIVATE, STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS), INCLUDING A DESCRIPTION OF HOW MATCHING REQUIREMENTS WILL BE SATISFIED

The City will cultivate funding partners who can match the City's investment of CDBG funds. The City administration recognizes that the City's annual entitlement and formula allocations are not sufficient to meet all of its needs. Additional funds need to be raised to ensure that more infrastructure improvements, affordable housing, and community services are available for those in need.

Matching requirements will be satisfied with other eligible financial resources and/or in-kind services, and the City will continue to seek this type of matching as well as financial matches.

The City has received funds from a variety of other sources over the past decade. These include HOME funds, and NADBank grant for a major sewer project, County funds for emergency repairs and other projects, as well as an Energy Efficiency Block Grant for lighting in a low-mod neighborhood. The Community Partnership of Southern Arizona, based in Tucson, has several programs in Sierra Vista, including assisting two persons receiving HOGAR housing assistance, nine persons receiving Casas Primeras assistance and five persons receiving Shelter Plus Care assistance. The City uses general fund resources for infrastructure and community service activities on a regular basis, but such funds are becoming increasingly limited in light of other needs and priorities across the City. While the City actively seeks additional funding from a range of sources, many of these sources are applications for highly competitive grants, and there is no assurance of receiving these funds.

IF APPROPRIATE, DESCRIBE PUBLICALLY OWNED LAND OR PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN THE JURISDICTION THAT MAY BE USED TO ADDRESS THE NEEDS IDENTIFIED IN THE PLAN

The City has been instrumental in acquiring slum properties being auctioned, due to non-payment of taxes, and ensuring the properties will be redeveloped into low-income housing or other options that will benefit the low-income neighborhoods.

DISCUSSION

Please see the preceding responses.
## AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives

### TABLE 57: GOALS SUMMARY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort Order</th>
<th>Goal Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>End Year</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>Needs Addressed</th>
<th>Funding Year</th>
<th>Goal Outcome Indicator</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Goal Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit of Measure (UoM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure / Facility Improvements</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Availability/Accessibility</td>
<td>Create Suitable Living Environments</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Public Improvements/Infrastructure, Public Facilities Improvements</td>
<td>$246,174</td>
<td>Public facility or infrastructure activities other than low/moderate-income housing benefit</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation and Services</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>Provide Decent Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Provide Affordable Housing Opportunities</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provision of Needed Services</td>
<td>Non-Homeless Special Needs, Non-Housing Community Development, Homeless</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Availability/Accessibility</td>
<td>Create Suitable Living Environments</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Homeless Activities, Public Service Programs</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Public service activities other than low/moderate-income housing benefit</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Persons Assisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neighborhood Stabilization</td>
<td>Non-Housing Community Development</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Create Suitable Living Environments</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Elimination of Slum and Blight</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fair Housing</td>
<td>Other: Fair Housing</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Availability/Accessibility</td>
<td>Provide Decent Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Fair Housing</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Administration/Planning</td>
<td>Other: Program Administration</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Availability/Accessibility</td>
<td>Create Suitable Living Environments</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Year of Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 57 – Goals Summary Information
AP-35 Projects

INTRODUCTION

The first-year program will focus on several public infrastructure/facility improvements projects that will augment the upcoming North Garden Avenue streetscape project and bolster the City’s West End revitalization effort. The City’s Economic Development and Leisure Services staff have developed a conceptual framework plan for creating a community event/gathering space at Soldier Creek Park through a series of improvements. The proposed funding for James Landwehr Plaza is envisioned for a general “sprucing up” of the property including the parcel to the north (former funeral home site) that the City will soon own. The first-year program will also focus on ADA improvements as these are a priority Citywide. Needed ADA sidewalk ramps will be constructed at various locations around the City to benefit special needs populations. Additionally, one service project will provide scholarships for After-
School programs organized by the Boys & Girls Club.

A total of five (5) projects (with project administration) will be funded in FY 2019. See Project Information table below.

**TABLE 59: PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Soldier Creek Park Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>James Landwehr Plaza Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ADA Ramps/Sidewalks Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club Program Scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CDBG Program Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 59 – Project Information
DESCRIBE THE REASONS FOR ALLOCATION PRIORITIES AND ANY OBSTACLES TO ADDRESSING UNDERSERVED NEEDS

In the Consolidated Plan, the principal needs identified are: 1) Public Infrastructure/Facility Improvements, 2) Housing Rehabilitation and Services, 3) Provision of Needed Services, 4) Neighborhood Stabilization, and 5) Fair Housing. The 2019 Public Meetings and Public Hearings were instrumental in identifying these principal needs for our community. However, Public Improvements and Infrastructure continue to receive high rankings because they are a means to make significant improvements in the quality of life in the distressed neighborhoods.

The development of the Annual Action Plan involved consultation with those agencies involved in delivering housing, housing services, and community improvements. Meetings and discussions were held between the staff of the City's Department of Community Development and other City Departments, as well as conducting meetings with appropriate housing and social service agencies. Public input was also solicited through a public meeting, public hearings, and a web-based survey. All projects selected to receive funding meet objectives and goals set by the City to address the needs of low- and moderate-income persons and special needs populations.

The City’s primary obstacle to meeting underserved needs is a lack of funding. In recent years, due to the lingering affects of the Great Recession, reduced revenues have plagued all levels of government (federal, state, and local). These reduced revenues have hindered the City’s ability to meet the needs of low-income residents. Another obstacle to meeting underserved needs is the generally increasing demand for public services that is placing an additional burden on public service agencies within the City.
### TABLE 60: PROJECT SUMMARY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Target Area</th>
<th>Goals Supported</th>
<th>Needs Addressed</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Planned Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Soldier Creek Park Improvements</td>
<td>Low/Mod Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure/Facility Improvements</td>
<td>Public Improvements/Infrastructure</td>
<td>CDBG: $175,000</td>
<td>Creation of a community event/gathering space at Soldier Creek Park through a series of improvements</td>
<td>Enhance walkway and provide for accessibility, improve driveway access, install electrical service, replace bathrooms, construct pedestrian bridge, general landscape improvements based on priorities established through public consultation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>James Landwehr Plaza Improvements</td>
<td>Low/Mod Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure/Facility Improvements</td>
<td>Public Improvements/Infrastructure</td>
<td>CDBG: $25,000</td>
<td>Improvement of the subject property including the parcel to the north (i.e., former funeral home site)</td>
<td>Add park amenities/features identified through public consultation process and improve landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ADA Ramps/Sidewalk Installation</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure/Facility Improvements</td>
<td>Public Improvements/Infrastructure</td>
<td>CDBG: $46,174</td>
<td>Needed ADA sidewalk ramps and sidewalks will be constructed at various locations around the City</td>
<td>Construction of ADA sidewalk ramps and sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club Program Scholarships</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Provision of Needed Services</td>
<td>Public Service Programs</td>
<td>CDBG: $15,000</td>
<td>Program scholarships for before and after school program services</td>
<td>STEM, sports, arts, education, homework help, and more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CDBG Program Administration</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>Administration/Planning</td>
<td>Program Administration</td>
<td>CDBG: $10,000</td>
<td>One Year of CDBG Program Administration</td>
<td>Annual action planning, project development, coordination and compliance oversight, and administrative activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 60 – Project Summary Information
AP-50 Geographic Distribution

DESCRIPTION OF THE GEOGRAPHIC AREAS OF THE ENTITLEMENT (INCLUDING AREAS OF LOW-INCOME AND MINORITY CONCENTRATION) WHERE ASSISTANCE WILL BE DIRECTED

Low- and moderate-income areas in the City will be those areas and locations which have the greatest need for ADA sidewalk ramps and public infrastructure/facility improvements.

For the initial years of the City’s participation in the CDBG program, the City will manage all CDBG funds from within the City government fiscal system, which complies with OMB and HUD standards for tracking expenses and payments. All HUD and cross cutting requirements will be followed including Davis Bacon wage standards. The City has used state CDBG funds and is familiar with the administrative requirements for documenting Davis Bacon requirements and other HUD policies, procedures and standards.

**TABLE 61: GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Area</th>
<th>Percentage of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low/Mod Neighborhoods</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 61 – Geographic Distribution

RATIONALE FOR THE PRIORITIES FOR ALLOCATING INVESTMENTS GEOGRAPHICALLY

The City has worked closely with the public and civic leaders to ascertain the priority needs within the targeted areas. Meetings with agency providers, neighborhood associations, and the West End Commission guided the prioritization of needs. These priority needs include infrastructure improvements such as proper drainage and sidewalks, removing slum/blight and increasing code enforcement, public facility improvements to neighborhood parks, and public services for youth. The Soldier Creek Park and James Landwehr Plaza projects are site-specific. The ADA Ramps/Sidewalk Installation project will occur at various locations throughout the City. Scholarships for after school programs will be provided to low- and moderate-income youth citywide.

DISCUSSION

The City of Sierra Vista has identified five (5) projects to implement the five goals of the Strategic Plan during the final year of the 2019-2023 Consolidated Plan. These projects benefit low- and moderate-income persons Citywide and within the City’s low- and moderate- income areas.
AP-55 Affordable Housing

INTRODUCTION

As stated previously, the City places a high priority on providing homeownership opportunity in Sierra Vista. This goal shall be addressed, in part, by local non-profit organizations and developers that construct new, modestly priced, affordable houses, or repair existing houses for resale to lower-income, first-time homebuyers. In addition, the City shall seek creative ways in which we can provide affordable housing opportunities and a means for obtaining such.

For the first program year, the City does not plan to directly support any affordable housing activities because the necessary procedures and policies are not in place. Affordable housing programs will likely be initiated in the subsequent program years.

**TABLE 62: ONE YEAR GOALS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING BY SUPPORT REQUIREMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Requirement</th>
<th>Number of Households to be Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Homeless</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 62 – One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement

**TABLE 63: ONE YEAR GOALS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING BY SUPPORT TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Type</th>
<th>Number of Households Supported Through:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental Assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Production of New Units</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab of Existing Units</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of Existing Units</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 63 – One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type

**DISCUSSION**

The City is not prepared to engage in affordable housing activities in the first program year. The City will rely on various partners throughout the jurisdiction, and county in assisting its residents in obtaining affordable housing. Through programs including but not limited to: Owner-Occupied Rehabilitation grants; and Emergency Rehabilitation Grants.
AP-60 Public Housing

INTRODUCTION

The City of Sierra Vista does not have a Public Housing Authority nor does the City own or operate any public housing. Additionally, the City of Sierra Vista does not administer any Section 8 certificates. As a result, the needs of public housing are not within the scope of this Consolidated Plan. In the absence of a locally administered program, the City works cooperatively with the Housing Authority of Cochise County which provides City residents any Section 8 and VASH vouchers.

ACTIONS PLANNED DURING THE NEXT YEAR TO ADDRESS THE NEEDS TO PUBLIC HOUSING

Not Applicable.

ACTIONS TO ENCOURAGE PUBLIC HOUSING RESIDENTS TO BECOME MORE INVOLVED IN MANAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATE IN HOMEOWNERSHIP

Not Applicable.

IF THE PHA IS DESIGNATED AS TROUBLED, DESCRIBE THE MANNER IN WHICH FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE WILL BE PROVIDED OR OTHER ASSISTANCE

Not Applicable.

DISCUSSION

Not Applicable.
AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities

INTRODUCTION

This section of the Annual Action Plan describes the City of Sierra Vista one-year goal and the specific actions steps it will undertake in the program year to carry out the homeless strategy identified in the Strategic Plan. Additionally, this section addresses any activities related to the supportive housing needs of non-homeless populations.

Going forward the City will work to assess the community’s homeless needs and develop the policies, procedures and capacity to better assist homeless and other special needs activities. Several avenues already exist and will be expanded upon to achieve these goals. The City has a Commission of Disabilities and is a member of the regional Continuum of Care. Further, a City staff member is on the Governor’s Commission on Homelessness and Housing, a Board member of the local United Way, and a Board member of the Southwest Arizona Fair Housing Council.

DESCRIBE THE JURISDICTIONS ONE-YEAR GOALS AND ACTIONS FOR REDUCING AND ENDING HOMELESSNESS

The City will consider pursuing activities to address the housing and supportive service needs of persons who are homeless, and those that have special needs. However, at this time, the City does not have the procedures, policies or mechanisms in place to assist organizations providing these types of services.

REACHING OUT TO HOMELESS PERSONS (ESPECIALLY UNSHELTERED PERSONS) AND ASSESSING THEIR INDIVIDUAL NEEDS

The City government cannot directly assist persons experiencing homelessness; rather it relies on the Good Neighbor Alliance (owns the homeless shelter) and other service-oriented agencies to assist those persons. The Cochise County Resources Guide lists a number of organizations and agencies that provide food, clothing, financial assistance, healthcare, and transportation assistance. These include State and County agencies and organizations such as the St. Vincent DePaul Society, the Salvation Army, the American Red Cross SSVF Program, the Wellness Connection, the Veterans’ Administration, services from Fort Huachuca, the Arizona Coalition for Military Families (focused for service providers), and Good Neighbor Alliance.

The City will consider pursuing activities to address the housing and supportive service needs of persons who are homeless, and those that have special needs. However, at this time, the City does not have the
procedures, policies or mechanisms in place to assist organizations providing these types of services.

**ADDRESSING THE EMERGENCY SHELTER AND TRANSITIONAL HOUSING NEEDS OF HOMELESS PERSONS**

There is one homeless shelter in the City— the Good Neighbor Alliance facility that is for men, women, and families. Good Neighbor Alliance has received a PATH grant for the last several years and has staff and caseworkers performing outreach to those individuals experiencing homelessness throughout Cochise County. Good Neighbor Alliance is an emergency and temporary shelter that offers a walk-in shower program, clothes washing, nightly dinner, AA and NA meetings at the location, and case management to ensure that the clients can access HUD and DES programs.

The Good Neighbor Alliance facility has a total capacity of 20 persons, combination of single men, single women, and families and has an estimated occupancy rate of 90 percent. In 2016 the City allotted $20,000 of its 2016 CDBG to GNA to fix the roof at the Samaritan Station (dorm) which, without replacing the roof, the building would have become inhabitable and displace all 20 persons. The City was unable to get an eligible roof contractor after three solicitations and paid for the new roof with General Fund money. Good Neighbor Alliance has received ESG and rapid rehousing funding, but due to State cuts didn’t receive funding for several years; however, they are now receiving a small amount of funding. They work with agencies like the Legacy Foundation for operating funding and housing clients. GNA also works closely with the mental health providers to ensure the well-being of their clients.

The City will consider pursuing activities to address the housing and supportive service needs of persons who are homeless, and those that have special needs. However, at this time, the City does not have the procedures, policies or mechanisms in place to assist organizations providing these types of services.

**HELPING HOMELESS PERSONS (ESPECIALLY CHRONICALLY HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES, FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN, VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND UNACCOMPANIED YOUTH) MAKE THE TRANSITION TO PERMANENT HOUSING AND INDEPENDENT LIVING, INCLUDING SHORTENING THE PERIOD OF TIME THAT INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES EXPERIENCE HOMELESSNESS, FACILITATING ACCESS FOR HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS, AND PREVENTING INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES WHO WERE RECENTLY HOMELESS FROM BECOMING HOMELESS AGAIN**

This is being discussed at the Cochise County Continuum of Care. For several years, GNA did not received ESG or rapid rehousing funding, due to State funding cuts. However, GNA does now have a
small amount of funding to assist with rehousing. However, being grant funded, funding is unknown year-to-year.

Furthermore, the City will continue to work with homeless service providers a to implement a cohesive, community-wide discharge coordination policy that can be successfully implemented to ensure that persons being discharged from publicly funded agencies and institutions do not become homeless upon release.

HELPING LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES AVOID BECOMING HOMELESS, ESPECIALLY EXTREMELY LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES AND THOSE WHO ARE: BEING DISCHARGED FROM PUBLICLY FUNDED INSTITUTIONS AND SYSTEMS OF CARE (SUCH AS HEALTH CARE FACILITIES, MENTAL HEALTH FACILITIES, FOSTER CARE AND OTHER YOUTH FACILITIES, AND CORRECTIONS PROGRAMS AND INSTITUTIONS); OR, RECEIVING ASSISTANCE FROM PUBLIC OR PRIVATE AGENCIES THAT ADDRESS HOUSING, HEALTH, SOCIAL SERVICES, EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION, OR YOUTH NEEDS

This is being discussed at the Cochise County Continuum of Care. For several years, GNA did not received ESG or rapid rehousing funding, due to State funding cuts. However, GNA does now have a small amount of funding to assist with rehousing. However, being grant funded, funding is unknown year-to-year.

Furthermore, the City will continue to work with homeless service providers a to implement a cohesive, community-wide discharge coordination policy that can be successfully implemented to ensure that persons being discharged from publicly funded agencies and institutions do not become homeless upon release.

DISCUSSION

The City does not anticipate funding homeless activities with the FY2019 CDBG award. The City will continue to offer other assistance, advice, and coordination with agencies that provide day facilities, case management, job skills training, vocational tools and other homeless services.

AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing

INTRODUCTION

This section of the Annual Action Plan summarizes actions the City of Sierra Vista will undertake during the program year to reduce barriers to affordable housing and influence whether the cost of housing or the incentives to develop, maintain, or improve affordable housing are affected by public policies, particularly those of the local jurisdiction. Such policies include land use controls, zoning ordinances,
building codes, and policies that affect the return on residential investment.

**ACTIONS IT PLANNED TO REMOVE OR AMELIORATE THE NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF PUBLIC POLICIES THAT SERVE AS BARRIERS TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING SUCH AS LAND USE CONTROLS, TAX POLICIES AFFECTING LAND, ZONING ORDINANCES, BUILDING CODES, FEES AND CHARGES, GROWTH LIMITATIONS, AND POLICIES AFFECTING THE RETURN ON RESIDENTIAL INVESTMENT**

The City has several strategies that it utilizes to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that are barriers to affordable housing. In general, the City of Sierra Vista will continue to work with non-profit and for-profit housing developers and providers to increase the amount of affordable housing.

Sierra Vista does not put any limitations on growth. Through vehicles such as zoning ordinances, subdivision controls, permit systems, and housing codes and standards, the City has attempted to ensure the health, safety, and quality of life of its residents while minimizing the barriers that may impede the development of affordable housing.

The City has addressed its zoning and land use regulations to ensure they are as equitable and open as possible. Development standards, though they sometimes add costs to construction or rehabilitation, are necessary for the safety and health of residents. The City continues efforts to streamline and facilitate the permitting process locally. The City reviews building codes to ensure that non-life safety codes are not adding cost.

The City continues to have one of the lowest property tax rates in AZ.

**DISCUSSION**

Public policies can have a direct impact on barriers to affordable housing. Sierra Vista has recognized this fact and is currently undergoing its own processes to expose any barriers or obstacles to developing affordable and fair housing. It is anticipated the documents such as the zoning and building codes and the City Master Plan do not create barriers to affordable housing as there are many affordable units within the City of Sierra Vista.
AP-85 Other Actions

INTRODUCTION

This section of the Annual Action Plan describes the City of Sierra Vista’ planned actions to carry out the following strategies outlined in the Strategic Plan:

- Foster and maintain affordable housing;
- Evaluate and reduce lead-based paint hazards;
- Reduce the number of poverty-level families;
- Develop institutional structure; and Enhance coordination.

ACTIONS PLANNED TO ADDRESS OBSTACLES TO MEETING UNDERSERVED NEEDS

The greatest challenge to meeting underserved needs in the coming year will be meeting the increased need for program activities with a limited amount of funding. To overcome this significant challenge, the City will work more efficiently, seek a greater level of collaboration with other agencies and organizations, and aggressively seek opportunities to leverage funds. One activity, scholarships for after school programs organized by the Boys & Girls Club of Sierra Vista, will be offered in the first year. In addition, public service projects and/or programs that can be supported by CDBG funds are limited yet create a large demand for funding. The City will continue to work with public service providers to expand services and become more of a resource for these providers.

Poverty levels have increased between 2000 and 2017 (10.5 percent to 14.2 percent). It can be assumed that between 2000 and 2017 that poverty has increased due to lingering effects of the “Great Recession”. Federal program funds being used are not designed to be anti-poverty programs, thus limiting the amount of resources available for such activities. The improvements that occur within Community Development Block Grant eligible areas require that Section 3 area residents are used, when feasible. Sierra Vista, however, is dependent on the availability of funding in order to accomplish infrastructure improvements.

The City, through the Consolidated Plan, shall seek to target federal funds, and other available resources, to residents that have traditionally not been served, or are underserved by previous programs. A strong emphasis will be placed on programmatic restructure that is not only compliant with changing rules and regulations, but make sense for today's economic climate, and ever-changing community structure.
ACTIONS PLANNED TO FOSTER AND MAINTAIN AFFORDABLE HOUSING

As noted above, the City could in later program years provide rental assistance and seek to develop affordable housing projects. The latter efforts will be limited because of the amount of funds available and the many competing needs.

ACTIONS PLANNED TO REDUCE LEAD-BASED PAINT HAZARDS

The City will incorporate all HUD requirements concerning lead-based paint abatement into its housing rehabilitation programs, will see that program participants are informed about lead-based paint hazards and will see that all abatement work is undertaken by qualified contractors who have completed U.S. HUD and EPA lead training courses.

Several years ago, the Housing Authority of Cochise County implemented a lead-based paint rehabilitation program, they were able to abate all the paint in qualified homes when requested.

ACTIONS PLANNED TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF POVERTY-LEVEL FAMILIES

Because the nature of poverty is complex and multi-faceted, the City will attempt to allocate CDBG funds for services to very low-income households. CDBG can provide funding for meeting these critical basic needs, but these efforts will be constrained by the amount of funds available and competing priority needs. One activity, scholarships for after school programs organized by the Boys & Girls Club of Sierra Vista, will be offered in the first year.

According to the 2013-2017 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates, 14.2% of people living in the City of Sierra Vista are below poverty level. The City of Sierra Vista does not possess the capacity or manpower to directly improve the poverty status of its citizens. However, the City supports non-profit groups, County and State efforts to move low-income persons to economic self-sufficiency or to a maximum level of economic independence.

ACTIONS PLANNED TO DEVELOP INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE

The City has in place a strong institutional structure necessary to carry out its housing, community and economic development strategies. The City’s Community Development Department will administer the CDBG Program.

In conjunction with other City operating departments, the Community Development Department will also implement any public works project proposed by the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan or any of the
Annual Action Plans.

Accordingly, the Community Development Department and the City’s non-profit agencies have longstanding ties and an effective delivery system for social services to the youth, persons with special needs and low- and moderate-income residents. The Community Development Department will integrate the public service activities and affordable housing proposed in the Action Plan with these ongoing operations.

The City will continue to coordinate with various community groups to determine objectives and goals through the public participation process. These groups play a vital role in implementing the Five-Year Consolidated Plan and the Annual Action Plans, annual Performance Reviews, and any proposed Substantial Amendments. All stakeholders are welcomed and encouraged to participate in the implementation of this Consolidated Plan and Action Plan.

**ACTIONS PLANNED TO ENHANCE COORDINATION BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING AND SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES**

The City maintains a close relationship with state, regional, and county organizations that provide assistance to low- and moderate-income persons as well as the homeless.

The City will work closely with local non-profit organizations to actively encourage housing programs for low- and moderate-income persons. Also, the Community Development Department will develop and maintain a positive relationship with the builders, developers, and financial institutions in the region.

This collaborative approach will assist in the creation and delivery of effective service delivery programs and affordable housing projects.

**DISCUSSION**

The City’s actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs include activities in support of special needs assistance. Additionally, the City’s actions to foster and maintain affordable housing include continued funding of programs and agencies that further the affordable housing goals of the City.

**AP-90 Program Specific Requirements**

**INTRODUCTION**

Projects planned with all CDBG funds expected to be available during the year are identified in the Projects Table. The following identifies program income that is available for use that is included in
projects to be carried out.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM (CDBG) REFERENCE 24 CFR 91.220. (I)(1)

TABLE 64: AVAILABLE PROGRAM INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Program Income</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The total amount of program income that will have been received before the start of the next program year and that has not yet been reprogrammed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The amount of proceeds from section 108 loan guarantees that will be used during the year to address the priority needs and specific objectives identified in the grantee's strategic plan.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The amount of surplus funds from urban renewal settlements</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The amount of any grant funds returned to the line of credit for which the planned use has not been included in a prior statement or plan</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The amount of income from float-funded activities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Income:</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 64 – Available Program Income

TABLE 65: OTHER CDBG REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Program Income</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The amount of urgent need activities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The estimated percentage of CDBG funds that will be used for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income. Overall Benefit - A consecutive period of one, two or three years may be used to determine that a minimum overall benefit of 70% of CDBG funds is used to benefit persons of low and moderate income. Specify the years covered that include this Annual Action Plan.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 65 – Other CDBG Requirements

DISCUSSION

The City estimates 100 percent of CDBG funding will be spent on low- and moderate-income activities.
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