



# Second Program Year CAPER

The CPMP Second Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report includes Narrative Responses to CAPER questions that CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, and ESG grantees must respond to each year in order to be compliant with the Consolidated Planning Regulations. The Executive Summary narratives are optional.

The grantee must submit an updated Financial Summary Report (PR26).

## GENERAL

### Executive Summary

This module is optional but encouraged. If you choose to complete it, provide a brief overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the first year.

Program Year 2 CAPER Executive Summary response:

Program Year 2009 was the second year of the five year (2008-2012) Consolidated Plan. To establish the goals and objectives of the five-year Consolidated Plan and the one year Action Plan, input was gathered from citizens, non-profit entities, City Departments, City Boards and Committees through public meetings. The process ensured full access and participation by the community in developing goals and objectives by reviewing any public input on the eligible areas, prioritizing problems and solutions, and developing a good strategic plan.

The Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) is a report that provides information on Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) activities undertaken by the City of Rogers from January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009. Funds for these activities are provided by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) through the Community Development Block Grant Entitlement Cities Program.

The City of Rogers is aware of the need of the many and various community development activities, both housing and non-housing needs, including public improvements. The City acknowledges that there are not enough funds available to meet all of the City's needs and funding limitations did not allow all requests for funding to be addressed in 2009. The City will endeavor to identify these needs and requests for possible funding in subsequent years as CDBG funds become available. The City is also mindful of continuing to carry out the Community Development Block Grant Program for maximum benefit to extremely-low to low-income individuals and families.

The Community Development Block Grant Program continues to partner with the City and other agencies to accomplish their short and long term goals and at the same time meet the goals set by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The goals of the City of Rogers' CDBG Program are to provide:

(a) Decent Housing to include assisting homeless persons to obtain appropriate housing, assisting persons at risk of becoming homeless; retaining the attainable housing stock; and increasing the availability of permanent housing in standard condition and at an affordable cost for low-to-moderate-income families, particularly to members of disadvantaged minorities, without discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, family status, or disability. Decent housing also includes increasing the supply of supportive housing, which combines structural features and services needed to enable persons with special needs, including persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, to live with dignity and independence; and providing affordable housing to low-income persons that is accessible to job opportunities.

(b) A Suitable Living Environment includes improving the safety and livability of neighborhoods; increasing access to quality public and private facilities and services, reducing the isolation of income groups within a community or geographical area through the spatial de-concentration of housing opportunities for persons of lower income and the revitalization of deteriorating or deteriorated neighborhoods; restoring and preserving properties of special historic, architectural, or aesthetic value; and conserving energy resources.

(c) Expanded Economic Opportunities includes job creation and retention; establishment, stabilization and expansion of small businesses (including micro-businesses); provision of public services and concerned with employment, provision of jobs to low-income persons living in areas affected by those programs and activities, or jobs resulting from carrying out activities under programs covered by the plan; availability of mortgage financing for low-income persons at reasonable rates using non-discriminatory lending practices; access to capital and credit for development activities that promote the long-term economic and social viability of the community; and empowerment and self-sufficiency for low-income persons to reduce generational poverty in Federally assisted housing and public housing.

The City of Rogers received \$422,981 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for the period starting January 1, 2009 and ending December 31, 2009. These funds were used for two housing service projects, four public service projects, and five public facility projects. All these projects improved the living conditions for the City's low and moderate income residents. During Program Year 2009, the City of Rogers spent its CDBG funds in the following areas:

- \$14,964.82 were spent on housing rehabilitation, emergency repairs, and weatherization projects. Six houses were recipients of this funding.
- \$50,000.00 were spent on infrastructure in Habitat Trails, a Habitat for Humanity housing project in the City of Rogers. This will complete the infrastructure needed for this subdivision. When completed, Habitat Trails will provide 15 homes for low income families.
- \$5,281.01 were spent providing transportation assistance to the City's low income elderly and disabled citizens. Forty-seven people were recipients of this program.
- \$4,202.13 were spent on the English as Second Language (ESL) classes in 2009. Fall enrollment for these classes included 150 students and parents.

- \$17,390.00 were spent providing after school and summer care for low income children. During the second semester and summer session of 2009, 118 children were enrolled in this program.

- \$10,000.00 was spent providing dental and medical care for low income children. This funding was used to buy equipment and supplies for providing dental and medical care to 3,800 uninsured low income children during the 2009 Program Year.

- \$50,000.00 was spent on the Non-Profit Center to assist in making this building more efficient, environmentally friendly and cost effective with a focus on sustainability and green building practices. This in-turn will provide low-cost physical space for non-profit organizations to provide service to low and moderate income families and individuals.

- \$5,364.00 was spent on the design of the Price Lane Road project located in a low income area of Rogers.

- \$10,000.00 was spent on the build-out for the Community Clinic. The clinic is moving to the Non-Profit Center which will enable the clinic to have more exam rooms and expansion of services improving access to care for low income residents in Rogers.

- \$40,558.58 was spent on the design of the Persimmon Street project, another low income area located west of the downtown area.

- \$135,219.19 was spent on infrastructure for the new Adult Development Center, a facility and campus for adults with disabilities.

### **General Questions**

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

- b. How Federal resources from HUD leveraged other public and private resources.
- c. How matching requirements were satisfied.

Program Year 2 CAPER General Questions response:

1. **Assessment of the One-Year Goals and Objectives:**

Communities develop their own programs and funding priorities based on local needs. HUD has established guidelines to define the types of projects/activities that may be undertaken and to ensure each project/activity meets one of the national objectives of the CDBG Program. Examples of eligible projects/activities include:

- (a) Acquisition and disposition of real property.
- (b) Acquisition, construction, reconstruction, and rehabilitation of public facilities such as community, senior and health centers. Public facilities also include streets, sidewalks, parks, playgrounds, and infrastructure (water and sewer or flood and drainage improvements).
- (c) Provisions of public services such as child care, health care, recreation or education programs, services for senior citizens, and services for homeless persons.
- (d) Residential housing rehabilitation.

Each project/activity must carry out one of the three national objectives of the program:

- (a) Benefit low and moderate income persons either individually, such as housing rehabilitation, or area-wide, such as improvements to streets, sidewalks, and parks. Activities that benefit special populations that are presumed to be low and moderate income such as elderly persons, abused spouses or children, homeless persons, and developmentally or physically handicap persons.
- (b) Aid in the prevention or elimination of slums and blight on an area basis, spot basis, or in an urban renewal area.
- (c) Meet urgent community development needs that pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community.

**Describe the accomplishments in attaining the goals and objectives for the reporting period.**

Listed below are the objectives, goals, and accomplishments for the City or Rogers' 2009 Program Year:

**Housing \$64,964.82 – 17% of the Grant Funds Spent in 2009**

The City has taken steps to encourage affordable housing by passing zoning ordinances which encourage affordable development by reducing setback requirements and density. This has sparked an interest from developers to look at building affordable housing in Rogers. The City has also seen a slow down in the building of high-end market housing. The City did see a pickup in building permits

toward the last quarter of 2009. The area's economy and unemployment rate, though much better than the national or even state average, is not as strong as in previous years.

Housing rehabilitation continues to be the focus for using CDBG grant money to meet the City's housing goals and objectives. Because of the downturn in housing construction, the City is seeing more qualified builders willing to take on rehabilitation projects. In the past the City has partnered with other agencies to meet most of our housing rehabilitation goals, however, in 2009 the City began using the City's Building and Inspections Department to assist the CDBG Office in preparing specifications for bids. The CDBG Office began processing more of the paperwork to qualify recipients and oversee the entire project from start to finish. We feel this has given us a much better control of spending our CDBG funds. We will still work with the non-profits as certain needs arise.

The City had two housing projects in the 2009 Program Year.

Habitat for Humanity Project

Goal: Decent Housing

Objective: Benefit low and moderate income persons by increasing the availability of affordable owner housing and improving access to affordable owner housing.

By partnering with Habitat for Humanity, the City has been able to assist in the development of Habitat Trails, an environmentally friendly eco Habitat for Humanity subdivision on Old Wire Road. When completed, this subdivision will provide 15 new homes in the Rogers City limits for extremely-low to low-income families. The entire subdivision will be dedicated to preserving the environment and will include a wetland conservation area, community area, a park, and is within walking distance to several Rogers Public Schools. A property owner's association will be developed along with covenants for the owners. At the end of Program Year 2009, there were six homes constructed in this subdivision providing homes to 21 people.

Housing Rehabilitation and Emergency Repair

Goal: Decent Housing

Objective: Benefit low and moderate income persons by improving the quality of owner housing which will increase the availability of permanent housing in standard condition at an affordable cost and retain attainable housing stock.

The City undertook six housing rehabilitation projects in 2009. All homeowners are low income and unable to financially pay for the work. Home No. 1 is owned by a 78 year old woman. Also living in the house are two other relatives, ages 42 and 46. The owner is on social security and only one of the other two living in the house is employed. New flooring was put in the bathroom and a section of a leaky roof was repaired. Home No. 2 is owned by a married couple, ages 60 and 63. Husband draws social security and wife is employed part time. Funds were used to replace part of the existing roof and repair a portion of the roof that could be saved. Home No. 3 is owned by a 66 year old woman. Funds were used to replace roof. Home

## Jurisdiction

---

No. 4 is owned by a couple with three children, ages 9, 11, and 16. During the ice storm in 2009, this house received extensive damage. CDBG funding was used to pay for replacement of meter box and mast and replacement of burnt wires and circuits. Five smoke detectors were also installed. House No. 5 is owned by a woman, age 58 on disability. Funds were used to replace the heating unit. The existing unit was the original unit and unable to repair. House No. 6 is owned by a single Hispanic woman. Also living in the house are her four children, ages 10, 12, 15, and 19, her son-in-law, age 28, and a grandchild, age 15 months. Only two of the adults, the mom and son-in-law, are employed. Funds were used to replace part of the existing roof and repair a portion of the roof that could be saved.

Listed below are statistics on the homeowners who received rehabilitation assistance through CDBG during the 2009 Program Year:

Owner's Income	Head of Household	Size of Household	Handicap
\$29,190.00	Caucasian	3	No
\$28,380.00	Caucasian	2	Yes
\$18,861.24	Caucasian	1	No
\$44,117.00	Hispanic	5	No
\$10,248.00	Caucasian	1	Yes
\$32,448.00	Hispanic	7	No

### **PUBLIC SERVICES \$36,873.14 – 9% of the Grant Funds Spent in 2009**

The Community Development Block Grant regulation allows up to 15% of the total grant amount to be used for public service projects.

#### Transportation Assistance Services

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefiting low and moderate income persons by improving and increasing access to services.

The objective of the City is to improve the mobility of our elderly and disabled income eligible citizens. All the participants are approved residents of the City of Rogers and although they do not all live in a low to moderate income area, their incomes do not exceed HUD guidelines. The City is able to accomplish this goal by offsetting the cost of the City approved transportation systems, Ozark Regional Transit and Northwest Arkansas Taxi, LLC by providing the approved riders with coupons for free rides. Identification cards are provided that must be shown each time the rider boards the bus or enters the taxi. Ozark Regional Transit and Northwest Arkansas Taxi, LLC provides the City a breakdown on each rider to include date picked up, where taken, and when returned home. An invoice is also provided with the breakdown. These procedures safeguard against program abuse. This program has been invaluable to the City as most of the riders have no other means of transportation. The City provided transportation assistance for 47 individuals during 2009.

#### Funding of ESL Classes

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefit low and moderate income persons by improving and increasing access to services.

The City of Rogers has many immigrant needs. Our goal is to foster trust and provide a bridge between cultures while maintaining the present quality of life. The typical new Hispanic arrival to the City is illiterate to the English language. Because of the language barrier, simple things like opening a bank account, obtaining housing and utilities, and enrolling in school are very difficult for those immigrating into the City. CDBG funds were used to provide funding for the Family ESL classes. This program brings parents, children, and teachers together in an afternoon or evening setting. The parents work with their children on homework assignments and are schooled in improving their use of the English language. Reading, writing, listening/speaking, conversation, and pronunciation are all taught. Four schools in the Rogers School District participated in the program. Classes are held twice a week. Each class meets for two hours. There were 150 participants in the program in 2009 and over 75% were low-to-moderate income residents.

After School and Summer Programs

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefit low and moderate income persons by improving and increasing access to services.

This program provided funding for an after school and summer care program for low income children. This program provides a safe and developmentally appropriate place for children. The program will prevent antisocial behavior in children that will help children remain in school, provide character education, physical fitness, financial education, leadership and community service training. Field trips and special events are also planned providing opportunities that many of these children would never get to do. The after school and summer programs also enable the parents to maintain their employment and eliminate the costs of child care. During the second semester and summer session of 2009, 118 were children enrolled in this program.

Rogers Community Clinic – Dental and Medical

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefit low and moderate income persons by improving and increasing access to services.

The clinic provided dental and medical services to 3,800 low income children in the 2009 Program Year. Funds from CDBG were used to purchase consumable supplies and equipment used to provide free dental and medical care.

**PUBLIC FACILITIES - \$241,141.77 – 61% of the Grant Funds Spent in 2009**

CDBG dollars were used to fund five public facility projects in 2009.

Non-Profit Center

Goal: A Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefit low and moderate income persons by providing facilities to provide needed services for low to moderate income families and individuals and conserve energy resources.

The Non-Profit Center is located on a 13-acre campus at the gateway to downtown Rogers. Funds from CDBG were used to make the buildings on this campus more efficient, environmentally friendly and cost effective with a focus on sustainability and green building practices. At the end of 2009, there were 17 organizations located at the center that provided needed services to low-to-moderate income individuals and families. The building was used by 5,000 people during the time the facility opened until year end. Five additional organizations have committed to locate to this facility in 2010.

Design of Price Lane

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefit low and moderate persons by providing public improvements to low to moderate income areas.

This area contains a large number of small homes and duplexes. The traffic arterial is a narrow, non-curbed two lane road. This design will create a new three lane road with curb and gutter and will relieve traffic for the three schools located in this area. This project will also provide access to Hwy 71-B for the residents who live in this area. This will be a joint project with CDBG covering the design and the City covering the construction costs.

Community Clinic

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefit low and moderate income persons by improving a facility that provides medical and dental services.

The key beneficiaries of this facility will be those families in need. The move to the Non-Profit Center will enable the Community Clinic to have more exam rooms and expand their services improving access to care for low income children in Rogers.

Revitalization Area Infrastructure Improvements – Persimmon Street

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefit low and moderate persons by providing public improvements to low to moderate income areas.

The City is nearing completion of the design process for the Persimmon Street project, a low income area. Construction of the project will consist of curb and gutter on portions of the street where curb and gutter have not been placed. Sidewalks and handicap ramps will also be placed along the street. The City had hoped to bid out phase one of the project by the end of 2009; however, the design was not completed in time to bid and start construction prior to winter weather coming in. Phase one should go out for bids in 2010.

Adult Development Center

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefiting low and moderate income disabled persons by providing a range of services for persons with special needs.

The Adult Development Center serves over 100 adults living with emotional, mental and physical limitations. The Center operates a sheltered workshop where clients actively learn new skills, build close relationships, and provide business and industry with a reliable off-line production workforce. The Center has built a strong reputation of excellence and professionalism in the community and has partnered with local businesses and industry to provide timely, high-quality results. The goals of the Center are to foster independent living through the development of life, work, social skills, and prepare clients to become a part of, rather than apart from, the community. The Center also provides opportunities for a more fulfilling and productive life for those developmentally challenged individuals served by the Center. The Center has presently outgrown its existing facilities and has started the construction of a new training facility and campus for adults with disabilities. CDBG funding in 2009 was used on infrastructure costs for this new facility. The new facility will be ready for occupancy in 2010.

**ADMINISTRATION \$53,347.19 – 13% of the Grant Funds Spent in 2009**

The Community Development Block Grant regulation allows up to 20% of the total grant amount to be used for administration cost. Administration cost is the cost required to administer the CDBG Program including monitoring any sub-recipients. Administration funds were used to pay a portion of the CDBG Administrator’s salary, travel for meetings and training for the CDBG Administrator, as well as supplies and postage for the CDBG office. Funds were also used to reimburse the City for time spent by City employees who worked on design and inspections associated with CDBG projects. Time sheets are kept on all employees whose salaries are impacted by CDBG funding.

**b. Provide a Breakdown of the CPD Formula Grant Funds Spent on Grant Activities for Each Goal and Objective.**

Listed below is the breakdown of the grant funds spent on grant activities for each national objective and City goal:

Project	Activity	National Objective	City Goal	Amount Spent
Housing	Infrastructure	Decent Housing	Benefit Low/Mod	\$ 50,000.00
Housing	Rehabilitation Weatherization Emergency Repairs	Decent Housing	Benefit Low/Mod	14,964.82
Public Service	Transportation Assistance	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	5,281.01
Public Service	ESL Classes	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	4,202.13

Public Service	After School and Summer Program	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	17,390.00
Public Service	Medical and Dental Care	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	\$ 10,000.00
Public Facilities	Center for Non-Profits	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	50,000.00
Public Facilities	Price Lane	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	5,364.00
Public Facilities	Community Clinic	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	10,000.00
Public Facilities	Persimmon Street	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	40,558.58
Public Facilities	Adult Development Center	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	135,219.19

The City spent a total of \$342,979.73 on projects in Program Year 2009. By adding administration costs of \$53,347.19, the City of Rogers spent \$396,326.92 in Program Year 2009.

**c. If Applicable, Explain Why Progress was not Made Towards Meeting the Goals and Objectives.**

The City set its housing goals a little high for 2009. It was anticipated that most of the houses in Habitat Trails would be completed by 2009; however, the slowed down economy had a severe impact on donations to Habitat for Humanity. No home sponsorships were received in 2009. CDBG’s funding for infrastructure in Habitat Trails was completed in this Program Year. Everything is in place for the remaining homes to be built. Our home rehabilitation and repair numbers were also below what we had projected. This was mainly due to some structural changes within the CDBG Office to make certain all home rehabilitations strictly followed HUD guidelines. Although partnerships can be good, we took the time in 2009 to assess all our working partnerships to ensure all rules and regulations were being followed. Financial instability with the homeowner close to foreclosure or applications received where the person living in the home could not show ownership also contributed to the lack of homes available for rehabilitation and emergency repairs. Overall had we been able to provide rehabilitation and/or repair work to all the applications we received, we would have surpassed our total number projected in 2009. Public Service projects were completed providing more services to low-income people than we had done in previous years. We estimated our service projects would touch 2,133 people with our five service projects, we actually provided services to 4,115 people. There was no funding used in one of the service projects, emergency utility bills. The City received no requests for this funding. Two of our Public Facility projects were completed and construction was started on another Public Facility project. This project will complete in 2010. The other two Public Facility projects are still in design stage with one of these projects ready for bid with construction to start in 2010.

**2. Describe the Manner in Which the Recipient Would Change its Program as a Result of its Experiences.**

The City did not see anything they would change in how the program operated. We were able to meet our timeliness standards in Program Year 2009. The City again received more requests for funding than allocated money. We felt we funded those projects that would have the biggest impact on the national objectives and goals of our City.

**3. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing:**

The City entered into a contract with J-Quad & Associates in 2006 to provide a Fair Housing Study for the City of Rogers. This study was completed in 2007. The City provided an update to HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity in September 2009 concerning impediments discovered in this 2006 study and what corrective action the City had taken. The City realizes fair housing and expanded opportunities are necessary for the City to meet its' housing objectives. The City understands the need for fair housing education and outreach and remains committed to providing fair housing services.

- a. and b. **Provide a Summary of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice and Identify Actions Taken to Overcome Effects of Impediments Identified.**

**Real Estate Impediments:**

**1. Concentration of Affordable Housing Resulting in Income and Racial Segregation.** The lack of lower-priced housing has had an impact on fair housing in Rogers. At the time the study was done, land costs had become too expensive to produce new housing affordable to the area's low-to middle-income families. The city made changes to zoning laws to allow more homes to be built per acre and square footages to be reduced to be able to build more affordable homes; however, developers felt it was no longer profitable to build low-income housing. Once the housing boom began to slow in Northwest Arkansas in 2008, the City began to see developers submit subdivision plans for affordable housing. The City has continued to work with developers in bringing affordable homes to Rogers without compromising the amenities the City looks for in its subdivisions, i.e., paved streets, curb and gutter, sidewalks, and landscaping. Rogers also has a limited number of older lower-priced homes as compared to new, higher priced homes. We found that most people who lived in the older homes were not willing to pull up stakes and move to other areas of the City. Turn over for older homes are very low in the City. At the time the analysis was completed there was a lack of affordable senior housing or subsidized senior housing facilities for the City's elderly population. Since the analysis was done a new HUD development, Dixieland Gardens, for seniors has been constructed in Rogers providing 24 new units for seniors. Additionally, another 72 units are scheduled for construction in Dixieland Gardens. The City has been advised that the next phase for the senior complex will be submitted for review this year with construction to start upon approval by the City.

**2. Possible Fair Housing Violations in Real Estate Advertising.** The CDBG Administrator met with the Rogers Board of Realtors as well as the advertisement departments of all local newspapers. In those meetings, discussions were held about ad campaigns that include only or mostly models of a particular race, gender, or other protected class. They were advised we needed to see more diversification with pictures used in advertising and that equal housing opportunity statements and logos

are a part of future advertising. The City will again meet with these agencies in 2010 on the importance of fair housing in real estate advertising.

**Public Policy Impediments:**

1. **Lack of Updated Fair Housing Ordinance and a Local Fair Housing Enforcement Program.** The City has published display ads proclaiming the month of April as “Fair Housing Month” and stating their commitment to fair housing laws and support of programs that educate the public about the right to equal housing opportunities and to plan partnership efforts with other organizations to help assure every American of their right to fair housing. The City does have a Fair Housing Ordinance; however, the City has moved forward in taking steps to update our existing fair housing ordinance by working with the local Board of Realtors and an individual who had moved into our City with a background in fair housing in another state to work on this ordinance. Once this revised ordinance moves to “final” draft, it will be sent to City Council for approval. At one time the City did have a Fair Housing Officer, but that position was vacated when the Community Support Center shut down. The Center was originally set up when the City was seeing an influx of people especially those of the Hispanic race. By 2007, the Center was being used by so few people that funding this center did not make for good business practice. The director of that center also served as the Fair Housing Officer. To the best of our knowledge, Rogers has had very few fair housing complaints. In fact, only one complaint has been registered with the City since the analysis was done. That complaint was turned over to the Arkansas Fair Housing Commission. If the Commission has received any other complaints, the City has not been notified. The City, along with the Rogers Board of Realtors, has met to establish a committee for assuring that fair housing laws are complied with and educating the public regarding the rights and responsibilities afforded by fair housing law and discrimination. Fair housing fairs have been held in the City since the analysis was done. The City feels it is important for potential victims of housing and/or lending discrimination to be aware of fair housing issues that may constitute a violation and for them to know what can be done if they feel they have been discriminated against. The City also feels it is important for lenders, housing providers, and their agents to know their responsibilities and when they might be violating fair housing law. All complaints will be turned over to the Arkansas Fair Housing Commission.

**Banking, Finance, and Insurance Related Impediments:**

1. **Low Number of Loan Applications from Minorities.** The City has met with local banks and lending institutions concerning this impediment. In talking with these institutions, one of the main reasons there are so few loans by minorities, particularly the Hispanic people, is because they can’t provide the paperwork necessary to secure a home loan. They don’t have a payroll stub showing they are employed and they can’t provide any documentation showing they have filed Federal income tax forms to show proof of income. With banks and lending institutions having more restrictions on lending it is doubtful we will see this impediment corrected any time soon. The City’s only hope of impacting this barrier is to expand homebuyer outreach and educations efforts.

**Socio-Economic Impediments:**

1. **Income Disparities Among Racial Groups.** The City supports agencies that provide workforce development programs and continuing education courses to low-income and minority residents. The City does feel that incomes that are reflected by

the 2000 census, particularly the Hispanic population, could show lower incomes than what they actually area. Many of our Hispanic population provide a labor service for cash only. Employers of the City are encouraged to create training programs which target minority and low-income residents.

2. **Language and Cultural Barriers.** Bilingual City employees are available for meetings and outreach activities where an interpreter is needed. The City also employs several Hispanic employees. Information concerning the offering of Spanish classes is provided to all City employees. The City has provided funding for English as Second Language to all Hispanic children and their parents through the Rogers School District. In canvassing the job section of the classified ads, we are finding more and more employers are seeking additional employees who are bilingual. We are seeing a large amount of bilingual requests in the banking, medical and rental property fields. Having bilingual employees will provide information and assist our Hispanic population to discover the "American Dream" of homeownership.

4. **Describe Other Actions in Strategic Plan or Action Plan taken to Address Obstacles to Meeting Underserved Needs.**

The City of Rogers partnered with the Cities of Bentonville and Springdale in contracting with the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville campus to conduct a Homeless Needs Assessment for the City. This assessment is a tool that can be used by the City to determine the best way to meet the underserved needs of the homeless. The City continually strives to keep informed of the needs of its citizens. We have developed good relationships with the non-profits and organizations who serve the homeless, the disabled, the battered, and others put in positions that will not allow them to take care of themselves or their families. We are constantly looking for ways to improve the living environment of all our citizens.

5. **Leveraging Resources:**

a. **Identify Progress in Obtaining "Other" Public and Private Resources to Address Needs.**

The City does not receive any other monies for their programs other than CDBG funds.

b. **How Federal Resources from HUD Leveraged Other Public and Private Resources.**

By partnering with non-profits, Habitat for Humanity, Rebuilding Together Northwest Arkansas, and Office of Human Concern the City is able to meet more housing needs. The land and infrastructure grants received by Habitat for Humanity will provide an additional 15 homes in Rogers. Rehabilitation work and emergency repairs are provided individuals and families with income limitations that the City would not know about without our partnership with our non-profits.

c. **How Matching Grants were Satisfied.**

None of the City's CDBG funds expended in 2009 were used for matching grants by other agencies.

The City of Rogers is appreciative of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's funding that provides the City the resources to carry out their housing, public service, and public facility programs. The City contributes to the CDBG Program by providing the CDBG Administrator office space, utilities, janitorial services, phone, and other items necessary to carry out the CDBG Program.

## **Managing the Process**

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to ensure compliance with program and comprehensive planning requirements.

Program Year 2 CAPER Managing the Process response:

The City of Rogers has strived to successfully meet the goals of its Consolidated Plan and 2009 Action Plan. The CDBG entitlement funds are being expended in a timely manner. The City provided funds for six housing rehabilitations and an infrastructure project for a Habitat for Humanity subdivision that will have 15 homes constructed when completed. Four service projects were completed helping 4,115 persons have a suitable living environment by providing much needed services. Two public facility projects were completed that provided a suitable living environment for approximately 5,000 people. Two other public facility projects were in the design phase and once construction is completed many citizens will be affected by these two projects. One facility project is under construction and once that facility is completed over 100 adults with emotional, mental and physical limitations will have a new center to learn and build new skills, earn an income, and build close relationships. All of the facility projects are in the low income areas of Rogers. All of the CDBG-supported projects respond to genuine and compelling needs of the City's neediest residents.

The Community Development Block Grant Office works with non-profits to provide services and suitable housing to the City's low income individuals. The City worked with three non-profits to provide decent housing and two non-profits to provide a suitable living environment with needed services. The City also partnered with three non-profits to enhance public facilities that will provide services to low-income people as well as people with disabilities. The City is continuing to be involved with other Northwest Arkansas cities in addressing the emergency shelter needs as well as transitional/supportive housing to the homeless.

The City of Rogers' Planning and Transportation Department has a CDBG Administrator who is responsible for overseeing the CDBG Program and the development of the City's Annual Action Plan, CAPER, and Five-Year Consolidated Plan. The CDBG Administrator is responsible for administering the programs including their development, implementation, monitoring and reporting activities. The CDBG Administrator works with the citizens of Rogers, community and neighborhood organizations, non-profit housing agencies, as well as the private housing industry. The CDBG Administrator gathers data from citizens, meetings, and public hearings to encourage public comment and to use those views to establish priorities for housing and community development needs.

The CDBG Administrator communicates with several agencies in the development of the City's plans. Among those in 2009 were Habitat for Humanity, Rebuilding Together of Northwest Arkansas, Boys and Girls Club of Benton County (Rogers Unit), Ozark Regional Transit System, Northwest Arkansas Taxi, LLC, Adult

Development Center, Rogers Public School District, Office of Human Concern, Salvation Army, Samaritan House, and St. Francis House NWA, Inc., d/b/a Community Clinic at St. Francis House. The Administrator also visited with City Staff including the Mayor, Director of Planning and Transportation, Police Department,

Main Street Rogers and Director of Parks and Recreation. Visits were also made with local news media.

## **Citizen Participation**

1. Provide a summary of citizen comments.
2. In addition, the performance report provided to citizens must identify the Federal funds made available for furthering the objectives of the Consolidated Plan. For each formula grant program, the grantee shall identify the total amount of funds available (including estimated program income), the total amount of funds committed during the reporting period, the total amount expended during the reporting period, and the geographic distribution and location of expenditures. Jurisdictions are encouraged to include maps in describing the geographic distribution and location of investment (including areas of minority concentration). The geographic distribution and expenditure requirement may also be satisfied by specifying the census tracts where expenditures were concentrated.

\*Please note that Citizen Comments and Responses may be included as additional files within the CPMP Tool.

Program Year 2 CAPER Citizen Participation response:

The Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER) was made available to the public for review. The CAPER was placed on the City's website at [www.rogersark.com](http://www.rogersark.com) under City Administration, Community Development Grant Administrator on February 12, 2010. Hard copies were also placed at the following locations: City Hall, 301 West Chestnut; Rogers Public Library, 711 South Dixieland; The Adult Wellness Center, 2001 West Persimmon; and the Rogers Activity Center, 301 West Olive. A display ad was published in the City's local newspaper, The Morning News, on February 11, 2010 advising that the CAPER was available for public review and comment. Comments on the CAPER were accepted for 15 days beginning February 12, 2010 and ending February 26, 2010. A copy of the display ad is located at the Affidavit of Publication section of this report.

### **1. Provide a Summary of Citizen Comments.**

Any comments received concerning the 2009 Program Year will be made a part of the CAPER.

### **2. Federal Funds Available for Furthering the Objectives.**

The CAPER identifies Federal funds made available for furthering the objectives of the Consolidated Plan. For each formula grant program, the grantee shall identify the total amount of funds available, the total amount of funds committed during the reporting period, the total amount expended during the reporting period, and the geographic distribution and location of expenditures. Jurisdictions are encouraged to

include maps in describing the geographic distribution and location of investment (including areas of minority concentration). The geographic distribution and expenditure requirement may also be satisfied by specifying census tracts where expenditures were concentrated. Tabs located at the back of the CAPER provide maps showing the geographic distribution and locations when the dollars were confined to specific areas. Census tract information is also provided for some of the activities.

Project	Funds Available	Funds Expended	Carry Over Funds
Habit for Humanity	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 0.00
Rehabilitation Weatherization Emergency Repairs	109,626.37	14,964.82	94,661.55
Transportation Assistance Program	7,707.11	5,281.01	2,426.10
ESL Classes	4,202.13	4,202.13	0.00
Boys and Girls Club	17,390.00	17,390.00	0.00
Community Clinic	10,000.00	10,000.00	0.00
Non-Profit Center	50,000.00	50,000.00	0.00
Price Lane	12,544.00	5,364.00	7,180.00
Community Clinic Build-Out	10,000.00	10,000.00	0.00
Persimmon Street	197,085.90	40,558.58	156,527.02
Adult Development Center	234,000.00	135,219.19	98,780.81
Administration	60,000.00	53,347.19	\$6,652.81 dropped in line of credit

### Institutional Structure

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Institutional Structure response:

1. **Describe Actions Taken During the Last Year to Overcome Gaps in Institutional Structures and Enhance Coordination.**

The City of Rogers carried out its 2009 Action Plan through the use of Federal funds received from HUD. The Planning and Transportation Department through the City's Community Development Block Grant Coordinator and on behalf of the Mayor and City Council administers the CDBG Program. The Department works with several other municipal and non-profit agencies to successfully complete its CDBG-funded projects. The City of Rogers Parks and Recreation Department is involved in any improvement project involving municipal parks, playgrounds, athletic fields, and trails. The City Engineer, Project Engineer, and Street Department are involved in the development of plans and specifications and inspections for public facility improvement projects. The Building Department is involved in any housing rehab projects to ensure all work is done in compliance with City codes.

Although the City has major strengths with an economy and unemployment that is better than most areas of the Nation, quality health care facilities, a public education

system that has received national awards for its education programs, and a variety of local non-profits and social service agencies, the City does have gaps that affect quality of life for some of its citizens. One of these gaps is affordable home ownership opportunities. The City is continuing to work with housing developers and government agencies in the development of affordable housing. The City was advised in late 2009 that another phase of affordable housing for elderly is scheduled to begin construction in 2010.

## Monitoring

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Monitoring response:

### 1. **Describe How and the Frequency with Which Activities were Monitored.**

Monitoring is an ongoing process of reviewing the City's performance of meeting goals, ensuring compliance with regulatory and statutory requirements, and enhancing management capacity through technical assistance. It is the policy of the City to inspect all agencies that receive assistance under the CDBG Program on an annual basis to ensure compliance with applicable federal, state and local regulations. Monitoring procedures will vary depending on the type of project or activity undertaken. The policy is to ensure that the location receiving the assistance is in compliance with all conditions regarding the receipt of Federal funds. All projects and activities undertaken with CDBG funds will be consistent with the priorities and strategies in the Consolidated Plan.

**Public Facility Projects** – The City's infrastructure and drainage projects were monitored by the CDBG Administrator, Director of Planning and Transportation, Project Engineer, City inspectors, and the City's Street Superintendent. Anytime City personnel are used to provide labor and material on any public facility project, the Street Department Superintendent provides the CDBG Administrator all material invoices and labor expenditures by City work forces. When contract forces are used,

the City advertises for bids and all work is awarded using the competitive bidding process. A bid guarantee of five percent of bid is required from each bidder. Written contracts are written for all work performed. The accepted low bidder is required to furnish a performance and payment bond in the amount of 100% of the contract. All bid packets contain information on the prevailing wage rate schedule prescribed and mandated by Federal Labor Standards Provisions HUD-4010 and the most current General Decision Number. On site monitoring is done daily by inspectors. On site meetings are also held with the contractor, engineer, inspectors, Director of Planning and Transportation and/or City Project Engineer, and CDBG Administrator. Inspections and meetings are documented and made a part of the project file. If the project is a City parks project, the Director of Parks and Recreation will also be included in the on site meetings.

**Housing** – All housing rehabilitation projects are monitored by the CDBG Administrator and the City’s Building Inspections Department. Sometimes the City Engineer and/or Project Engineer will be made part of the monitoring team. Inspections are performed on any facility receiving CDBG funding until the completion of the project to ensure code compliances are met. On site inspections are also completed prior the start of the work. The City maintains copies of all appropriate paperwork required in land acquisitions. No displacement of individuals was associated with any home rehabilitation in Program Year 2009.

**Public Service** – Transportation Assistance Project is monitored by the CDBG Administrator. Each application is reviewed to ensure all recipients meet the income guidelines for assistance. The City has two service providers for this program— Ozark Regional Transit and Northwest Arkansas Taxi, LLC. Both transportation providers furnish a breakdown on each rider with dates picked up, where taken, and when returned to pickup location or home. The breakdown is furnished with each invoice the City receives. Through our monitoring system, the City has procedures in place to safeguard against program abuse. The EIS Program, Boys and Girls Club After School and Summer Programs, and the Community Clinic’s Medical Care Clinic are all monitored by the CDBG Administrator.

Two City employees, the Treasurer and the CDBG Administrator, are the overseers of the CDBG funds. The CDBG Administrator draws down the funds. The City Treasurer approves the funds. Receipt and disbursement of CDBG funds is a part of the City’s annual audit.

No files will be archived until inspected by the Arkansas HUD Office. Any citizen complaint will be addressed by the Mayor or CDBG Administrator within 30 days of receipt of the complaint.

## **2. Describe the Results of the Monitoring Including Any Improvements.**

Monitoring assures that Federal funds received by the City of Rogers complies with CDBG Program directives, and meets the objectives as set forth in the City’s Consolidated Plan. All agencies receiving funding entered into an agreement with the City of Rogers before funds were released. Monitoring also assured that work is done in accordance with plans and specifications and that all prevailing wage rates are met. Monitoring assures all safety requirements are met, and assures the City of no misuse or abuse of the City’s programs and funding.

## **3. Self-Evaluation.**

a. **Describe the Effect Programs have in Solving Neighborhood and Community Problems.**

The CDBG Program stays focused on the objectives in serving the needs of the community. The City strives to carry out all activities in a timely manner to see that goals are achieved, and expenditures do not exceed letter of credit disbursements. The City's projects include but are not limited to the improvement of older low and moderate-income neighborhoods, to provide public facilities for all citizens, and to provided needed services to our low income residents.

b. **Describe Progress in Meeting Priority Needs and Specific Objectives and Help Make Community's Vision of the Future a Reality.**

The drainage and street programs impact the citizens of Rogers immensely. Because of lack of drainage in the City's older neighborhoods, many of these homes deal with standing water on their property and in some cases, water stands under their houses. This can cause structural damage as well as create a health hazard during mosquito breeding. The street work not only provides a better means of travel, but by adding curb and gutter to the streets, the City is helping prevent this water accumulation. The City is also building sidewalks and providing handicap ramps at street intersections. All of the City's ongoing street construction projects were completed in 2008. The City presently has two street projects under design and a bid project that will start construction in February 2010. This project will be completed with CDBG-Recovery funds. One other street project will bid in Spring of 2010 with construction to start within 30 days of bid.

The Non-Profit Center provided a unique business, government, and community opportunity to develop a partnership for sustainability through the re-use of downtown buildings, increased operating efficiencies of the buildings and organizations, and increased service capacity for the nonprofit tenants. At present this facility houses a medical and dental clinic, a women's shelter which as 22 bedrooms and anticipates to serve more than 400 women and children this year, a facility that provides residential and support services for young women (ages 18-24) who are aging out of foster care, a facility that assists physically disabled people with counseling and job preparation, and a facility which provides counseling services to troubled youth. The Center is also preparing to receive other service entities at this location as space is remodeled and building utility consumption is reduced. By using funding to accomplish the goal of reducing utility consumption, this building will be more efficient, environmentally friendly and cost effective and will provide low-cost physical space for nonprofit organizations to provide services to low and moderate-income individuals.

The four Service Projects—Care Program (transportation assistance) ELS (English as Second Language), After School and Summer Care Program, and Community Clinic Medical Care Program all provide assistance to the City's low income citizens. The Care Program greatly improved the mobility of income eligible seniors and disabled citizens. This is a priority for the City because this is the only means of transportation for many of our riders. The ESL classes also helped the City foster trust and create a bridge between cultures while maintaining the present quality of life. The After School and Summer Care Program enabled parents to maintain their employment. Many of these parents could not afford to work as daycare would take all of their expendable income. The Medical Care Program provide free medical and

dental care to those children who would not have the opportunity to visit a doctor or dentist without this program.

Housing projects provided infrastructure, rehabilitation to include weatherization and emergency repair. The City has ordinances that provide for affordable housing and have approved variances to assist in the building of affordable housing. The partnership the City maintained with Habitat for Humanity has helped to provide affordable housing in Rogers. The funds spent in Program Year 2009 were the last phase to provide infrastructure for new lots to be used for constructing new Habitat homes. Once the Habitat Trails Project is complete, there will be 15 new homes in this subdivision. The City has also provided rehabilitation and emergency repair on six occupied and structurally sound homes in Rogers creating decent housing for 19 low income persons. The City's partnership with Rebuilding Together of Northwest Arkansas and Office of Human Concern assisted the City in locating the homes where work was accomplished. It appears the rehabilitation of our older homes is still the most efficient method of preserving our affordable housing stock. This also prevents many of our at risk homeowners from becoming homeless because of living in substandard housing. Our goal is to restore houses where they are improved, preserved, and sound resulting in safe, secure, healthy, and energy efficient by bringing the dwellings up to current building codes and energy conservation codes. CDBG funds are used to update plumbing, electrical, and/or heating and air conditioning if necessary. Funds are also used to provide insulation, new doors and windows, and roofs. Emergency repairs usually consist of heat and air repair, hot water heater replacements, and flooring repair. Repair work is generally associated with problems encountered after decay and/or damage and old equipment that will no longer work. Most are related to a health and safety issue. Most emergency repairs are performed on an immediate basis as the City does not find out about these problems until they are needed to be dealt with immediately.

The City spent considerable review time evaluating all proposed projects to prioritize needs and make sure all objectives and goals were met. Listed below is the percentage breakdown of how CDBG monies were used in Program Year 2009:

Housing – 17%  
Public Services – 9%  
Public Facilities – 61%  
Administration – 13%

c. **Describe How You Provided Decent Housing and a Suitable Living Environment and Expanded Economic Opportunity Principally for Low and Moderate-Income Persons.**

In 2009, the City did not provide economic opportunities for low and moderate-income persons with CDBG funds. As stated earlier, decent housing and a suitable living environment were accomplished by providing infrastructure for lots to be used for new affordable housing. The City also completed housing rehabilitation that helped preserve the City's affordable housing stock and approve the appearance of the older neighborhoods.

d. **Indicate any Activities Falling Behind Schedule.**

In Program Year 2009, we did fall behind schedule in our public facility projects. We did not get the designs completed on a couple of projects. Those should be ready to

start construction in 2010. The Adult Development Center finally got out of the ground and it is on schedule to complete by summer of 2010. We didn't spend all our housing rehab funds either. Most of the applications we received prior to August were processed and work completed. Due to some changes made in how the City would address housing rehabilitation in the future, the City did not act upon any applications until we had new procedures in place for housing rehabilitation. We were able to complete some of the applications by year end, but some applications were delayed until 2010 and those funds are being used to process those pending applications. The City also did not spend any of their emergency utility funds in 2009, but have carried that funding over for possible use in 2010. No requests were received in 2009 for utility assistance.

e. **Describe How Activities and Strategies Made an Impact on Identified Needs.**

Housing projects have had a large impact on identified needs. Not only does this have an impact on the home and homeowner, but housing rehabilitation has an impact on the neighborhood also. The owner takes great pride in the accomplishments of the rehabilitation. Some of the homeowners feel like they are living in a "new" home. The impact on partnering with Habitat for Humanity creates new homes for individuals and families that would probably never experience homeownership without this opportunity. The facility project at the Non-Profit Center also has a large impact on identified needs. This facility is allowing so many services needed by our low-income families and individuals to be located under one roof. With all the energy efficiency changes to this building, the agencies that supply these needs are seeing significant reduction in leased square footage costs allowing them more funds to spend on needs.

f. **Identify Indicators that Would Best Describe the Results.**

Increased homeownership and improved neighborhood appearance can be seen from the Habitat Trail project and the six rehabilitation projects accomplished in 2009. Increased services and lower rental rates have been accomplished at the Non-Profit Center.

g. **Identify Barriers that had a Negative Impact on Fulfilling the Strategies and Overall Vision.**

As far as barriers the City sees with fulfilling strategies and overall visions, I would say getting people to apply for the program was our biggest barrier in 2009. We did not spend all our housing rehabilitation funds by the end of the year. We are working hard to make people aware of the program. The barrier of contractors not willing to work small jobs has improved from previous years; however, we are still finding many of those who provide bids do not carry the necessary insurances, bonding and licenses needed to provide the work. Although the City does not build houses with any of their grant money, affordable housing is still considered a barrier to fulfilling strategies and overall vision. The contractors were more interested in building the larger homes and smaller homes just didn't get built for several years. With the downturn in the economy and plentiful supply of housing in this area, we have seen an increase in permits to build the smaller homes as well as interest from developers to build affordable housing especially condos. The last barrier would be funding the City receives. If we were to see an increase in qualified individuals and/or families for housing rehabilitation, we would still not be able to provide the

housing funding we would need without cutting other needed programs. The cap at 15% on service projects also hinders the City from providing more funding to provide various services to those in need.

h. **Identify Whether Major Goals are on Target and Discuss Reasons for Those that are not on Target.**

All major goals are on target. We are spending our funds as identified in our 2008-2012 Consolidated Plan.

i. **Identify Any Adjustments or Improvements to Strategies and Activities That Might Meet Your Needs More Effectively.**

The CDBG Administrator met with City Staff and non-profits and for-profit agencies. Public Hearings were held to gather input from the City's citizens. All of this information was used to assemble goals and objectives, performance measures and outcomes for the Five Year Consolidated Plan. All projects and activities undertaken with CDBG funds will be consistent with the priorities and strategies in the Consolidated Strategy and Plan. Projects will be monitored to ensure compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations. Draw-downs of CDBG funds will be monitored and CDBG account reconciling will be accomplished several times during the Program Year.

## **Lead-based Paint**

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Lead-based Paint response:

1. **Describe Actions Taken During the Last Year to Evaluate and Reduce Lead-Based Paint Hazards.**

According to the U. S. Census, there are 6,113 housing units built prior to 1978. It is estimated that approximately 30% of that total number could contain some levels of lead-based paint and are occupied by low-income individuals and families. Each home built before 1978 that will be part of the City's rehabilitation program, will be tested for lead-based paint. All materials identified as containing high levels of lead-based paint will be removed and replaced if possible or feasible, or it may be covered. All deteriorated lead-based paint identified in the risk assessment will be addressed during the rehabilitation of the dwelling. All construction material being removed from the home containing lead-based paint belongs to the contractor performing the work, and he/she is required to remove the material from the property. The dwelling is required to be tested if the work includes any demolition or major carpentry work and if the work involves painted surfaces. The results of the lead-based paint inspection will show where lead-based paint was detected and the concentration levels. The City must have possession of the lead-based paint inspection before work will proceed on the dwelling. Emergency work may be accomplished without having a lead-based paint inspection if the work will not affect the lead-based paint regulation such as roofing, exterior plumbing, some electrical and/or heating work. At the completion of a housing rehabilitation project, a lead-

based paint clearance inspection will be performed by an Arkansas certified and licensed lead-based paint clearance inspector.

The City has implemented a lead-based paint policy. Two of the City's building inspectors have completed lead-based paint certification training. The City has advised Rebuilding Together of Northwest Arkansas and Office of Human Concern HUD's policies on lead-based paint. The CDBG Administrator as well as the building inspectors who have attended lead-based training will work with these agencies to assure lead-based paint rules and regulations are clearly identified and followed.

## HOUSING

### Housing Needs

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

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Housing Needs response:

1. **Describe Actions Taken During the Last Year to Foster and Maintain Affordable Housing.**

The City provided funds to put in infrastructure to lots in the Habitat Trails Subdivision in 2009. These lots will be used for the construction of single-family, owner-occupied housing. When this project is completed, there will be 15 new homes built in this Habitat for Humanity Subdivision. The City provided funds for the rehabilitation and emergency repair of six homes in Rogers.

### Specific Housing Objectives

1. Evaluate progress in meeting specific objective of providing affordable housing, including the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income renter and owner households comparing actual accomplishments with proposed goals during the reporting period.
2. Evaluate progress in providing affordable housing that meets the Section 215 definition of affordable housing for rental and owner households comparing actual accomplishments with proposed goals during the reporting period.
3. Describe efforts to address "worst-case" housing needs and housing needs of persons with disabilities.

Program Year 2 CAPER Specific Housing Objectives response:

1. **Evaluate Progress in Meeting Specific Objectives of Providing Housing, Including the Number of Extremely Low-Income, Low-Income, and Moderate-Income Renter and Owner Households Comparing Actual Accomplishments with Proposed Goals During the Reporting Period.**

The CDBG Program’s definition of affordable housing includes housing already owned and occupied by an individual or family whose total income, adjusted for family size, is 80% or less of the area median income. All of the homeowners assisted in 2009 had incomes below 80% of the area median, adjusted for family size. Two household incomes were extremely low and four household incomes were low.

The City is aware of the need for more affordable housing and will continue to search for affordable lots to acquire and donate to Habitat for Humanity for construction of affordable homes. The City will also continue to assist with infrastructure costs, when needed, on lots to assist Habitat for Humanity in the development of new houses. The City will also continue to work with developers interested in developing affordable housing areas. Rehabilitation of existing homes will continue. The rehabilitation projects will bring homes up to energy conservation standards, current plumbing, electrical, and HVAC codes. The City will continue to support non-profit agencies that provide programs to enhance the construction of new affordable housing as well as providing labor and material for existing homes. The City has ordinances and zoning codes that allow for affordable housing. The City’s Comprehensive Growth Plan also has several areas for affordable housing that have not been developed.

The charts listed below are based on the 2000 census as this information was not part of the 2006 special census completed in the City.

Extremely Low	Low	Low-Moderate
2,027 (5%)	2,098 (5%)	1,858 (4%)

Owner-Occupied	Renter-Occupied	Vacant Housing Units
8,855	5,150	831

% of Income Costs for Owner Occupancy		% of Income Costs for Rental Occupancy	
Less than 15%	40.5	Less than 15%	22.9
15% to 19%	19.5	15% to 19%	20.4
20% to 24%	14.7	20% to 24%	12.1
25% to 29%	7.9	25% to 29%	9.5
30% to 34%	5.5	30% to 34%	7.2
35% and Over	11.5	35% and Over	11.5

In Program Year 2009, the City provided rehabilitation and repair work on six existing homes in Rogers. The City recognized that a gap does exist in affordable homeownership opportunities and is taking opportunities to work with developers to build affordable housing within the City of Rogers. Homeowner seminars by banks, lending agencies, and realtors have been held within the City to educate the community about availability of funds for securing home loans; however, we are seeing less and less funding available for home purchases due to tougher restrictions qualifying individuals for loans.

**2. Evaluate Progress in Providing Affordable Housing that Meets the Section 215 Definition of Affordable Housing for Rental and Owner Household Comparing Actual Accomplishments with Proposed Goals During the Reporting Period.**

The City does not use CDBG funds on rental properties. As stated earlier, the City

didn't quite meet its housing goals for number of rehabilitations planned for 2009. As stated earlier, lack of qualified applications contributed to our not meeting that goal. We did decrease those number for 2010, but only by a small amount. Rehabilitation housing projects the City did in 2009 were handled directly by the City or in partnership with Rebuilding Together of Northwest Arkansas and Office of Human Concern.

3. **Describe Efforts to Address "Worst-Care" Housing Needs and Housing Needs of Persons with Disabilities.**

Construction of affordable single family dwellings would be the worse case need in Rogers. The City's CDBG Program does not provide funding for the construction of affordable housing; however, the City's funds are used for land acquisition and infrastructure for new homes. The City's priority is keeping the affordable housing stock in good condition. The City does address the needs of disabled homeowners and has in past years used funding for structural barriers and handicapped showers/ramps for the disabled.

### **Public Housing Strategy**

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Public Housing Strategy response:

1. **Describe Actions Taken During the Last Year to Improve Public Housing and Resident Initiatives.**

The City of Rogers did not participate in any kind of public housing with their 2009 CDBG funds.

### **Barriers to Affordable Housing**

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Barriers to Affordable Housing response:

1. **Describe Actions Taken During the Last Year to Eliminate Barriers to Affordable Housing.**

The new construction approach is no longer hindered by the existence of a strong high-end market and lack of affordable builders in the residential market. The only high-end housing construction is the single home contracted by a single owner. Many of the builders in the area have left and/or have seen their businesses closed or filed bankruptcy because of financial conditions. Some of the builders who survived the downturn in the economy are looking at affordable housing as a way to continue residential housing construction. The City has implemented zoning ordinances which allow for affordable housing. Setback variances have also been granted to help the builder develop smaller parcels of land for building homes in the \$90,000 to \$110,000 range and yet still be profitable. It should be noted, though, that price range is still not affordable for some of the City's lower income families.

## **HOME/ American Dream Down Payment Initiative (ADDI)**

1. Assessment of Relationship of HOME Funds to Goals and Objectives
  - a. Evaluate progress made toward meeting goals for providing affordable housing using HOME funds, including the number and types of households served.
2. HOME Match Report
  - a. Use HOME Match Report HUD-40107-A to report on match contributions for the period covered by the Consolidated Plan program year.
3. HOME MBE and WBE Report
  - a. Use Part III of HUD Form 40107 to report contracts and subcontracts with Minority Business Enterprises (MBEs) and Women's Business Enterprises (WBEs).
4. Assessments
  - a. Detail results of on-site inspections of rental housing.
  - b. Describe the HOME jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions.
  - c. Describe outreach to minority and women owned businesses.

Program Year 2 CAPER HOME/ADDI response:

The City of Rogers does not receive funds from Arkansas Department Finance Authority (ADFA) HOME Investment Partnership Program.

## **HOMELESS**

### **Homeless Needs**

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

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Homeless Needs response:

#### **1. Identify Actions Taken to Address Needs of Homeless Persons.**

The City of Rogers continues their commitment to decent and affordable housing to address the homelessness situation and those at risk of becoming homeless. The City partnered with other cities in Northwest Arkansas in the development of a Homeless Needs Assessment. That assessment was completed by the University of Arkansas in the summer of 2007. The City also became a member in 2006 of a coalition of Northwest Arkansas cities and agencies who have teamed together to set a goal of eliminating homelessness.

2. **Identify Actions to Help Homeless Persons Make the Transition to Permanent Housing and Independent Living.**

There are several organizations that exist in Northwest Arkansas that serve families or persons who are homeless or at a risk of becoming homeless. No funding was requested by those organizations in 2009. Although no actions were taken in 2009 to meet these transition needs, the completion of the Homeless Needs Assessment for the City has been a tool to enable the City to be better prepared to assist the homeless to make the transition to permanent housing and independent living. The Mayor and the CDBG Administrator met in 2010 with individuals who are interested in bringing transitional living facilities to our City to serve the needs of the homeless in this section of the State. We will stay involved with this and the City is committed to assist in anyway we can to meet homelessness needs.

3. **Identify New Federal Resources Obtained from Homeless SuperNOFA.**

The City did not receive any funds from the Homeless SuperNOFA.

### **Specific Homeless Prevention Elements**

1. Identify actions taken to prevent homelessness.

Program Year 2 CAPER Specific Housing Prevention Elements response:

1. **Identify Actions Taken to Prevent Homelessness.**

The cities of Springdale, Bentonville, and Rogers contracted with the University of Arkansas's Fayetteville Campus to conduct a Homeless Needs Assessment to identify the size of the homeless population and determine what their needs are. The University provided the City of Rogers with this completed assessment in the summer of 2007. The results of this assessment were considered in the preparation of the City's Five Year (2008-2012) Consolidated Plan and were used in the preparation of the City Annual Plan for 2009.

### **Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG)**

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

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

Program Year 2 CAPER ESG response:

The City of Rogers did not receive ESG funds from the Federal Government.

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

### Community Development

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

1. Assessment of Relationship of CDBG Funds to Goals and Objectives
  - a. Assess use of CDBG funds in relation to the priorities, needs, goals, and specific objectives in the Consolidated Plan, particularly the highest priority activities.
  - b. Evaluate progress made toward meeting goals for providing affordable housing using CDBG funds, including the number and types of households served.
  - c. Indicate the extent to which CDBG funds were used for activities that benefited extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons.
2. Changes in Program Objectives
  - a. Identify the nature of and the reasons for any changes in program objectives and how the jurisdiction would change its program as a result of its experiences.
3. Assessment of Efforts in Carrying Out Planned Actions
  - a. Indicate how grantee pursued all resources indicated in the Consolidated Plan.
  - b. Indicate how grantee provided certifications of consistency in a fair and impartial manner.
  - c. Indicate how grantee did not hinder Consolidated Plan implementation by action or willful inaction.

4. For Funds Not Used for National Objectives
  - a. Indicate how use of CDBG funds did not meet national objectives.
  - b. Indicate how did not comply with overall benefit certification.
5. Anti-displacement and Relocation – for activities that involve acquisition, rehabilitation or demolition of occupied real property
  - a. Describe steps actually taken to minimize the amount of displacement resulting from the CDBG-assisted activities.
  - b. Describe steps taken to identify households, businesses, farms or nonprofit organizations who occupied properties subject to the Uniform Relocation Act or Section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, and whether or not they were displaced, and the nature of their needs and preferences.
  - c. Describe steps taken to ensure the timely issuance of information notices to displaced households, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations.
6. Low/Mod Job Activities – for economic development activities undertaken where jobs were made available but not taken by low- or moderate-income persons
  - a. Describe actions taken by grantee and businesses to ensure first consideration was or will be given to low/mod persons.
  - b. List by job title of all the permanent jobs created/retained and those that were made available to low/mod persons.
  - c. If any of jobs claimed as being available to low/mod persons require special skill, work experience, or education, provide a description of steps being taken or that will be taken to provide such skills, experience, or education.
7. Low/Mod Limited Clientele Activities – for activities not falling within one of the categories of presumed limited clientele low and moderate income benefit
  - a. Describe how the nature, location, or other information demonstrates the activities benefit a limited clientele at least 51% of whom are low- and moderate-income.
8. Program income received
  - a. Detail the amount of program income reported that was returned to each individual revolving fund, e.g., housing rehabilitation, economic development, or other type of revolving fund.
  - b. Detail the amount repaid on each float-funded activity.
  - c. Detail all other loan repayments broken down by the categories of housing rehabilitation, economic development, or other.
  - d. Detail the amount of income received from the sale of property by parcel.
9. Prior period adjustments – where reimbursement was made this reporting period for expenditures (made in previous reporting periods) that have been disallowed, provide the following information:
  - a. The activity name and number as shown in IDIS;
  - b. The program year(s) in which the expenditure(s) for the disallowed activity(ies) was reported;
  - c. The amount returned to line-of-credit or program account; and
  - d. Total amount to be reimbursed and the time period over which the reimbursement is to be made, if the reimbursement is made with multi-year payments.
10. Loans and other receivables

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Community Development response:

1. **Assessment of Relationship of CDBG Funds to Goals and Objectives.**
- a.b., and c. **Assess Use of CDBG Funds in Relation to the Priorities, Needs, Goals, and Specific Objectives in the Consolidated Plan, Particularly the Highest Priority Activities, Evaluation Progress Made Toward Meeting Goals for Providing Affordable Housing Using CDBG Funds, Including the Number and Types of Household Served, and Indicate the Extent to which CDBG Funds were Used for Activities that Benefited Extremely Low-Income, Low-Income, and Moderate-Income Persons.**

**Public Facilities Objectives – 61% of Funds**

1. Objective 1, Revitalization Area Infrastructure Improvements. Many areas located in the older sections of the City can not adequately collect surface

accumulation and transport this accumulation away from our citizen's homes. No drainage structures in these areas have ever been built resulting in "pooling" of water on private properties and City roadways. These areas are located in extremely low-income census tracts in the City. It is anticipated over 3,600 people will be affected by the construction completed drainage projects. The City used 19% of their public facility dollars expended in 2009 on design for these future drainage projects.

Persimmon Street project, a low income target area, will consist of curb and gutter on portions of the street where curb and gutter have not been placed. Sidewalks with handicap ramps will be placed along one side of the street. Because the road will be considered a complete rebuild, paving will also be done in the area. Once completed the drainage in this area will not only benefit this area but will impact the drainage in surrounding areas. The City used 17% of their public facility dollars spent in 2009 on this design project.

Price Lane is located in the southeast area of Rogers and is located in a low to low/mod section of town. Currently traffic in the area is routed to a narrow, non-curbed two lane road. With the construction of many new homes and the location of three schools, the City is proposing to build a new three-lane road with curb and gutter. The completion of this road will relieve traffic for the three schools located on First Street and Old Wire Road and will provide access to Hwy 71-B for the low to low-mod homes in the area. The City is using CDBG grant money for the design of this project with construction funding coming from the City. This project is located in one of the low income census tracts in the City. Once the project is completed, it is anticipated over 1,000 people a day will use this new street. The City used 2% of their public facility dollars spent in 2009 on this project.

2. Objective 2, Adult Development Center. The Adult Development Center provides service to over 100 adults living with emotional, mental and physical limitations. The Center operates a sheltered workshop where clients actively learn new skills, build close relationships, and provides business and industry with a reliable off-line project workforce. The workshop provides vocational training, productive sheltered employment and competitive job placement for disabled adults. The Adult Development Center has built a strong reputation of excellence and professionalism in the community. Industrial partners look to the Adult Development Center time and time again for timely, high-quality results. The goals of the Center are to foster independent living through the development of life, work, and social skills, prepare clients to become a part of, rather than apart from the community and provide opportunities for a more fulfilling and productive life. The Adults Development Center's current facility is no longer adequate to serve its clients. The workshop is cramped, the building is not configured well, there are not enough ADA accessible restrooms, and there is inadequate storage. The Center requested funding to provide the infrastructure for the facility's recently purchased site to provide a new training facility and campus for adults with disabilities. Construction should be completed on this facility by early summer 2010 and provide a place where the City's mentally and physically challenged adults will have a place to train and work providing independent living and quality of life. The City used 56% of their public facility dollars spent in 2009 on this project.

3. Objective 3, Community Clinic Build-Out. The Community Clinic is located in the new Non-Profit Center. The key beneficiaries of this facility will be those families in need. The move to this facility will enable the clinic to have more exam

rooms, expand their services, and improve access for both medical and dental care for low income residents of Rogers. The City used 4% of their public facility dollars spent in 2009 on this objective.

4. Objective 4, Non-Profit Center. The Non-Profit Center provides a unique business, government, and community opportunity to develop a partnership for sustainability through the re-use of downtown buildings, increased operating efficiencies of the buildings and organizations, and increased service capacity for the nonprofit tenants. This facility provides many services that are needed by our lower income citizens. To accomplish the goal of reducing utility consumption, all lighting in this facility will be replaced with energy-efficient retrofits. Steam boilers with hot water systems will need to be replaced. All heating and air conditioning systems will need to be upgraded. Funding for 2009 was used in these areas to make this facility more efficient, environmentally friendly and cost effective. This, in turn, will provide low-cost physical space for organizations to provide services. The City used 21% of their public facility dollars spent in 2009 on this objective.

### **Housing Objectives – 17% of Funds**

1. Objective 1, Infrastructure for New Housing. Partnering with Habitat for Humanity is the only means the City has of providing new affordable housing with their CDBG funds. As many as 45 persons will be in a new Habitat home once this project is completed. The City used 77% of their housing dollars spent in 2009 on this objective.

2. Objective 2, Housing Rehabilitation and Emergency Repairs. The City undertook six homes for either rehabilitation or emergency repair. All of the individuals who received CDBG funding on their homes were considered low-income. A total of 19 individuals were helped by this program. The City used 23% of their housing dollars spent in 2009 on this objective.

### **Public Service Objectives – 9% of Funds**

1. Objective 1, Transportation Assistance. The City provided free rides in 2009 for 47 low income elderly and disabled citizens. The City used 15% of their public service dollars spent in 2009 on this objective.

2. Objective 2, ESL Classes. Because of the increasing Hispanic population in Rogers over the years, CDBG funds have been used to provide ESL (English as Second Language) classes in four of the Rogers Public Schools. These classes are held after school and in the evenings. Approximately 150 parents and children were enrolled in the ESL Program in 2009. The City used 11% of their public service dollars spent in 2009 on this objective.

3. Objective 3, Boy's and Girl's Club of Benton County, Inc. (Rogers Unit). This project provided an after school and summer care program for low income children. A safe and developmentally appropriate place for these children provided character education, physical fitness, financial education, leadership and community services training as well as field trips and special events allowing their parents to maintain their employment to provide basic needs for their families. This objective provided service to 118 children. The City used 47% of their public service dollars spent in 2009 on this objective.

4. Objective 4, Community Clinic. This project purchased medical and dental equipment and supplies to provide free medical and dental services to 3,800 low income children. The City used 27% of their public service dollars spent in 2009 on this objective.

The 2009 housing goals were to assist Habitat for Humanity by providing funding to be used for infrastructure for building Habitat homes and to provide home rehabilitation and/or emergency repairs within the City of Rogers. The City felt they met their goals with the projects we completed in 2009.

All monies used in 2009 were used on extremely low to low-moderate income families.

2. **Changes in Program Objectives.**

a. **Identify the Nature and the Reasons for Any Changes in Program Objectives and how the Jurisdiction would Change its Program as a Result of this Experience.**

There were no changes in program objectives for the 2009 Program Year.

3. **Assessment of Efforts in Carrying Out Planned Actions.**

a. **Indicate how Grantee Pursued All Resources Indicated in the Consolidated Plan.**

The City's 2009 Action Plan called for a partnership with Habitat for Humanity, Rebuilding Together of Northwest Arkansas, and Office of Human Concern to meet housing needs. The Plan also called for a partnership with the new Non-Profit Center, Community Clinic and Adult Development Center to not only enhance public facilities but increase much needed services for the City's low-income families and individuals. The City also partnered with The Rogers School District and the Boys and Girls Club of Benton County (Rogers Unit) to provide services that greatly impacted low-income children. One project allowed for conservation of energy resources.

b. **Indicate how Grantee Provided Certifications of Consistency in a Fair and Impartial Manner.**

All agencies who applied for CDBG funding were evaluated by the CDBG Administrator, the City of Rogers' Planning and Transportation Director and Mayor. Each request was evaluated on amount requested and the number of people directly benefited by the funding. All home rehabilitations were evaluated by the CDBG Administrator and Board of Directors and Staff of Rebuilding Together of Northwest Arkansas and Office of Human Concern. The main concern of each evaluation was the needs of each home to be safe, warm, and dry. Homes were also evaluated on mortgage payments being current and made on a timely basis, the needs of the applicants, and the ownership of the home seeking assistance. By working together with these agencies, paperwork duplication was eliminated and the City was able to make certain CDBG funding was not being used when there were other funding available through these organizations to do this work.

c. **Indicate how Grantee did not Hinder Consolidated Plan Implementation**

**by Action or Willful Inaction.**

The City followed its Consolidated Plan to the best of its abilities and within the funding allocation.

4. **Funds not Used for National Objectives.**

- a. & b. **Indicate how Use of CDBG Funds did not Meet National Objectives and Indicate how they did not Comply with Overall Benefit Certification.**

All activities in the 2009 Program Year met at least one of the national objectives. All CDBG funds expensed in 2009 complied with the overall benefit. The City is committed to continuing to meet national objectives.

5. **Anti-Displacement and Relocation – for Activities that Involve Acquisition.**

- a., b., & c. **Describe Steps Actually Taken to Minimize the Amount of Displacement Resulting from the CDBG-Assisted Activities, Describe Steps Taken to Identify Households, Businesses, Farms or Nonprofit Organizations who Occupied Properties Subject to the Uniform Relocation Act of Section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as Amended, and Whether or not they were Displaced, and the Nature of Their Needs and Preferences, and Describe Steps Taken to Ensure the Timely Issuance of Information Notices to Displaced Households, Businesses, Farms, or Nonprofit Organizations.**

No CDBG-funded activities involved the acquisition or demolition of occupied real property.

6. **Low/Mod Job Activities.**

- a., b., & c. **Describe Actions Taken by Grantee and Businesses to Ensure First Consideration was or will be Given to Low/Mod Person. List by Job Title of all the Permanent Jobs Created/Retained and those that were Made Available to Low/Mod Persons, and if any of Jobs Claimed as being Available to Low/Mod Persons Require Special Skill, Work Experience, or Education. Provide A Description of Steps being Taken or that will be Taken to Provide Such Skills, Experience, or Education.**

The City of Rogers did not undertake any economic development activities that directly resulted in quantifiable new jobs.

7. **Low/Mod Limited Clientele Activities.**

- a. **Describe how the Nature, Location, or Other Information Demonstrates the Activities that Benefit a Limited Clientele at Least 51% of whom are Low-and-Moderate Income.**

To qualify for the City's Housing Programs, all applications must own and occupy a single family dwelling within the City limits and be extremely-low/moderate income based on HUD guidelines, adjusted for family size. Occupant's incomes are verified.

All applications who receive assistance through the City's Public Service Programs meet HUD's income guidelines, adjusted for family size. The City fosters good working relationships with our non-profit agencies that provide services to the low income individuals and families in our City.

8. **Program Income Received.**

The City of Rogers does not receive program income.

9. **Prior Period Adjustments.**

The City of Rogers did not make any prior period adjustments.

10. **Loans and Other Receivables.**

The City does not make loans or receive any income.

11. **Lump Sum Agreements.**

The City of Rogers did not have any lump sum agreements. The CDBG funds awarded to the City is drawn down monthly as needed.

12. **Housing Rehabilitation.**

a. & b. **Identify the Type of Program and Number of Projects/Units Completed for Each Program and Provide the Total CDBG Funds Involved in the Program.**

The City of Rogers did all their housing rehabilitation projects through the City, Rebuilding together of Northwest Arkansas and Office of Human Concern. Six homes were rehabbed or received emergency repairs in 2009 at a total cost of \$14,964.82.

c. **Detail Other Public and Private Funds Involved in the Project.**

There were no public or private funds involved in any of the City's 2009 CDBG projects.

13. **Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies.**

The City of Rogers does not have a HUD-approved neighborhood revitalization strategy.

## **Antipoverty Strategy**

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to reduce the number of persons living below the poverty level.

Program Year 2 CAPER Antipoverty Strategy response:

1. **Describe Actions Taken During the Last Year to Reduce the Number of Persons Living Below the Poverty Level.**

The 2000 U. S. Census determined that 12.8% of Rogers' residents lived in poverty. Many of these people were families with female householder and with children under the age of five. The next largest group was families with related children under 18 years of age. Seniors made up the smallest group of people. The City recognizes that in order to reduce the number of households earning income below the poverty level, we not only need educated and trained people, but we must have the positions available in our work force. Millions of dollars have been spent on the City's infrastructure in past years to attract development. Many new jobs have been created by the development during the construction phases and hiring of employees as retail and restaurants opened, however, as this construction boom slowed down, so did the jobs. Rogers does have a stable Government and an excellent health care and school system. A new \$145,000,000 hospital opened in 2008 generating the construction of new medical offices and centers in this area. A new Cancer Treatment Facility should start construction in 2010 bringing this area a state-of-the-art cancer treatment facility. The City works with local businesses to stimulate business and economic development in impoverished areas of the City as much of the City's industrial area lies in low income census tracts. The local Chamber of Commerce works hard to bring economic development to our City.

## NON-HOMELESS SPECIAL NEEDS

### Non-homeless Special Needs

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

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

Program Year 2 CAPER Non-homeless Special Needs response:

1. **Identify Actions Taken to Address Special Needs of Persons that are not Homeless but Require Supportive Housing.**

The 2000 U. S. Census counted 4,343 non-elderly people with a disability in the City of Rogers and 2,141 elderly people with a disability living in the City of Rogers. Most of these disabilities were physical. While 50% of those with a disability were employed, 24% of those suffering from a disability were living below the poverty level. There was no direct action taken during 2009 to address special needs of persons that require supportive housing. There are several organizations existing that serve families or individuals with special needs who require supportive housing. These organizations provide a wide range of services.

### Specific HOPWA Objectives

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

1. Overall Assessment of Relationship of HOPWA Funds to Goals and Objectives  
Grantees should demonstrate through the CAPER and related IDIS reports the

progress they are making at accomplishing identified goals and objectives with HOPWA funding. Grantees should demonstrate:

- a. That progress is being made toward meeting the HOPWA goal for providing affordable housing using HOPWA funds and other resources for persons with HIV/AIDS and their families through a comprehensive community plan;
  - b. That community-wide HIV/AIDS housing strategies are meeting HUD's national goal of increasing the availability of decent, safe, and affordable housing for low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS;
  - c. That community partnerships between State and local governments and community-based non-profits are creating models and innovative strategies to serve the housing and related supportive service needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families;
  - d. That through community-wide strategies Federal, State, local, and other resources are matched with HOPWA funding to create comprehensive housing strategies;
  - e. That community strategies produce and support actual units of housing for persons living with HIV/AIDS; and finally,
  - f. That community strategies identify and supply related supportive services in conjunction with housing to ensure the needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families are met.
2. This should be accomplished by providing an executive summary (1-5 pages) that includes:
- a. Grantee Narrative
    - i. Grantee and Community Overview
      - (1) A brief description of your organization, the area of service, the name of each project sponsor and a broad overview of the range/type of housing activities and related services
      - (2) How grant management oversight of project sponsor activities is conducted and how project sponsors are selected
      - (3) A description of the local jurisdiction, its need, and the estimated number of persons living with HIV/AIDS
      - (4) A brief description of the planning and public consultations involved in the use of HOPWA funds including reference to any appropriate planning document or advisory body
      - (5) What other resources were used in conjunction with HOPWA funded activities, including cash resources and in-kind contributions, such as the value of services or materials provided by volunteers or by other individuals or organizations
      - (6) Collaborative efforts with related programs including coordination and planning with clients, advocates, Ryan White CARE Act planning bodies, AIDS Drug Assistance Programs, homeless assistance programs, or other efforts that assist persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families.
    - ii. Project Accomplishment Overview
      - (1) A brief summary of all housing activities broken down by three types: emergency or short-term rent, mortgage or utility payments to prevent homelessness; rental assistance; facility based housing, including development cost, operating cost for those facilities and community residences

- (2) The number of units of housing which have been created through acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction since 1993 with any HOPWA funds
  - (3) A brief description of any unique supportive service or other service delivery models or efforts
  - (4) Any other accomplishments recognized in your community due to the use of HOPWA funds, including any projects in developmental stages that are not operational.
- iii. Barriers or Trends Overview
    - (1) Describe any barriers encountered, actions in response to barriers, and recommendations for program improvement
    - (2) Trends you expect your community to face in meeting the needs of persons with HIV/AIDS, and
    - (3) Any other information you feel may be important as you look at providing services to persons with HIV/AIDS in the next 5-10 years
  - b. Accomplishment Data
    - i. Completion of CAPER Performance Chart 1 of Actual Performance in the provision of housing (Table II-1 to be submitted with CAPER).
    - ii. Completion of CAPER Performance Chart 2 of Comparison to Planned Housing Actions (Table II-2 to be submitted with CAPER).

Program Year 2 CAPER Specific HOPWA Objectives response:

The City of Rogers does not receive HOPWA funds from the Federal Government.

## OTHER NARRATIVE

Include any CAPER information that was not covered by narratives in any other section.

Program Year 2 CAPER Other Narrative response:

The 2009 Program Year for the City of Rogers was successful. Almost all program areas were met or exceeded the goals and objectives laid out in the 2008-2012 Consolidated Plan and the 2009 Annual Action Plan. City staff, City Council, and area non-profit organizations worked hard to meet the needs of the City's low-and-moderate income residents.