



**Tulsa County HOME Consortium
&
Tulsa County
Community Development Block Grant
Urban County**

**FIVE YEAR CONSOLIDATED PLAN
2013-2017**

&

**Fiscal Year 2013
ANNUAL ACTION PLAN
Period July 1, 2013- June 30, 2014**

October 2013



Executive Summary

ES-05 Executive Summary - 91.200(c), 91.220(b)

1. Introduction

The Tulsa County HOME Consortium, formed in 1994, serves 24 members governments in Northeastern Oklahoma in a geographic area that covers 5,291 square miles. The Consortium includes 18 cities and 6 counties with a total 2011 population of 506,495. The Consortium includes rapidly growing suburban areas adjacent to the corporate city limits of Tulsa, small communities under 5,000 population, as well as the unincorporated rural areas of six counties. The Tulsa County Community Development Block Grant Urban County, formed in 2008, is comprised of unincorporated Tulsa County and ten Tulsa County incorporated places, including the City of Sapulpa (whose city limits include a portion of Tulsa County). The City of Tulsa is not a member of the CDBG Urban County. This five year Consolidated Plan outlines the activities which will be undertaken during the 2013-2017 program years, beginning July 1, 2013 and ending June 30, 2017 using federal funds allocated to the Tulsa County HOME Consortium and the Tulsa County CDBG Urban County Entitlement program. Programs and activities described in this Consolidated Plan will principally benefit low and moderate income populations of the service areas of the HOME Consortium and the Urban County.

2. Summary of the objectives and outcomes identified in the Plan

Based on an assessment of needs across the Consortium region, priorities were selected to focus HOME and CDBG funding. Proposed goals and objectives were developed to address those priorities.

HOME

Priority Need: Availability of Rental and Owner-Occupied Housing

Goal: New Construction of Single Family Homes

Goal: Homeownership Opportunities for Low Income

Objective: Creation of affordable infill rental and owner occupied housing units for low income households

Outcome: Homeowner Housing Added: 4 Household Housing Unit

Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 60 Households Assisted

Priority Need: Rental Housing for Elderly Households

Goal: Rental Housing for Elderly

Objective: Provision of affordable rental housing and supportive services within one complex to permit elderly to continue to lead independent life styles.

Outcome: Rental units constructed: 120 Household Housing Units

CDBG

Priority Need: Sustainability of Community

Goal: Construction of Public Facilities and Services

Goal: Construction of Public Infrastructure

Objective: Communities participating in the CDBG Urban County will seek to improve the quality and increase the quantity of public improvements and services for low income residents within their jurisdictions.

Outcome: Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit:

21385 Persons Assisted

Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit:

19925 Persons Assisted

Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit:

14285 Persons Assisted

3. Evaluation of past performance

In recent years, significant contributions have been made by the HOME Consortium to supply new affordable housing units to the member governments. This includes funding each year for the construction of affordable rental units for the elderly, construction of innovative single-family housing units to promote homeownership, homebuyer assistance. To date, eleven MTHC Consortium cities have benefited from the construction of elderly congregate housing projects that were financed in part with the Consortium HOME funds. Two member communities, Sapulpa and Broken Arrow, have two HOME-funded elderly projects in their cities. CHDO development has created affordable new single-family units in Bartlesville, Claremore, Coweta, Sapulpa, and unincorporated Rogers County. Homebuyer Assistance has been provided to all 24 member governments by CHDO partners. Fourteen out of 18 Consortium cities and two counties have received the Owner-occupied Housing Rehabilitation Program.

The City of Broken Arrow has utilized CDBG funds for numerous public works projects that have benefited low to moderate income residents of the residential neighborhoods in the Central City. Several social service agencies have also received CDBG funding for their programs that serve the special needs populations in the City of Broken Arrow.

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

Each of the member governments in the CDBG Urban County held public hearings to determine which projects to develop within their respective communities. HOME Consortium CHDOs were consulted to develop affordable housing activities based on area needs. The Tulsa County-Tulsa-Broken Arrow Continuum of Care members played a key role in the homelessness discussion.

5. Summary of public comments

No public comments were received in writing, although a limited number of citizens attended public hearings in local jurisdictions.

6. Summary of comments or views not accepted and the reasons for not accepting them

No comments were received.

7. Summary

Based on public hearings and input from city staff, each jurisdiction developed a responsive project for funding and made an application for project funding to the urban County.

TULSA COUNTY
HOME CONSORTIUM
MEMBERS FY 2010-2012

LOCAL UNIT OF GOVERNMENT	2010 POPULATION**
Tulsa County (lead entity)	*34,942
Creek County	*33,481
Osage County	*23,802
Rogers County	*50,631
Wagoner County	*33,072
Washington County	*9,864
Broken Arrow	98,850
Bartlesville	35,750
Owasso	28,915
Bixby	20,884
Sapulpa	20,544
Sand Springs	18,906
Claremore	18,581
Jenks	16,924
Glenpool	10,808
Coweta	9,943
Skiatook	7,397
Catoosa	7,151
Collinsville	5,606
Bristow	4,222
Pawhuska	3,584
Hominy	3,565
Drumright	2,907
Sperry	1,206
Total	501,535

*Unincorporated population of the County

**2010 Census Data-released April, 2011

Tulsa County
CDBG Urban County Designation
Population Summary

Place/Geographic Area	Tulsa County part	Part in other Counties	Total Population
City of Bixby	20,706	178	20,884
City of Broken Arrow	80,634	18,216	98,850
City of Collinsville	5,599	7	5,606
City of Glenpool	10,808	0	10,808
City of Jenks	16,924	0	16,924
City of Owasso	26,301	2,614	28,915
City of Sand Springs	18,515	391	18,906
City of Sapulpa	43	20,501	20,544
Town of Skiatook	2,130	5,267	7,397
Town of Sperry	1,177	29	1,206
Unincorporated Tulsa County	34,942	0	34,942
Total	217,779	47,203	264,982

Split places by other County

Creek County - Sapulpa

Osage County - Sand Springs, Skiatook and Sperry

Rogers County - Collinsville and Owasso

Wagoner County - Bixby and Broken Arrow

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Population by Place by County: 2010 Census

The Process

PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies - 91.200(b)

1. Describe agency/entity responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source

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

Agency Role	Name	Department/Agency
Lead Agency	TULSA COUNTY	

Table 1 – Responsible Agencies

Narrative

Tulsa County serves as the lead entity for both the Tulsa County HOME Consortium and the Tulsa County CDBG Urban County. The HOME Consortium and the Tulsa County CDBG Urban County Entitlement programs are both administered by the staff of the Indian Nations Council of Governments (INCOG).

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

Inquiries and comments regarding the Consolidated Plan may be directed to the INCOG Community and Economic Development Manager at (918)584-7526.

PR-10 Consultation - 91.100, 91.200(b), 91.215(l)

1. Introduction

Provide a concise summary of the jurisdiction's activities to enhance coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies (91.215(l)).

The Consortium works closely with providers of affordable housing for elderly populations and for populations with mental health disabilities to increase opportunities to housing populations in need.

Describe coordination with the Continuum of Care and efforts to address the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans, and unaccompanied youth) and persons at risk of homelessness

The Tulsa Continuum of Care is officially organized as the Tulsa & Tulsa County/Broken Arrow CoC, so the planning efforts and focus of the CoC are county-wide. The MTHC does not receive funding for homeless prevention, rapid re-housing, or supportive services for the homeless. However, local homeless service providers in Tulsa provide assistance to homeless individuals and families in the greater Tulsa area. As of 2013 the Tulsa & Tulsa County/Broken Arrow Continuum of Care is undergoing a re-organization and merger with the "A Way Home For Tulsa Pathways" efforts targeting the 100 most long term homeless. Recently the "A Way Home For Tulsa" Governance Council unanimously voted to expand its scope from a single focus on ending *long term* homelessness to a system-wide planning initiative focused on *ending homelessness*. This decision is driven by numerous factors including staffing needs, federal regulations, and positioning the organization to take advantage of numerous opportunities. Leadership from the participating agencies is actively engaged while the agencies are facilitating real change within their own organizations to best support the *A Way Home for Tulsa* Integrated and Coordinated Case Management "Pathways" Program and the HUD funded Homeless Management Information System and Continuum of Care Programs. Participating agencies include: Community Service Council, The Tulsa Day Center for the Homeless, Volunteers of America, Mental Health Association in Tulsa, Counseling and Recovery Services of Oklahoma, Legal Aid Services of Oklahoma, Family and Children's Services, The Salvation Army, John 3:16 Mission, Tulsa County Social Services, Youth Services of Tulsa, Abba's Family, Tulsa Housing Authority, 12 & 12, Inc., Domestic Violence Intervention Services /Call Rape, Morton Comprehensive Health Care Services, Day Spring Villas, Crossroads, and the OU School of Community Medicine, Medical Informatics.

Describe consultation with the Continuum(s) of Care that serves the jurisdiction's area in determining how to allocate ESG funds, develop performance standards and evaluate outcomes, and develop funding, policies and procedures for the administration of HMIS

Frequent consultation occurs as an INCOG staff member attends the monthly meetings of the Homeless Services Network and the Continuum of Care Steering Committee. An INCOG staff member serves on the CoC Review Panel sub-committee that is convened on a semi-annual basis to review the local CoC renewal application and to conduct the annual new project ranking for submission in the CoC Consolidated Supportive Housing Program application. Finally, INCOG staff members participate each January in the *One-night Consumer Survey* which is a count of the Tulsa area homeless population. The INCOG staff focuses on the City of Broken Arrow during the One-night survey.

2. Describe Agencies, groups, organizations and others who participated in the process and describe the jurisdictions consultations with housing, social service agencies and other entities.

The Consortium works closely with providers of affordable housing for elderly populations and for populations with mental health disabilities to increase opportunities to housing populations in need.

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

Identify any Agency Types not consulted and provide rationale for not consulting

Public Housing agencies were not consulted because of inability to provide funding.

Other local/regional/state/federal planning efforts considered when preparing the Plan

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Continuum of Care		

Table 3 – Other local / regional / federal planning efforts

Describe cooperation and coordination with other public entities, including the State and any adjacent units of general local government, in the implementation of the Consolidated Plan (91.215(l))

The Consortium works closely with providers of affordable housing for elderly populations and for populations with mental health disabilities to increase opportunities to housing populations in need Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency is a partner in providing leveraged funding for affordable housing.

Narrative

PR-15 Citizen Participation - 91.401, 91.105, 91.200(c)

1. Summary of citizen participation process/Efforts made to broaden citizen participation Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting

A Citizen Participation Plan is in place for the Consolidated Plan process that sets forth the jurisdiction's policies and procedures for citizen participation. The Plan details participation of groups impacted by CDBG and HOME funding, and encourages participation in the development of the Consolidated Plan of low and moderate income residents, minorities and non-English speaking persons where significant populations exist, residents of assisted housing, and residents of targeted areas. Each of the eleven members of the CDBG Urban County is required to hold a community development Needs Public Hearing within their communities, per the Tulsa County CDBG Urban County Application guidance and Citizen Participation Plan. Several of the communities hold informational meetings in neighborhoods targeted for CDBG project assistance. Notice of the public hearings are given via community newspaper publication or posting. The Policy Committee, comprised of public officials from the local jurisdictions, is apprised of the public participation process, and actively solicits participation in their communities. Areas of predominately low-and moderate-income neighborhoods are limited within the CDBG Urban County jurisdictions, and planners focus on developing eligible CDBG projects within those areas. There is not a lot of competition among neighborhood factions for CDBG funds due to the limited number of eligible areas. Cities such as Collinsville, Sand Springs, Owasso, and Jenks have focused on developing projects to provide accessibility for disabled residents, and Broken Arrow, Glenpool, Sperry and Skiatook are addressing the needs of their elderly populations through senior center construction. Senior service agencies are consulted in the development of the centers. Tulsa County serves as the lead entity for both the Metropolitan Tulsa HOME Consortium and the Tulsa County CDBG Urban County. The HOME Consortium and the Tulsa County CDBG Urban County entitlement grants are both administered by the staff of the Indian Nations Council of Governments (INCOG). INCOG staff and Community Development staff planners from the local jurisdictions conducted needs assessment public hearings at various locations in the Consortium service area and in the Tulsa County CDBG Urban County and developed the plan in accordance with input from the hearings. The Broken Arrow Downtown Advisory Board, a public body with published agendas, comprised of business owners, Broken Arrow residents, non-profit agencies and faith-based organizations, was instrumental in the development of the plan for redevelopment of the original townsite area. The redevelopment plan was discussed in numerous Advisory Board meetings open to the public this spring. CDBG funding is directed toward street improvements in the low and moderate income neighborhoods adjacent to the downtown area. The Broken Arrow Seniors organization was directly involved in discussions for the renovation of the current Senior Center, funded with CDBG funds.

Dates of Public Hearings held by Member Jurisdictions:

Consolidated Plan

TULSA COUNTY

11

Bixby: March 25, 2013 6:00PM

Collinsville: March 18, 2013 5:30 PM

Glenpool: April 1, 2013 6:00PM

Jenks: March 19, 2012 7:00PM

Owasso: March 19, 2013 6:30PM

Sand Springs: March 25, 2013 7:00PM

Sapulpa: March 18, 2013 7:00PM

Skiatook: March 26, 2013 7:00PM

Sperry: March 14, 2013 7 PM

Tulsa County: March 11, 2013 9:30AM

On March 11, 2013, the Tulsa County Board of County Commissioners as lead entity of the CDBG Urban County and the HOME Consortium, held a Needs Assessment public hearing in their regular board meeting. The public hearing was advertised in the regional Tulsa World. The minutes from the Tulsa County HOME Consortium and CDBG Urban County Needs Assessment Public Hearing conducted during the Consolidated and Annual Action Plan process is included below.

TULSA COUNTY HOME CONSORTIUM

TULSA COUNTY CDBG URBAN COUNTY

NEEDS ASSESSMENT PUBLIC HEARING

March 11, 2013

9:30 AM

Tulsa County Board of Commissioners

Meeting Summary

Citizens Present

*No citizens spoke at this public hearing

Staff Present

Claudia Brierre, INCOG

County Commission Chairperson Karen Keith called to order the March 11, 2013 Tulsa County HOME Investment Partnership and the Tulsa County CDBG Urban County public hearing at 9:30 A.M. in the County Commission Room. The purpose of the public hearing was to receive recommendations on housing needs for the 18 cities and 6 counties within the Tulsa County HOME Consortium area and to receive recommendations on non-housing community development needs for the 10 cities and the unincorporated area of Tulsa County in the Tulsa County CDBG Urban County. Claudia Brierre explained that nationally, HOME and CDBG Entitlement grantees experienced significant cuts in funding, and a 7% decrease in grant funds is projected for the County. It is anticipated, therefore, that Tulsa County would receive \$736,172 in FY2013 HOME funds and \$1,134,006 in FY2013 CDBG funds for the program year beginning July 1, 2013. This represents a decrease of \$55,411 in HOME funds and a decrease of \$85,355 in CDBG funds over last year's allocations.

The Tulsa County HOME Consortium includes the cities of Bartlesville, Broken Arrow, Bixby, Bristow, Catoosa, Claremore, Collinsville, Coweta, Drumright, Glenpool, Hominy, Jenks, Owasso, Pawhuska, Sand Springs, Sapulpa, Skiatook, Sperry, and the unincorporated areas of Creek, Osage, Rogers, Tulsa, Wagoner, and Washington Counties. The CDBG Urban County includes the cities of Bixby, Broken Arrow, Collinsville, Glenpool, Jenks, Owasso, Sand Springs, Sapulpa, Skiatook, Sperry, and the unincorporated area of Tulsa County. Ms. Brierre explained that recommendations received at the 2013 public hearing will be considered by INCOG, the MTHC Policy Committee, and the CDBG Urban County Policy Committee in developing a Consolidated and Annual Action Plan to be submitted to HUD. Citizens at the March 11th public hearing were requested to participate in the hearing and express their views on housing needs in the HOME Consortium area and on non-housing community development needs in the CDBG Urban County area. Comments or proposals, where feasible, would be incorporated into the plan to be submitted to HUD by May 15, 2013.

The FY 2013 Grant Year begins on July 1, 2013. For the HOME program, the principal program activity will be Elderly Congregate housing new construction. Tulsa County is the lead agency in the HOME Consortium. The Tulsa County CDBG Urban County has six cities in the Metro Cities category that each receive a specific allocation of CDBG funds. Four smaller communities and Tulsa County are in the Competitive category. The Urban County cities develop infrastructure improvement projects and/or create other non-housing community development projects in low to moderate income residential areas. Today's public hearing was to receive comments from citizens regarding the FY 2013 Action Plan and housing needs for the HOME area and non-housing community development needs in the Tulsa County CDBG Urban County area. Chairperson Keith asked if anyone was present to speak on this item. No citizen comments were received at the public hearing. The public hearing was adjourned at 9:40 AM.

Citizen Participation Outreach

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
1	Public Meeting	<p>Minorities</p> <p>Non-English Speaking - Specify other language: Spanish</p> <p>Persons with disabilities</p> <p>Senior Citizens</p>	<p>A CDBG Needs Public Hearing can be held separately or in conjunction with a regularly scheduled City Council meeting. Most of the member communities chose to have the public hearing at the City Council meeting so the attendance can be very large.</p>	<p>Most of the citizen comments received at the public hearings are questions rather than comments. Citizens want to know what is the amount of grant funding available and what can the funds be used for. INCOG staff members attend the public hearings along with city staff and they answer the questions raised by the public.</p>	None.	

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
2	Newspaper Ad	Non-targeted/broad community	Suburban Newspapers serve all of the Tulsa County CDBG communities with the exception of Sperry which does not have its own weekly newspaper. Sperry relies on the nearby Skiatook Journal. These suburban newspapers are well read in the communities and are a good source of local information for citizens.	None.	None.	

Table 4 – Citizen Participation Outreach

Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

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

Summary of Housing Needs

Demographics	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2009	% Change
Population	206,121	478,756	132%
Households	79,094	178,170	125%
Median Income	\$0.00	\$0.00	

Table 5 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2005-2009 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Number of Households Table

	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	>80-100% HAMFI	>100% HAMFI
Total Households *	15,192	17,214	29,356	18,284	
Small Family Households *	4,940	5,486	11,646	69,908	
Large Family Households *	967	1,518	3,215	11,417	
Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age	2,616	3,736	5,384	3,402	15,172
Household contains at least one person age 75 or older	2,399	3,801	4,657	1,997	5,444
Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger *	2,845	3,281	6,151	20,702	
* the highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI					

Table 6 - Total Households Table

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Housing Needs Summary Tables

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

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	244	200	180	18	642	194	93	181	59	527
Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	119	43	85	0	247	63	34	80	39	216
Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	210	414	502	64	1,190	94	201	400	277	972
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	3,933	1,259	160	14	5,366	3,752	2,542	1,983	477	8,754
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	714	2,403	2,260	127	5,504	1,511	2,376	5,395	2,962	12,244

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)	553	0	0	0	553	531	0	0	0	531

Table 7 – Housing Problems Table

Data 2005-2009 CHAS
Source:

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

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Having 1 or more of four housing problems	4,518	1,928	927	97	7,470	4,097	2,873	2,637	852	10,459
Having none of four housing problems	2,329	4,467	7,907	3,617	18,320	3,118	8,002	17,875	13,722	42,717
Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems	553	0	0	0	553	531	0	0	0	531

Table 8 – Housing Problems 2

Data 2005-2009 CHAS
Source:

3. Cost Burden > 30%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	1,939	1,705	1,284	4,928	1,731	1,920	3,697	7,348

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
Large Related	376	394	204	974	355	635	966	1,956
Elderly	1,040	777	266	2,083	2,088	1,907	1,562	5,557
Other	1,752	1,213	788	3,753	1,274	621	1,320	3,215
Total need by income	5,107	4,089	2,542	11,738	5,448	5,083	7,545	18,076

Table 9 – Cost Burden > 30%

Data 2005-2009 CHAS

Source:

4. Cost Burden > 50%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	1,702	612	43	2,357	1,450	1,092	998	3,540
Large Related	228	70	0	298	221	297	129	647
Elderly	802	274	99	1,175	1,208	772	459	2,439
Other	1,423	420	55	1,898	997	393	388	1,778
Total need by income	4,155	1,376	197	5,728	3,876	2,554	1,974	8,404

Table 10 – Cost Burden > 50%

Data 2005-2009 CHAS

Source:

5. Crowding (More than one person per room)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Single family households	279	458	532	64	1,333	143	225	406	256	1,030
Multiple, unrelated family households	50	10	40	0	100	14	14	98	64	190
Other, non-family households	0	4	20	0	24	0	0	0	0	0
Total need by income	329	472	592	64	1,457	157	239	504	320	1,220

Table 11 – Crowding Information - 1/2

Data 2005-2009 CHAS

Source:

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

Table 12 – Crowding Information – 2/2

Data Source

Comments:

What are the most common housing problems?

Cost burden greater than 30% of income is the most common housing problem, at 89.4%. Overcrowding is the next common problem at 7.4% and lacking plumbing is next at 3.3%..

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

Housing cost burden on owners is twice as prevalent as housing cost burden on renters. Very low income renters and owners are most affected by cost burden in housing.

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

Due to a lack of direct funding from programs to assist households in imminent risk of either residing in shelters or becoming unsheltered, this topic is not explored in any depth here by the Consortium.

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

No estimates of at-risk populations provided due to limited funding.

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

Loss of employment, foreclosure and cost burden are most closely linked with an increased risk of homelessness.

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

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

Introduction

A disproportionately greater need exists when the members of racial or ethnic group at a given income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percentage points or more) than the income level as a whole. Caucasians across all median income percentages experience housing problems at a far greater percentage than any other racial or ethnic group. Black/African Americans experience needs slightly above the 10 percentage points. These groups may require housing assistance.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	30,535	7,545	3,615
White	(61%) 18,575	(61%) 4,590	1,885
Black / African American	(18%) 5,659	(19%) 1,450	755
Asian	345	85	65
American Indian, Alaska Native	1,870	474	418
Pacific Islander	120	0	65
Hispanic	(7%) 2,305	(5%) 345	185

Table 13 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

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

30%-50% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	26,455	15,215	0
White	(62%) 16,310	(71%) 10,770	0
Black / African American	(15%) 4,029	(10%) 1,494	0

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Asian	244	144	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	1,410	955	0
Pacific Islander	35	0	0
Hispanic	(11%) 2,778	(5%) 763	0

Table 14 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

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

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	24,860	39,495	0
White	(70%) 17,320	(71%) 27,695	0
Black / African American	(11%) 2,640	(9%) 3,380	0
Asian	355	380	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	1,270	2,735	0
Pacific Islander	4	23	0
Hispanic	(9%) 2,134	(8%) 2,994	0

Table 15 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

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

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	7,480	29,455	0

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
White	5,459	22,345	0
Black / African American	734	2,235	0
Asian	88	350	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	360	1,585	0
Pacific Islander	0	8	0
Hispanic	455	1,734	0

Table 16 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

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

Discussion

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

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

Introduction

A disproportionately greater need exists when the members of racial or ethnic group at a given income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percentage points or more) than the income level as a whole. Caucasians across all median income percentages experience housing problems at a far greater percentage than any other racial or ethnic group. Black/African Americans experience needs slightly above the 10 percentage points. These groups may require housing assistance

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	25,020	13,070	3,615
White	(61%) 15,300	(60%) 7,885	1,885
Black / African American	(18%) 4,594	(19%) 2,535	755
Asian	260	175	65
American Indian, Alaska Native	1,430	895	418
Pacific Islander	120	0	65
Hispanic	(8%) 2,045	(5%) 610	185

Table 17 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

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

30%-50% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	12,170	29,495	0
White	(61%) 7,435	(67%) 19,660	0
Black / African American	(16%) 1,970	(12%) 3,560	0

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Asian	149	239	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	679	1,670	0
Pacific Islander	35	0	0
Hispanic	(11%) 1,330	(7%) 2,209	0

Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

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

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	7,110	57,250	0
White	(69%) 4,934	(70%) 40,090	0
Black / African American	(9%) 625	(9%) 5,410	0
Asian	145	590	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	340	3,675	0
Pacific Islander	4	23	0
Hispanic	(11%) 759	(8%) 4,369	0

Table 19 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

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

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	1,998	34,930	0
White	1,378	26,435	0
Black / African American	184	2,785	0
Asian	65	378	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	84	1,865	0
Pacific Islander	0	8	0
Hispanic	225	1,974	0

Table 20 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

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

Discussion

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

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

Introduction

A disproportionately greater need exists when the members of racial or ethnic group at a given income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percentage points or more) than the income level as a whole. Caucasians across all median income percentages experience housing problems at a far greater percentage than any other racial or ethnic group. Black/African Americans experience needs slightly below the 10 percentage points at less than 30% cost burden; and slightly above at 30-50% and greater than 50%. The Caucasian groups may require housing assistance to afford housing.

Housing Cost Burden

Housing Cost Burden	<=30%	30-50%	>50%	No / negative income (not computed)
Jurisdiction as a whole	258,390	53,759	40,234	3,695
White	(71%) 202,645	(68%) 36,660	(66%) 26,495	1,945
Black / African American	(6%) 15,430	(12%) 6,360	(16%) 6,625	755
Asian	3,115	698	360	65
American Indian, Alaska Native	13,480	2,875	2,025	418
Pacific Islander	132	0	89	65
Hispanic	(5%) 11,925	(8%) 4,244	(7%) 2,670	185

Table 21 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Discussion

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

Are there any Income categories in which a racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need than the needs of that income category as a whole? No

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

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

Since the geographic service area of the Consortium is so large, there are not really any concentrations of specific racial or ethnic groups.

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

Introduction

There are three public housing authorities in the MTHC Consortium Area: Bristow PHA, Drumright PHA, and Osage County PHA.

Totals in Use

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers in use	0	0	551	76	0	76	0	0	0

Table 22 - Public Housing by Program Type

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

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Characteristics of Residents

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	
# Homeless at admission	0	0	2	0	0	0	0		0
# of Elderly Program Participants (>62)	0	0	206	32	0	32	0		0

	Program Type							
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers				
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher	
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program
# of Disabled Families	0	0	98	13	0	13	0	0
# of Families requesting accessibility features	0	0	551	76	0	76	0	0
# of HIV/AIDS program participants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
# of DV victims	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 23 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Race of Residents

Program Type									
Race	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
White	0	0	433	57	0	57	0	0	0
Black/African American	0	0	44	17	0	17	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0	70	2	0	2	0	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Table 24 – Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Ethnicity of Residents

Ethnicity	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Hispanic	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Not Hispanic	0	0	549	76	0	76	0	0	0

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

Table 25 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

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

No information available.

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

It appears that all of the 551 units of Public Housing in the region have accessibility needs.

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

The number of households in Public Housing requiring accessibility features appears inflated in comparison to the population at large.

Discussion

The region does not have many public housing units, and funding is limited for the complexes. The Public Housing Authorities receive their own source of funding and are not generally impacted by the HOME Consortium activities.

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

Introduction:

As the Tulsa Metropolitan Region has grown, so has the scope of homelessness. The exact numbers are not known, however the Tulsa HMIS-Homeless Management Information System reports that on an average night there are 525 individuals sleeping in Tulsa Shelters. Based on the *January 2013 Point-in-Time Count* survey results it is estimated that there are just over 6,000 unique individuals experiencing homelessness in Tulsa during the last twelve months. Homelessness is not confined to the city limits of Tulsa as the homeless service providers in Tulsa serve a regional population. The MTHC Consortium does not receive funding for homelessness prevention, rapid re-housing, or for support services for homeless persons or households. Recently Tulsa County received HPRP Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Rehousing funding for a three-year period starting in 2009 and ending in July of 2012. Restore Hope Ministries, Inc. was a HPRP subgrantee that assisted with the program. All Tulsa County HPRP funds have been expended. MTHC staff members continue to participate in the monthly meetings of the Continuum of Care and the Homeless Services Network and the Annual Point in Time survey. There are four key structures that are in place in the Tulsa area in identify homeless needs and to assist in providing services to the homeless population in the Greater Tulsa area:

The Tulsa-Tulsa County-Broken Arrow Continuum of Care – The Community Service Council of Greater Tulsa is the lead agency for the Tulsa County multi-agency Continuum of Care (CoC), a program administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. As outlined by HUD, The Tulsa-Tulsa County-Broken Arrow Continuum of Care's primary efforts are to provide: Outreach, intake, and assessment to identify needs; provide emergency shelter; increase transitional housing units with supportive services; and increase permanent and permanent supportive housing units. Each year the local CoC submits an application to HUD for continued funding for the local agencies that provide supportive housing and related services to the homeless.

The Homeless Services Network provides the forum in which homeless service providers, consumers, public officials, and citizens can meet monthly for inter-agency planning and educational sessions. The HSN conducts public relations initiatives that increase the community's knowledge and support for homeless individuals. The Homeless Services Network also works to address emerging issues and monitors homeless trends in Tulsa County and the region. From the beginning, the focus of the HSN has been education and networking to combine strategies and programs while avoiding the duplication or delay of services to the homeless.

A Way Home for Tulsa is a collaboration of nineteen community organizations, supported by the Community Service Council (CSC) that brings a coordinated effort and greater opportunity to ending long-term homelessness in greater Tulsa. The Collaboration was formed with a shared mission of ending long-term homelessness in Tulsa. All member agencies operate under the organization's formal Conditions of Provider Participation. The *A Way Home for Tulsa* Governance Council includes diverse individuals with expertise and resources to help address the many complex issues surrounding individuals experiencing long-term homelessness in Tulsa. Recently, the *A Way Home for Tulsa* Collaboration Governance Council unanimously approved to build upon its current success and knowledge and expand its scope from a single focus on ending

long term homelessness to a system-wide planning initiative focused on *ending homelessness*. Leadership from the participating agencies is actively engaged while the agencies are facilitating real change within their own organizations to best support the *A Way Home for Tulsa* Integrated and Coordinated Case Management “Pathways” Program and the HUD funded Homeless Management Information System and Continuum of Care Programs. Participating agencies include: Community Service Council, The Tulsa Day Center for the Homeless, Volunteers of America, Mental Health Association in Tulsa, Counseling and Recovery Services of Oklahoma, Legal Aid Services of Oklahoma, Family and Children’s Services, The Salvation Army, John 3:16 Mission, Tulsa County Social Services, Youth Services of Tulsa, Abba’s Family, Tulsa Housing Authority, 12 & 12, Inc., Domestic Violence Intervention Services /Call Rape, Morton Comprehensive Health Care Services, Day Spring Villas, Crossroads, and the OU School of Community Medicine, Medical Informatics.

The Tulsa Area HMIS System - The Community Service Council of Greater Tulsa provides staffing for the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) which is used by homeless shelter, housing, and service providers for client data capture and use. This information sharing system helps homeless persons get more efficient services with less duplication and delays.

Homeless Needs Assessment

Population	Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night		Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year	Estimate the # becoming homeless each year	Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year	Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness
	Sheltered	Unsheltered				
Persons in Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persons in Households with Only Children	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persons in Households with Only Adults	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chronically Homeless Individuals	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chronically Homeless Families	0	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unaccompanied Child	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persons with HIV	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 26 - Homeless Needs Assessment

Data Source Comments: No data available. The MTHC does not receive funding for homelessness prevention or rapid re-housing. The MTHC does not have access to an HMIS data base.

Indicate if the homeless population is: Has No Rural Homeless

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

No data is available.

Nature and Extent of Homelessness: (Optional)

Race:	Sheltered:	Unsheltered (optional)
White	0	0
Black or African American	0	0
Asian	0	0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	0
Ethnicity:	Sheltered:	Unsheltered (optional)
Hispanic	0	0
Not Hispanic	0	0

Data Source**Comments:** No data available.

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

No data available.

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

No available information on this subject.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.

No available information on this subject.

Discussion:

None.

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

Introduction

The Consortium allocates a large percentage of its annual HOME funding to the construction of elderly congregate housing units. All of the larger communities in the Consortium have an elderly housing project developed by one of the MTHC Consortium's CHDO Vintage Housing. The City of Broken Arrow has two projects. These projects are designed for senior citizens who are mobile and can live independently. Another CHDO has developed senior apartments for the MTHC Consortium in Downtown Sapulpa. There are no other projects developed by the Consortium for population groups such as the frail elderly, for persons with mental & physical disabilities, for persons dealing with addiction, for persons dealing with HIV and their families, or for victims of domestic violence.

Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

With the exception of the elderly population and possibly the frail elderly, there are no significant concentrations of special needs population in the suburban and rural areas that form the Metropolitan Tulsa HOME Consortium.

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

Transportation is most likely the greatest need of the special needs population groups as the outlying suburban areas and adjacent rural counties have limited public transportation.

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

No specific information on this target group. Urbanized areas such as Tulsa and Oklahoma City have facilities that provide housing and related services for this population group. It is assumed that the MTHC would have scattered households with this situation.

Discussion:

With a limited amount of funding, the MTHC does not target any of the special needs population groups with the exception of the elderly (62 and over population). Broken Arrow is the only city in the CDBG Urban County that receives Public Services CDBG funding and CDBG funding has been used to provide services for the BA Seniors and to begin improvements to the Broken Arrow Senior Citizens Center.

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

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Facilities:

Municipalities in the Tulsa County CDBG Urban County fund public facilities that sustain a suitable living environment. These activities will improve the quality and increase the quantity of public improvements, such as sewer and water line improvements, storm sewer improvements, street improvements and drainage improvements.

How were these needs determined?

Each of the eleven members of the CDBG Urban County undertook a lengthy process of evaluating their local community needs through their capital improvement planning process and public meetings to receive comments from community residents.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Improvements:

Communities participating in the CDBG Urban County seek to improve the quality and increase the quantity of public improvements for low income residents within their jurisdictions. Infrastructure and neighborhood revitalization activities will be undertaken such park improvements, ADA sidewalk accessibility and senior center renovations. These enhancements will be a focus of area communities.

How were these needs determined?

Each of the eleven members of the CDBG Urban County undertook a lengthy process of evaluating their local community needs through their capital improvement planning process and public meetings to receive comments from community residents.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Services:

Broken Arrow, the largest member of the CDBG Urban County, traditionally funds public service agencies with CDBG funds that will make services available to low and moderate income persons and improve the quality of their living environment. These activities improve access to public services for youth, seniors, disabled, and other low- and- moderate income residents in the City of Broken Arrow.

How were these needs determined?

The City of Broken Arrow annually solicits needs assessments from providers who serve the community, and conducts an application process for public service funding.

Housing Market Analysis

MA-05 Overview

Housing Market Analysis Overview:

Within the six counties comprising the HOME Consortium service area, the vast majority of housing units are 1-unit detached structures (80%). Mobile homes comprise 11% of the housing units, and 5-19 units comprise 4% of the housing stock. Eighty-six percent (86%) of owners occupy units with 3 or more bedrooms, and forty-three percent (43%) of renters occupy units with 3 or more bedrooms.

MA-10 Housing Market Analysis: Number of Housing Units - 91.410, 91.210(a)&(b)(2)

Introduction

Within the six counties comprising the HOME Consortium service area, the vast majority of housing units are 1-unit detached structures (80%). Mobile homes comprise 11% of the housing units, and 5-19 units comprise 4% of the housing stock. Eighty-six percent (86%) of owners occupy units with 3 or more bedrooms, and forty-three percent (43%) of renters occupy units with 3 or more bedrooms.

All residential properties by number of units

Property Type	Number	%
1-unit detached structure	154,878	80%
1-unit, attached structure	2,700	1%
2-4 units	5,036	3%
5-19 units	6,920	4%
20 or more units	3,188	2%
Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc	21,819	11%
Total	194,541	100%

Table 27 – Residential Properties by Unit Number

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Unit Size by Tenure

	Owners		Renters	
	Number	%	Number	%
No bedroom	185	0%	605	2%
1 bedroom	1,623	1%	7,180	20%
2 bedrooms	17,419	12%	12,912	35%
3 or more bedrooms	122,374	86%	15,872	43%
Total	141,601	99%	36,569	100%

Table 28 – Unit Size by Tenure

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Describe the number and targeting (income level/type of family served) of units assisted with federal, state, and local programs.

Within the region, units assisted with federal funds are generally targeted to households between 30% and 50% of AMI for rental units, and 50%-80% for homeownership units.

Provide an assessment of units expected to be lost from the affordable housing inventory for any reason, such as expiration of Section 8 contracts.

No estimates are available.

Does the availability of housing units meet the needs of the population?

In general, current available housing units meet the needs of the population. Units targeted towards an ever-increasing elderly low income population are needed to increase housing opportunities for elderly.

Describe the need for specific types of housing:

Units for low income elderly are needed as the population in the region ages.

Discussion

MA-15 Housing Market Analysis: Cost of Housing - 91.410, 91.210(a)

Introduction

The cost of housing, housing trends, fair market rents, affordability, and housing inventory for the six-county HOME Consortium service area is summarized here. No pre-populated data was provided for Median Home Values or Median Contract Rent and it is difficult to gather that data due to the far reaching geographic area of the Consortium. Ninety-four percent (94%) of rent paid was below \$999, and only six percent (6%) was above \$1,000, reflecting affordable rental rates for most populations. Eleven percent (11%) of rental units were affordable to households earning 30% HAMFI; thirty-one percent (31%) of rental units were affordable to households earning 50% HAMFI; and fifty-eight percent (58%) of rental units were affordable to households earning 80% HAMFI. No affordability data is available for the percentage of owners making 30% HAMFI; seventeen percent (17%) of ownership units were affordable to households earning 50% HAMFI; thirty-one percent (31%) of ownership units were affordable to households earning 80% HAMFI; and double the percent of units (52%) of ownership units were affordable to households earning 100% HAMFI. For efficiency and 1 bedroom rental units, the fair market rents are below the HOME rents. Two bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 bedroom rental units all had monthly rents above the HOME rents.

Cost of Housing

	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2009	% Change
Median Home Value	0	0	0%
Median Contract Rent	0	0	0%

Table 29 – Cost of Housing

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2005-2009 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Rent Paid	Number	%
Less than \$500	19,817	54.2%
\$500-999	14,675	40.1%
\$1,000-1,499	1,384	3.8%
\$1,500-1,999	332	0.9%
\$2,000 or more	361	1.0%
Total	36,569	100.0%

Table 30 - Rent Paid

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Housing Affordability

% Units affordable to Households earning	Renter	Owner
30% HAMFI	(11%) 3,261	No Data
50% HAMFI	(31%) 9,067	(17%) 12,584
80% HAMFI	(58%) 17,055	(31%) 22,990
100% HAMFI	No Data	(52%) 38,703
Total	29,383	74,277

Table 31 – Housing Affordability

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Monthly Rent

Monthly Rent (\$)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Fair Market Rent	(below) 455	(below) 553	(above) 721	(above) 978	(above) 1,090
High HOME Rent	535	582	711	939	970
Low HOME Rent	522	559	671	775	865

Table 32 – Monthly Rent

Data Source: HUD FMR and HOME Rents

Is there sufficient housing for households at all income levels?

In general, sufficient housing for households at all income levels exists across the Consortium service area. Development of homeownership units for sale to households at 50% HAMFI would increase affordable housing opportunities for that segment of the population and should be a priority for HOME funding. Creation of rental units affordable to households at 30% HAMFI is also a priority to increase affordable opportunities.

How is affordability of housing likely to change considering changes to home values and/or rents?

Higher home values and rents will diminish affordable opportunities for households at 30%-50% HAMFI.

How do HOME rents / Fair Market Rent compare to Area Median Rent? How might this impact your strategy to produce or preserve affordable housing?

Median rents in the Tulsa metro area were approximately \$725 in 2012. This amount is lower than the US Median Rent of \$884 but higher than the State Median rent of approximately \$680. Fair Market and HOME rents were lower than the metro median for Efficiency, 1 bedroom unit, and 2 Bedroom units. Emphasis on the creation of Efficiency and 1 Bedroom units for elderly low income households is a priority as the aging population increases.

Discussion

MA-20 Housing Market Analysis: Condition of Housing - 91.410, 91.210(a)

Introduction

This section describes the significant characteristics of the Consortium's existing housing supply, including age and condition, and the risk posed by lead-based paint. The majority of existing units, both owner-occupied and rental, do not report any selected conditions such as lacking complete plumbing, lacking complete kitchen facilities, more than one person per room, and cost burden greater than 30%. Twenty percent (20%) of owner-occupied and thirty-four percent (34%) of rental-occupied report one selected condition. Seventy-four percent (74%) of owner-occupied and seventy-five (75%) of rental units were constructed between 1950 and 1999, indicating a good supply of fairly modern housing. Approximately half of the owner-occupied and rental-occupied housing units were constructed prior to 1980, which poses a risk for units with lead-based paint hazard. Nine (9%) of owner-occupied units and twenty-one (21%) of rental-occupied units had children present. No data is available for a total of Consortium area vacant, abandoned or REO properties suitable for rehabilitation.

Describe the jurisdiction's definition for "substandard condition" and "substandard condition but suitable for rehabilitation":

Financial assistance provided for the rehabilitation of substandard housing in the Consortium's jurisdiction is provided to bring the unit into compliance with applicable codes and eliminates conditions which are detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the residents. HOME rehabilitation funds are used only for those repairs and/or replacements which are necessary to ensure that the structure meets the Section 8 Housing Quality Standards and the Cost Effective Energy Efficiency Standards. The improvements must directly protect or improve the health and safety of the occupants of the dwelling units. Rehabilitation improvements under this program are made to the main dwelling unit and auxiliary structures. The sum total cannot exceed a HOME rehabilitation loan limit of \$25,000. A property is eligible if it fails to meet the applicable code but can be rehabilitated for not more than the maximum loan amount. A property is eligible if it fails to meet code standards, cannot be rehabilitated for the maximum loan amount and property owner agrees to provide additional funds to meet construction costs. Structurally sound units only are eligible for a rehabilitation loan. HOME housing inspectors determine whether a unit is structurally sound.

Condition of Units

Condition of Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
With one selected Condition	28,090	20%	12,430	34%
With two selected Conditions	755	1%	1,031	3%
With three selected Conditions	56	0%	63	0%
With four selected Conditions	0	0%	0	0%
No selected Conditions	112,700	80%	23,045	63%
Total	141,601	101%	36,569	100%

Table 33 - Condition of Units

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Year Unit Built

Year Unit Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
2000 or later	26,372	19%	4,247	12%
1980-1999	50,726	36%	11,801	32%
1950-1979	53,757	38%	15,856	43%
Before 1950	10,746	8%	4,665	13%
Total	141,601	101%	36,569	100%

Table 34 – Year Unit Built

Data Source: 2005-2009 CHAS

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total Number of Units Built Before 1980	64,503	46%	20,521	56%
Housing Units build before 1980 with children present	12,480	9%	7,779	21%

Table 35 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS (Total Units) 2005-2009 CHAS (Units with Children present)

Vacant Units

	Suitable for Rehabilitation	Not Suitable for Rehabilitation	Total
Vacant Units			
Abandoned Vacant Units			
REO Properties			
Abandoned REO Properties			

Table 36 - Vacant Units

Describe the need for owner and rental rehabilitation based on the condition of the jurisdiction's housing.

No data available to calculate this factor. The Consortium is not currently engaged in rehabilitation of housing.

Estimate the number of housing units within the jurisdiction that are occupied by low or moderate income families that contain lead-based paint hazards. 91.205(e), 91.405

Approximately 85,024 units of the Consortium's housing stock were built prior to 1979 and have the potential for having lead-based paint. Lead based paint testing is required of all Medicaid recipients and private physicians can selectively test for lead-based paint poisoning and report their results to the State. Not all counties test or report their results in a timely manner. Steps are being taken to improve the implementation and reporting requirements of the system. Based on the number of reported incidences of elevated blood levels, lead-based paint poisoning does not appear to be a significant health hazard in the Consortium area.

Discussion

MA-25 Public And Assisted Housing - 91.410, 91.210(b)

Introduction

There are three public housing agencies located in the MTHC Consortium area: The Bristow Public Housing Authority operates 159 units and the Drumright Public Housing Authority operates 148 units. The Osage County Public Housing Authority operates 282 units at these six locations in Osage County: Barnsdall, Cedar Ridge, Fairfax, Hominy, Osage, and Shidler. None of the three public housing agencies in the MTHC area are considered to be "troubled" public housing authorities by HUD. In the CDBG Urban County Tulsa County and the Cities of Bixby, Broken Arrow, Collinsville, Glenpool, Jenks, Owasso, Sand Springs, Sapulpa, Skiatook, and Sperry do not operate Public Housing authorities.

Totals Number of Units

	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers					
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers available			588	87			0	0	0
# of accessible units									
*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition									

Table 37 – Total Number of Units by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Describe the supply of public housing developments:

Describe the number and physical condition of public housing units in the jurisdiction, including those that are participating in an approved Public Housing Agency Plan:

There is a total of 589 public housing units in the MTHC Consortium area. All of the units are in good to excellent condition.

Public Housing Condition

Public Housing Development	Average Inspection Score

Table 38 - Public Housing Condition

Describe the restoration and revitalization needs of public housing units in the jurisdiction:

The three public housing agencies that are located in the MTHC area submit annual plans and requests for CFP Capital Funding grants to HUD in order to maintain and update their housing units and related facilities.

Describe the public housing agency's strategy for improving the living environment of low- and moderate-income families residing in public housing:

The public housing authorities have Resident Advisory Boards in place where the residents can share in the decision making process on items that affect their public housing community.

Discussion:

MA-30 Homeless Facilities and Services - 91.410, 91.210(c)

Introduction

The MTHC does not receive funding for homelessness prevention, rapid re-housing, or for support services for homeless individuals or families. The MTHC does not have access to an HMIS system and no data is available for the MTHC area.

Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons

	Emergency Shelter Beds		Transitional Housing Beds	Permanent Supportive Housing Beds	
	Year Round Beds (Current & New)	Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds	Current & New	Current & New	Under Development
Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	0	0	0	0	0
Households with Only Adults	0	0	0	0	0
Chronically Homeless Households	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans	0	0	0	0	0
Unaccompanied Youth	0	0	0	0	0

Table 39 - Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons

Data Source Comments: No data available.

Describe mainstream services, such as health, mental health, and employment services to the extent those services are use to complement services targeted to homeless persons

Persons in the Tulsa MSA can contact the 211 helpline to inquire about available assistance in the area.

List and describe services and facilities that meet the needs of homeless persons, particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth. If the services and facilities are listed on screen SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure or screen MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services, describe how these facilities and services specifically address the needs of these populations.

The MTHC does not fund services for facilities for the homeless.

MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services - 91.410, 91.210(d)

Introduction

There are presently 14 MTHC Elderly Congregate Housing projects in the Consortium area with 12 sites developed by Vintage Housing and 2 sites in Sapulpa developed by other MTHC CHDO's. There are no other facilities for special needs population groups in the Consortium area that received MTHC HOME funding. There are facilities and services in the City of Tulsa that serve special needs population groups on a regional basis.

Including the elderly, frail elderly, persons with disabilities (mental, physical, developmental), persons with alcohol or other drug addictions, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, public housing residents and any other categories the jurisdiction may specify, and describe their supportive housing needs

The Consortium has been able to address the needs of the elderly by providing affordable rental units at the 14 locations throughout the six county area. It is assumed that frail elderly would be living within all of the Consortium member government locations. There does not appear to be significant numbers of the other identified special needs populations living in the MTHC Consortium area.

Describe programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing

No specific programs in the Consortium area. The City of Tulsa has agencies that provide housing for that target population.

Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. 91.315(e)

With the exception of HOME funding for affordable elderly congregate apartments, there are no plans or proposals to assist other special needs population groups in the MTHC area.

For entitlement/consortia grantees: Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. (91.220(2))

There are no activities planned.

MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing - 91.410, 91.210(e)

Describe any negative effects of public policies on affordable housing and residential investment

There are several complex factors which prevent lower income households from obtaining affordable housing. Many of these factors are influenced by elements which are beyond the control of government. These factors include; economic conditions, interest rates, labor and material cost, wage levels, and non local tax policies. We should encourage our 24 local governments to look at factors such as land use and development regulations, development fees and building codes that may not be conducive to promote affordable housing. Cities and counties in the Consortium all participate in the promotion of fair housing within their communities. All 24 local governments are current or former recipients of CDBG funds and have conducted activities to promote fair housing. Such activities have included promoting April as Fair Housing Month, adopting or updating local Fair Housing Ordinances and making available a Fair Housing Brochure. In general, the State of Oklahoma and the local governments in the Tulsa Metropolitan Area do not have restrictive policies in place that might create a barrier to affordable housing development. Oklahoma housing markets usually rank high in the category of most affordable housing markets in the U.S.

MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets - 91.410, 91.210(f)

Introduction

Economic Development Market Analysis

Business Activity

Business by Sector	Number of Workers	Number of Jobs	Share of Workers %	Share of Jobs %	Jobs less workers %
Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction	2,041	478	2	1	-1
Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations	8,571	10,076	7	12	5
Construction	8,025	7,320	6	9	3
Education and Health Care Services	24,841	14,191	20	17	-3
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	9,552	4,497	8	5	-3
Information	4,257	3,837	3	5	2
Manufacturing	15,226	9,649	12	11	-1
Other Services	6,720	5,537	5	7	2
Professional, Scientific, Management Services	11,776	2,689	10	3	-7
Public Administration	3,453	2,277	3	3	0
Retail Trade	15,269	11,431	12	14	2
Transportation and Warehousing	8,419	8,823	7	10	3
Wholesale Trade	5,620	3,762	5	4	-1
Total	123,770	84,567	--	--	--

Table 40 - Business Activity

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS (Workers), 2010 ESRI Business Analyst Package (Jobs)

Labor Force

Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force	128,848
Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over	123,770
Unemployment Rate	3.94
Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24	11.75
Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65	2.59

Table 41 - Labor Force

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Management, business and financial	44,127
Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations	107
Service	17,289
Sales and office	36,049
Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair	11,620
Production, transportation and material moving	14,578

Table 42 – Occupations by Sector

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Travel Time

Travel Time	Number	Percentage
< 30 Minutes	89,295	76%
30-59 Minutes	24,769	21%
60 or More Minutes	2,934	3%
Total	116,998	100%

Table 43 - Travel Time

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Education:

Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	5,750	503	3,804
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	25,821	1,188	8,291
Some college or Associate's degree	38,076	1,101	8,217
Bachelor's degree or higher	33,149	617	4,986

Table 44 - Educational Attainment by Employment Status

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Educational Attainment by Age

	Age				
	18–24 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–44 yrs	45–65 yrs	65+ yrs
Less than 9th grade	425	689	472	1,052	1,987
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	3,064	2,015	1,944	3,885	3,707
High school graduate, GED, or alternative	6,909	8,583	8,440	18,277	10,043
Some college, no degree	5,784	9,718	9,501	15,825	5,971
Associate's degree	1,313	3,081	4,014	5,305	1,071
Bachelor's degree	1,495	8,176	8,060	11,941	2,972
Graduate or professional degree	110	2,207	3,178	5,291	1,547

Table 45 - Educational Attainment by Age

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months
Less than high school graduate	0
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	0
Some college or Associate's degree	0
Bachelor's degree	0
Graduate or professional degree	0

Table 46 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Data Source: 2005-2009 ACS Data

Based on the Business Activity table above, what are the major employment sectors within your jurisdiction?

The Education and Health Care sector comprises 20% of employment; Retail Trade comprises 12% of workforce, as does Manufacturing.

Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of the business community:

The Education and Health Care sector require professional degrees. The Retail Trade generally needs soft skills and Manufacturing requires technical skills. All sectors of employment benefit from Public Transit for workforce efficiency.

Describe any major changes that may have an economic impact, such as planned local or regional public or private sector investments or initiatives that have affected or may affect job and business growth opportunities during the planning period. Describe any needs for workforce development, business support or infrastructure these changes may create.

Recently, the Tulsa metropolitan area was listed as 24th on a list with the **most technology-employment growth in 2010 and 2011**. Specifically, the region was estimated to have had a 7.6% increase in high-tech jobs versus 2.6% for the nation as a whole. Accordingly, it has been reported that more risk capital is becoming available to allow that sector to continue growth. In 2010, the area received a \$50 million federal grant toward funding a \$78 million replacement of the failing I-244 Arkansas River Bridge. New structures will also accommodate passenger rail, commuter rail, and dedicated bicycle/pedestrian amenities. Widening and reconstruction of an important highway, I-44, through Tulsa is nearing completion of the multi-year, \$360 million project.

Infrastructure is more than transportation alone; the region also needs an **information technology network** that can meet the demands of a growing innovation economy. Many rural areas need significant improvements and access to 21st Century technology. Supporting entrepreneurship, new technologies, education, and research require expansion of the region's information systems to provide greater opportunities.

Finally, for decades numerous studies have detailed the issues and remedies regarding the Arkansas River corridor in technical insufficiencies as well as **potential economic development** and recreational improvements. While many amenities, existing and future, should remain as voter-approved initiatives, some environmental issues may require federal and state review and investments.

How do the skills and education of the current workforce correspond to employment opportunities in the jurisdiction?

The region generally is deficient in the skills needed to take advantage of available employment opportunities. Gaps exist in the skill sets and educational attainment of potential workforce. One third of community college and technical school students require remedial education upon entering higher education.

Describe any current workforce training initiatives, including those supported by Workforce Investment Boards, community colleges and other organizations. Describe how these efforts will support the jurisdiction's Consolidated Plan.

The Tulsa metro Chamber was recently awarded a Workforce Study grant, focused on the broad metro areas with the highest unemployment area. Outreach and partnerships with community colleges and technical schools will support workforce development.

Does your jurisdiction participate in a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS)?

The Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) establishes the regional economic development framework for the three counties within the INCOG Economic Development District (EDD), Creek, Osage and Tulsa.

If so, what economic development initiatives are you undertaking that may be coordinated with the Consolidated Plan? If not, describe other local/regional plans or initiatives that impact economic growth.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT GOALS:

- I. Ensure a healthy, attractive and sustainable environment, vibrant, thriving communities and a high quality of life for all the region's residents.
- II. Foster a regional business climate that supports high quality private investment and job creation.
- III. Ensure residents have better access to living wage jobs and employers have access to world class talent.
- IV. Harness and capitalize on the entrepreneurship and technology innovation assets in the region.
- V. Advance the region's transportation infrastructure to meet the demands of a globally connected modern economy.

Discussion

MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

Are there areas where households with multiple housing problems are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")

No such concentration occurs in the Consortium service area.

Are there any areas in the jurisdiction where racial or ethnic minorities or low-income families are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")

Index value is the comparison of the percent of racial or ethnic minorities or low income families for the census tract to the same percentage of the population for the whole MSA. Concentration is generally defined as 2 times the MSA average. African American concentration occurs in rural Wagoner County. American Indian population concentrations occur in Osage County and Rogers County.

What are the characteristics of the market in these areas/neighborhoods?

These are very small geographic areas within member jurisdictions. Generally, the market in these areas is similar to the individual community as a whole.

Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?

Churches and schools are good community assets and partners in these neighborhoods.

Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?

Similar to the community as a whole.

Strategic Plan

SP-05 Overview

Strategic Plan Overview

Based on an assessment of needs across the Consortium region, priorities were selected to focus HOME and CDBG funding. Proposed goals and objectives were developed to address those priorities.

HOME

Priority Need: Availability of Rental and Owner-Occupied Housing

Goal: New Construction of Single Family Homes

Goal: Homeownership Opportunities for Low Income

Objective: Creation of affordable infill rental and owner occupied housing units for low income households

Outcome: Homeowner Housing Added: 4 Household Housing Unit

Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 60 Households Assisted

Priority Need: Rental Housing for Elderly Households

Goal: Rental Housing for Elderly

Objective: Provision of affordable rental housing and supportive services within one complex to permit elderly to continue to lead independent life styles.

Outcome: Rental units constructed: 120 Household Housing Units

CDBG

Priority Need: Sustainability of Community

Goal: Construction of Public Facilities and Services

Goal: Construction of Public Infrastructure

Objective: Communities participating in the CDBG Urban County will seek to improve the quality and increase the quantity of public improvements and services for low income residents within their jurisdictions.

Outcome: Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit:
21385 Persons Assisted

Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit:
19925 Persons Assisted

Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit:
14285 Persons Assisted

SP-10 Geographic Priorities - 91.415, 91.215(a)(1)

Geographic Area

Table 47 - Geographic Priority Areas

General Allocation Priorities

Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the state.

In general, CDBG funds for the members of the Urban County are directed toward areas of each individual community that have the greatest concentration of low and moderate income residents. Each Urban County member selects where they wish to direct funds to improve conditions within the community. No CDFI or Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area is contained within the Urban County boundaries. HOME funds are not geographically allocated because of the large geographic service area of the Consortium. HOME funds are allocated on a project basis.

SP-25 Priority Needs - 91.415, 91.215(a)(2)

Priority Needs

1	Priority Need Name	Availability of Rental and Owner-Occupied Housing
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Large Families Families with Children Elderly Elderly Frail Elderly
	Geographic Areas Affected	HOME Consortium service areas; generally focused in Rogers, Creek Counties.
	Associated Goals	New Construction of Single Family Homes Homeownership Opportunities for Low Income
	Description	Creation of affordable infill rental and owner occupied housing units for low income households.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Decreasing available housing stock, increasing populations, renewed economic activity and higher housing costs create an increased demand for new and affordable housing.
2	Priority Need Name	Rental Housing for Elderly Households
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Elderly Elderly Frail Elderly
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tulsa County
	Associated Goals	Rental Housing for Elderly
	Description	Provision of affordable rental housing and supportive services within one complex to permit elderly to continue to lead independent life styles.

	Basis for Relative Priority	Provision of affordable rental housing for elderly populations and populations at risk of homelessness, as well as homeownership opportunities for low income households
3	Priority Need Name	Sustainability of Community
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Extremely Low Low Moderate Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	Tulsa County communities who are members of Urban County.
	Associated Goals	Construction of Public Facilities and Services Construction of Public Infrastructure
	Description	Communities participating in the CDBG Urban County will seek to improve the quality and increase the quantity of public improvements and services for low income residents within their jurisdictions.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Member governments of the Urban County will set their own community priorities and use available resources to address those relative priorities.

Table 48 – Priority Needs Summary

Narrative (Optional)

Tulsa County will direct HOME funds and Urban County CDBG funding to priorities identified as having "high" priority levels. Member governments of the Urban County will set their own community priorities and use available resources to address those relative priorities. Housing market conditions are often in a state of flux depending on the local economy, but generally priorities for funding will be directed to providing affordable rental housing for elderly populations and populations at risk of homelessness, as well as homeownership opportunities for low income households.

SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions - 91.415, 91.215(b)

Influence of Market Conditions

Affordable Housing Type	Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type
Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)	There is no tenant-based rental assistance in the MTHC Consortium area. No MTHC funds are planned for that use.
TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs	There is no tenant-based rental assistance in the MTHC Consortium area. No MTHC funds are planned for that use.
New Unit Production	CARD Community Action Resource & Development in Claremore has constructed affordable single-family units in Bartlesville, Claremore, and Sapulpa. New single family units are planned for Bristow. Each year new affordable elderly congregate units are constructed by an MTHC CHDO at a new location within the boundaries of the Metropolitan Tulsa HOME Consortium.
Rehabilitation	The MTHC Owner-occupied Single-Family Housing Rehabilitation program is inactive at the present time. In recent years the estimated costs of rehabilitating single family units in this area has seen estimates of \$45,000 to \$60,000 per unit when only a maximum of \$25,000 per unit is permitted under the HOME guidelines.
Acquisition, including preservation	CARD Community Action Resource & Development in Claremore provides downpayment and closing cost assistance to eligible households in all the member governments of the MTHC Consortium area. All of this funding is directed to single-family homeownership and none of the funds are used for preservation.

Table 49 – Influence of Market Conditions

SP-35 Anticipated Resources - 91.420(b), 91.215(a)(4), 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

The Urban County anticipates receiving both a direct allocation of federal CDBG funds and state CDBG funds to address community development needs. Member jurisdictions will also have available sources of funds which include Oklahoma Department of Commerce programs REAP, CDBG-EDIF, CSBG, EHP and LIHEAP; Emergency Food and Shelter program through FEMA; and private United Way grants. Resources to leverage with HOME funds include LIHTC, Public Housing CFP and Section 8.

Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	1,299,556	0	0	1,299,556	5,198,224	CDBG funds will be leveraged with local jurisdiction funds to increase the impact of activities.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
HOME	public - federal	Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA	760,182	0	0	760,182	3,040,728	HOME funds will be leveraged with tax credit funding to develop affordable housing in the region.

Table 50 - Anticipated Resources

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

Federal CDBG funds will be leveraged with local city funds in order to construct larger projects with greater impact to the community. CDBG Public Services funds will be combined with local United Way grants to provide funding to social agencies to impact low and moderate income residents in need. Each participating jurisdiction receiving HOME funds is required to provide a 25% match. That match may be in the form of direct subsidies, infrastructure improvements in the targeted area and/or the waiving of related construction fees. Currently, the HOME Consortium has available over \$3 million in banked match to apply towards HOME projects within the service area.

If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

Limited publically owned land or property located within the jurisdictions will be used to address the needs. A few communities who are members of the CDBG Urban County will address needs for their senior residents through improvements to City owned senior centers.

Discussion

SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure - 91.415, 91.215(k)

Explain the institutional structure through which the jurisdiction will carry out its consolidated plan including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions.

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
TULSA COUNTY	Government	Economic Development Non-homeless special needs Ownership Planning Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	Jurisdiction
INCOG	Regional organization	Planning	Jurisdiction
Community Action Resource and Development	CHDO	Ownership Rental	Jurisdiction
VINTAGE HOUSING, INC	CHDO	Rental	Jurisdiction
MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION IN TULSA, INC.	Non-profit organizations	Homelessness Rental	Jurisdiction

Table 51 - Institutional Delivery Structure

Assess of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System

The HOME program is administered by INCOG staff. Tulsa County serves as the lead entity for the Metropolitan Tulsa HOME Consortium which consists of 23 member governments. All Requests for Proposals are conducted through the Tulsa County Purchasing Department. Final approval of all planning documents is through the Tulsa County Board of Commissioners. The MTHC Policy Committee serves as a recommending body on HOME items prior to final submission to Tulsa County and to HUD. The MTHC Policy Committee works to ensure the equitable distribution of resources throughout the jurisdiction. Policy members and staff have the responsibility of disseminating notice of the availability of funds to the various city governments, social service agencies, and the unincorporated areas. This includes Needs Assessment Public Hearings that the staff conducts each year at Tulsa County, the City of Broken Arrow, and at selected member governments in the MTHC Consortium. Through a variety of subrecipients and CHDOs, affordable housing opportunities are created for eligible populations. Each of the partner organizations brings expertise and strengths to address housing needs to segments of the regional population. The HOME Consortium has been able to provide strong housing choices through its

nonprofit and CHDO partners. Input obtained from the social service agencies gives insight into the local housing needs and assists in establishing priorities and distributing funds, and identifying other resources. INCOG staff provides technical assistance to member local governments, CHDOs, and other participants within the Consortium in the assessment of specific needs, development of proposals, and the administration of programs and services. The commitment of the private sector to the Consortium housing development strategy continues to be encouraged. Representatives of lending institutions such as BancFirst of Sand Springs and American National Bank of Sapulpa serve on either the MTHC Policy Committee or on the Loan Review Committee. Bank of Oklahoma, BancFirst and American National Bank of Sapulpa, have been instrumental in assisting in the development of affordable housing. Bank One has sponsored an Affordable Housing Program grant through the Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka for both the homebuyer assistance activity and the housing rehabilitation activity. Spirit Bank of Drumright and RCB Bank serving Tulsa and Rogers Counties have expressed a desire to participate in future projects. Heritage Bank of Mannford contributed \$500 toward implementation of the owner-occupied housing rehabilitation program for Creek County. Within participating cities, the Consortium will seek a wider range of participation from realtors, developers, and the local Chambers of Commerce. The Urban County Community Development Block Grant program is administered by the INCOG staff and by staff members from the local governments who are members of the Urban County. The final approval of all plans, RFPs, acceptance of bids, and public hearings concerning CDBG are conducted by the City Councils of the member governments. City staff and INCOG staff oversee the implementation of these projects. In addition to public works projects, social service programs receive CDBG funding in the City of Broken Arrow program. The organizations chosen for funding serve the low income and special populations within the City of Broken Arrow.

Availability of services targeted to homeless persons and persons with HIV and mainstream services

Homelessness Prevention Services	Available in the Community	Targeted to Homeless	Targeted to People with HIV
Homelessness Prevention Services			
Counseling/Advocacy	X	X	X
Legal Assistance	X	X	
Mortgage Assistance	X		
Rental Assistance	X	X	X
Utilities Assistance	X	X	
Street Outreach Services			
Law Enforcement			
Mobile Clinics			
Other Street Outreach Services			
Supportive Services			
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	X	X	X
Child Care	X	X	
Education	X	X	X

Supportive Services			
Employment and Employment Training	X	X	X
Healthcare	X	X	X
HIV/AIDS	X	X	X
Life Skills			
Mental Health Counseling	X	X	X
Transportation	X	X	
Other			

Table 52 - Homeless Prevention Services Summary

Describe how the service delivery system including, but not limited to, the services listed above meet the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth)

Services to homeless populations and populations with HIV are generally coordinated through the Continuum of Care and Mental Health Association in Tulsa.

Describe the strengths and gaps of the service delivery system for special needs population and persons experiencing homelessness, including, but not limited to, the services listed above

Gaps in the delivery of services to special needs population exist because of a lack of direct funding for these populations.

Provide a summary of the strategy for overcoming gaps in the institutional structure and service delivery system for carrying out a strategy to address priority needs

The Continuum of Care does a good job of coordinating limited funding to see that the needs of special populations are addressed, although unresolved gaps still exist.

SP-45 Goals - 91.415, 91.215(a)(4)

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	Rental Housing for Elderly	2013	2015	Affordable Housing	Tulsa County	Rental Housing for Elderly Households	HOME: \$3,200,910	Rental units constructed: 120 Household Housing Unit
2	New Construction of Single Family Homes	2013	2017	Affordable Housing	Rogers and Creek Counties	Availability of Rental and Owner-Occupied Housing	HOME: \$300,000	Homeowner Housing Added: 4 Household Housing Unit
3	Homeownership Opportunities for Low Income	2013	2017	Affordable Housing	Consortium service areas	Availability of Rental and Owner-Occupied Housing	HOME: \$300,000	Direct Financial Assistance to Homebuyers: 60 Households Assisted
4	Construction of Public Facilities and Services	2013	2017	Non-Housing Community Development	Tulsa County communities	Sustainability of Community	CDBG: \$2,840,165	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 21385 Persons Assisted Public service activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 19925 Persons Assisted
5	Construction of Public Infrastructure	2013	2017	Non-Housing Community Development	Tulsa County communities	Sustainability of Community	CDBG: \$3,657,615	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 14285 Persons Assisted

Table 53 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

1	Goal Name	Rental Housing for Elderly
	Goal Description	Construction of rental housing for elderly to permit elderly to continue to lead independent life styles.
2	Goal Name	New Construction of Single Family Homes
	Goal Description	Construction of new single family housing units for sale to income eligible homebuyers.
3	Goal Name	Homeownership Opportunities for Low Income
	Goal Description	Homebuyer assistance through downpayment and closing costs funding for low income households to permit homeownership.
4	Goal Name	Construction of Public Facilities and Services
	Goal Description	Activities that will enhance the quality of life for specific populations within their jurisdictions. These activities will improve access to public facilities and services for seniors, disabled and other low income residents.
5	Goal Name	Construction of Public Infrastructure
	Goal Description	Funding of public improvements and infrastructure that sustain a suitable living environment. Activities will improve the quality and increase the quantity of public infrastructure, such as sewer and water line improvements, storm sewer and street improvements, and drainage improvements.

Estimate the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families to whom the jurisdiction will provide affordable housing as defined by HOME 91.315(b)(2)

Through HOME activities to benefit elderly rental populations and provide homeownership opportunities for families wishing to purchase housing, approximately 180 extremely low-income, low -income and moderate-income families will be assisted over the five-year period.

SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement - 91.415, 91.215(c)

Need to Increase the Number of Accessible Units (if Required by a Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement)

Bristow Public Housing Authority operates 159 units; Drumright Public Housing Authority operates 148 units; The Osage County Public Housing Authority operates 282 units at six locations in Osage County. These are the only locations in the MTHC Consortium area that have public housing authorities. All units at the three public housing authorities are maintained properly due to annual Capital Fund grants. There are no funds available or plans developed to increase the number of housing units at these locations.

Activities to Increase Resident Involvements

Public Housing Resident Advisory Boards are in place.

Is the public housing agency designated as troubled under 24 CFR part 902?

No

Plan to remove the 'troubled' designation

SP-55 Strategic Plan Barriers to Affordable Housing - 91.415, 91.215(h)

Barriers to Affordable Housing

There are several complex factors which prevent lower income households from obtaining affordable housing. Many of these factors are influenced by elements which are beyond the control of government. These factors include; economic conditions, interest rates, labor and material cost, wage levels, and non local tax policies. We should encourage our 24 local governments to look at factors such as land use and development regulations, development fees and building codes that may not be conducive to promote affordable housing. Cities and counties in the Consortium all participate in the promotion of fair housing within their communities. All 24 local governments are current or former recipients of CDBG funds and have conducted activities to promote fair housing. Such activities have included promoting April as Fair Housing Month, adopting or updating local Fair Housing Ordinances and making available a Fair Housing Brochure. In general, the State of Oklahoma and the local governments in the Tulsa Metropolitan Area do not have restrictive policies in place that might create a barrier to affordable housing development. Oklahoma housing markets usually rank high in the category of most affordable housing markets in the U.S.

Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing

None proposed due to the fact that barriers to affordable housing are not a critical issue in the Tulsa MSA.

SP-60 Homelessness Strategy - 91.415, 91.215(d)

Describe how the jurisdiction's strategic plan goals contribute to:

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

An accurate count of the number of homeless persons and subpopulations continues to be difficult yet agencies are experiencing significant demand under healthy economic conditions. There will be continued coordination with the Homeless Services Network and Housing and Urban Development to Strengthen Efforts for Assessing Homeless in the MTHC area. Estimates from the City of Tulsa and the State indicate there are rural homeless not accounted for in survey data. In recent years assessments have been conducted primarily within the City of Tulsa; however the City of Broken Arrow has participated in the Point in Time One-night Consumer Survey counts the last six years with the 2013 count held on January 30, 2013. Efforts are continuing to work with the Network and area agencies to develop an improved system.

Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

At the present time the MTHC does not receive funding for homelessness prevention, rapid re-housing, or for support services for homeless individuals or families.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again.

No funding is received at this time and no transition plan is in place.

Help low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from a publicly funded institution or system of care, or who are receiving assistance from public and private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education or youth needs

No funding received at this time and no transition plan in place.

SP-65 Lead-based Paint Hazards - 91.415, 91.215(i)

Actions to address LBP hazards and increase access to housing without LBP hazards

Approximately 136,905 units of the Consortium's housing stock were built prior to 1979 and have the potential for having lead-based paint. Lead based paint testing is required of all Medicaid recipients and private physicians can selectively test for lead-based paint poisoning and report their results to the State. Not all counties test or report their results in a timely manner. Steps are being taken to improve the implementation and reporting requirements of the system. Based on the number of reported incidences of elevated blood levels, lead-based paint poisoning does not appear to be a significant health hazard in the Consortium area. Lead-based point reduction is addressed in all projects in which the Consortium is involved affecting as many as 90 low-income households annually. In response to changed federal regulations, the Consortium is taking appropriate steps regarding lead-based point reduction.

How are the actions listed above related to the extent of lead poisoning and hazards?

Most of the MTHC housing activity in recent years has been new construction of elderly congregate housing or new single-family housing to be constructed by an MTHC CHDO (CARD-Community Action Resource and Development of Claremore, OK). CARD is also a subrecipient of MTHC HOME funds to conduct the homebuyer assistance program for the Consortium. All homes in the homebuyer program are HQS inspected and the units that predate 1978 are tested for LBP.

How are the actions listed above integrated into housing policies and procedures?

The Metropolitan Tulsa HOME Consortium housing rehabilitation program requires lead-based paint testing and assessment on all units constructed prior to 1978.

SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy - 91.415, 91.215(j)

Jurisdiction Goals, Programs and Policies for reducing the number of Poverty-Level Families

Several agencies, including all of the Community Action Agencies are implementing programs designed to minimize the number of persons at or below poverty. The various programs offered include: Head Start: provides comprehensive services in health/nutrition, parent involvement, disabilities, family literacy, social services and education; Weatherization Program: provides energy related cost cutting measures in older homes; Community Outreach and Development: increases the level of self-sufficiency for low-income individuals and groups through development of the self-help and management skills needed to operate effectively. Services include In-home care, educational programs, community organization, information and referral and community networking; Youth Programs: designed to create employment and training opportunities for low income youths; Homeless Program: provides financial assistance, case management, counseling and available resources to individuals and families who are homeless or at risk of being homeless; Emergency Assistance: provides food, shelter, utility assistance, clothing, medical treatment and support for individuals and families in emergency situations; Economic Development; offers employment/ career counseling and training, assistance in business development and an entrepreneurial development support system; Senior Nutrition and wellness program: offers meals, transportation and social activities to area senior citizens; and Referral system: an extensive referral system which contains information on employment, housing services, emergency services, lists of other social service agencies and the services they provide.

How are the Jurisdiction poverty reducing goals, programs, and policies coordinated with this affordable housing plan

The 211 Helpline is available to guide area residents to the agencies that provide the assistance mentioned above. Community Action Agencies and non-profit agencies such as Restore Hope Ministries, Inc. have had strong working relationships for several years with Tulsa County and INCOG and this has created a good communication network and referral system.

SP-80 Monitoring - 91.230

Describe the standards and procedures that the jurisdiction will use to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and will use to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements

The INCOG staff monitors Tulsa County HOME Consortium subrecipients/CHDO's and Tulsa County CDBG Urban County subgrantees on an annual basis to ensure that the sub recipients and subgrantees comply with all federal regulations and requirements governing their administrative, financial, and program operations. At the beginning of the program year, the INCOG staff develops Monitoring Plans for both the HOME and CDBG programs, evaluating each of the sub recipients and subgrantees resources against their needs and capacity. The Monitoring Plans identifies any "at-risk" sub recipients /subgrantees that may require in-depth reviews. The Monitoring Plans set schedules for on-site monitoring visit(s) and provides for a standardized procedure for all monitoring reviews. INCOG staff conducts on-site monitoring visits during the program year at each of the recently funded sub recipients in order to inspect program files, records, and related information. If necessary, the INCOG staff may require additional on-site monitoring visits.

Expected Resources

AP-15 Expected Resources - 91.420(b), 91.220(c)(1,2)

Introduction

The Urban County anticipates receiving both a direct allocation of federal CDBG funds and state CDBG funds to address community development needs. Member jurisdictions will also have available sources of funds which include Oklahoma Department of Commerce programs REAP, CDBG-EDIF, CSBG, EHP and LIHEAP; Emergency Food and Shelter program through FEMA; and private United Way grants. Resources to leverage with HOME funds include LIHTC, Public Housing CFP and Section 8.

Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	1,299,556	0	0	1,299,556	5,198,224	CDBG funds will be leveraged with local jurisdiction funds to increase the impact of activities.

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
HOME	public - federal	Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA	760,182	0	0	760,182	3,040,728	HOME funds will be leveraged with tax credit funding to develop affordable housing in the region.

Table 54 - Expected Resources – Priority Table

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

Federal CDBG funds will be leveraged with local city funds in order to construct larger projects with greater impact to the community. CDBG Public Services funds will be combined with local United Way grants to provide funding to social agencies to impact low and moderate income residents in need. Each participating jurisdiction receiving HOME funds is required to provide a 25% match. That match may be in the form of direct subsidies, infrastructure improvements in the targeted area and/or the waiving of related construction fees. Currently, the HOME Consortium has available over \$3 million in banked match to apply towards HOME projects within the service area.

If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

Limited publically owned land or property located within the jurisdictions will be used to address the needs. A few communities who are members of the CDBG Urban County will address needs for their senior residents through improvements to City owned senior centers.

Discussion

Annual Goals and Objectives

AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives - 91.420, 91.220(c)(3)&(e)

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	New Construction of Single Family Homes	2013	2017	Affordable Housing	Rogers County	Availability of Rental and Owner-Occupied Housing	HOME: \$684,164	Homeowner Housing Added: 5 Household Housing Unit
2	Construction of Public Facilities and Services	2013	2017	Non-Housing Community Development	Tulsa County communities	Sustainability of Community	CDBG: \$568,033	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 4277 Persons Assisted Public service activities for Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 3985 Households Assisted
3	Construction of Public Infrastructure	2013	2017	Non-Housing Community Development	Tulsa County communities	Sustainability of Community	CDBG: \$731,523	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 2857 Persons Assisted

Table 55 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

1	Goal Name	New Construction of Single Family Homes
	Goal Description	Decreasing available housing stock, particularly in smaller Consortium jurisdictions, coupled with increasing populations, renewed economic activity and higher housing costs create an increased demand for affordable, new single family homeownership opportunities.
2	Goal Name	Construction of Public Facilities and Services
	Goal Description	Activities that will enhance the quality of life for specific populations within their jurisdictions. These activities will improve access to public facilities and services for seniors, disabled and other low income residents
3	Goal Name	Construction of Public Infrastructure
	Goal Description	Funding of public improvements and infrastructure that sustain a suitable living environment. Activities will improve the quality and increase the quantity of public infrastructure, such as sewer and water line improvements, storm sewer and street improvements, and drainage improvements.

AP-35 Projects - 91.420, 91.220(d)

Introduction

This First Program Year Annual Action Plan outlines the activities which will be undertaken during the 2013 program year, beginning July 1, 2013 and ending June 30, 2014 using federal funds allocated to the Tulsa County HOME Consortium and the Tulsa County CDBG Urban County Entitlement program. Programs and activities described in this Action Plan will principally benefit low and moderate income populations of the service areas of the HOME Consortium and the Urban County. In Program Year 2013 (Program Year One), the HOME Consortium will provide an affordable housing program, New Construction of Single Family Homes, that will serve low to moderate income potential homeowners. Program Year 2013 is the sixth year for the Tulsa County Community Development Block Grant Urban County. CDBG regulations permit counties who meet the threshold of a total combined population of 200,000 or more (excluding metropolitan cities) to qualify as an urban county to receive a direct federal allocation of CDBG funds. Unincorporated Tulsa County and ten Tulsa County incorporated places, which includes the City of Sapulpa (whose city limits include a portion of Tulsa County) participate as members of the Tulsa County CDBG Urban County Program. The City of Broken Arrow, formerly a CDBG Entitlement city relinquished its status as an entitlement in order to join the Urban County. The City of Tulsa is not a member.

#	Project Name
1	New Construction of Single Family Housing
2	City of Broken Arrow Street Improvements
3	City of Sapulpa Street Improvements
4	City of Bixby Drainage Improvements
5	City of Collinsville Drainage Improvements
6	City of Sand Springs Old Town Sewer Improvements
7	City of Jenks Sidewalk Improvements
8	City of Owasso Park Improvements
9	City of Skiatook Senior Center Renovation
10	City of Glenpool Senior Center Renovations
11	Administration
12	Broken Arrow Neighbors Outreach
13	Margaret Hudson Counseling
14	Child Abuse Network
15	Broken Arrow Seniors
16	Broken Arrow Neighbors Treetops Apartments Outreach

Table 56 – Project Information

Describe the reasons for allocation priorities and any obstacles to addressing underserved needs

AP-38 Project Summary

Project Summary Information

1	Project Name	New Construction of Single Family Housing
	Target Area	Tiawah, Rogers County
	Goals Supported	New Construction of Single Family Homes
	Needs Addressed	Availability of Rental and Owner-Occupied Housing
	Funding	HOME: \$684,164
	Description	Construction of new single family homes in Rogers County for sale to income eligible homebuyers.
	Planned Activities	New construction of 3 single family homes in Tiawah, Rogers County.
2	Project Name	City of Broken Arrow Street Improvements
	Target Area	CT 74.02:1
	Goals Supported	Construction of Public Infrastructure
	Needs Addressed	Sustainability of Community
	Funding	CDBG: \$380,721
	Description	Street improvements in Old Town area of Broken Arrow to include roadway milling and overlay, sidewalks, and drainage improvements.
	Planned Activities	Street improvements in Old Town area of Broken Arrow to include roadway milling and overlay, sidewalks, and drainage improvements.
3	Project Name	City of Sapulpa Street Improvements
	Target Area	CT 214.00:1; 216.00:1
	Goals Supported	Construction of Public Infrastructure

	Needs Addressed	Sustainability of Community
	Funding	CDBG: \$139,270
	Description	Remove and reconstruct sections of street pavement along Wells Avenue.
	Planned Activities	Remove and reconstruct street pavement including aggregate base, asphalt pavement, establish bar ditches, culvert installation, and replacement of driveway approaches.
4	Project Name	City of Bixby Drainage Improvements
	Target Area	CT 78.01:2
	Goals Supported	Construction of Public Infrastructure
	Needs Addressed	Sustainability of Community
	Funding	CDBG: \$66,209
	Description	Storm sewer construction to alleviate street flooding.
	Planned Activities	Phase 3 construction of new storm sewer on needles Ave., to alleviate street flooding in area of Old Township and Midland Addition.
5	Project Name	City of Collinsville Drainage Improvements
	Target Area	Income Survey performed
	Goals Supported	Construction of Public Infrastructure
	Needs Addressed	Sustainability of Community
	Funding	CDBG: \$73,642
	Description	Drainage improvements to alleviate localized street flooding in low income neighborhood.
	Planned Activities	Drainage improvements consisting of reinforced concrete pipes along Center Street to alleviate localized flooding in a low income neighborhood.
6	Project Name	City of Sand Springs Old Town Sewer Improvements
	Target Area	CT 93.00:3

	Goals Supported	Construction of Public Infrastructure
	Needs Addressed	Sustainability of Community
	Funding	CDBG: \$71,681
	Description	Repair and replacement of existing deteriorated sanitary sewer lines.
	Planned Activities	Repair and replacement of existing deteriorated sanitary sewer lines in an area north of City Hall.
7	Project Name	City of Jenks Sidewalk Improvements
	Target Area	CT67.03:2
	Goals Supported	Construction of Public Facilities and Services
	Needs Addressed	Sustainability of Community
	Funding	CDBG: \$43,482
	Description	Reconstruction of existing and construction of new sidewalks, ramps, and lighting to improve handicapped accessibility.
	Planned Activities	Phase 4 reconstruction of existing and construction of new sidewalks, ramps, and lighting along streets in the original townsite area to improve handicapped accessibility.
8	Project Name	City of Owasso Park Improvements
	Target Area	CT 58.01:2,3,4
	Goals Supported	Construction of Public Facilities and Services
	Needs Addressed	Sustainability of Community
	Funding	CDBG: \$121,207
	Description	Replacement of outdated playground equipment at neighborhood park to improve recreational opportunities to serve low income residents.
	Planned Activities	Replacement of outdated playground equipment pieces at Rayola Park.

9	Project Name	City of Skiatook Senior Center Renovation
	Target Area	CT 102.01:2
	Goals Supported	Construction of Public Facilities and Services
	Needs Addressed	Sustainability of Community
	Funding	CDBG: \$73,641
	Description	Renovations to an existing building for relocation of Senior Center operation in order to provide city seniors a safer and secure facility for daily meals and activities.
	Planned Activities	Renovations to an existing school building for relocation of Senior Center operation.
10	Project Name	City of Glenpool Senior Center Renovations
	Target Area	CT 77.02:2
	Goals Supported	Construction of Public Facilities and Services
	Needs Addressed	Sustainability of Community
	Funding	CDBG: \$73,642
	Description	Renovations to an existing senior center building to provide seniors a safe and secure facility for meals and activities.
	Planned Activities	Renovations to an existing senior center building to provide seniors a safe and secure facility for meals and activities.
11	Project Name	Administration
	Target Area	NA
	Goals Supported	New Construction of Single Family Homes Construction of Public Facilities and Services Construction of Public Infrastructure
	Needs Addressed	Availability of Rental and Owner-Occupied Housing Rental Housing for Elderly Households Sustainability of Community

	Funding	CDBG: \$194,933 HOME: \$76,018
	Description	Program administration of HOME and CDBG activities.
	Planned Activities	
12	Project Name	Broken Arrow Neighbors Outreach
	Target Area	LMC
	Goals Supported	Construction of Public Facilities and Services
	Needs Addressed	Sustainability of Community
	Funding	CDBG: \$16,756
	Description	Advocacy and referral services for low income clients.
	Planned Activities	Provide advocacy and referral services to assist clients of agency serving low income residents of Broken Arrow.
13	Project Name	Margaret Hudson Counseling
	Target Area	LMC
	Goals Supported	Construction of Public Facilities and Services
	Needs Addressed	Sustainability of Community
	Funding	CDBG: \$11,805
	Description	Counseling services to pregnant teens and families.
	Planned Activities	Counseling services
14	Project Name	Child Abuse Network
	Target Area	LMC
	Goals Supported	Construction of Public Facilities and Services

	Needs Addressed	Sustainability of Community
	Funding	CDBG: \$15,000
	Description	Forensic interviews of allegedly abused children.
	Planned Activities	Forensic interviews of allegedly abused children in Broken Arrow.
15	Project Name	Broken Arrow Seniors
	Target Area	LMC
	Goals Supported	Construction of Public Facilities and Services
	Needs Addressed	Sustainability of Community
	Funding	CDBG: \$12,567
	Description	Increased access to services at Broken Arrow Senior Center.
	Planned Activities	Increased access to services at senior center by providing staff support.
16	Project Name	Broken Arrow Neighbors Treetops Apartments Outreach
	Target Area	LMC
	Goals Supported	Construction of Public Facilities and Services
	Needs Addressed	Sustainability of Community
	Funding	CDBG: \$5,000
	Description	Advocacy services provided to elderly and disabled clients at Treetops Apartments.
	Planned Activities	Advocacy services provided to elderly and disabled clients at Treetops Apartments.

Table 57 – Project Summary

AP-50 Geographic Distribution - 91.420, 91.220(f)

Description of the geographic areas of the entitlement (including areas of low-income and minority concentration) where assistance will be directed

The Metropolitan Tulsa HOME Consortium, formed in 1994, consists of 24 member governments in the northeastern part of Oklahoma. There are six county governments: Tulsa, Creek, Osage, Rogers, Wagoner, and Washington Counties. The eighteen cities range in size from the largest member Broken Arrow to the smallest member Sperry. The total 2010 population of the MTHC Consortium area is 501,535. HOME funds are targeted to low to moderate income households or individuals for all housing programs conducted by the Consortium. The MTHC Policy Committee reviews all proposals for housing programs and makes recommendations to Tulsa County, the lead agency. In recent years the Housing Rehabilitation Program was conducted in targeted residential neighborhoods in MTHC cities that are awarded HOME funds through a RFP process conducted by Tulsa County. The Homebuyer Assistance program is operated throughout the 6-county Consortium area by a MTHC subrecipient and it serves low to moderate income persons/households in all areas. The locations of the new Elderly Congregate Housing projects are determined by market studies conducted by the CHDO applying for HOME funding. Innovative Housing new construction is determined by each CHDO's analysis of the area real estate market and the CHDO's housing strategy and mission.

The Tulsa County CDBG-Community Development Block Grant Urban County with eleven member governments was formed in 2008. Tulsa County is the lead entity. The CDBG Urban County consists of the unincorporated areas of Tulsa County and ten Tulsa County communities. The City of Broken Arrow, a former CDBG Entitlement, receives an annual allocation from the Urban County program. The City of Broken Arrow will continue to use funds in target areas encompassing the original town site, to administer a comprehensive neighborhood improvement program. The Cities of Bixby, Jenks, Owasso, Sand Springs, and Sapulpa receive funding allocations as Metro Cities, similar to their prior status under the State of Oklahoma Small Cities CDBG program. The remaining cities of Collinsville, Glenpool, Skiatook, and Sperry, along with Tulsa County are in a competitive cities category. All members of the Urban County establish their own priorities for use of CDBG funds, and determine which activities they wish to fund.

Geographic Distribution

Target Area	Percentage of Funds

Table 58 - Geographic Distribution

Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically

In the CDBG Urban County each member government conducts a needs public hearing annually to request citizen comments. Projects are selected that will provide an area-wide benefit to a census tract

or block group that has 51% or more to low to moderate income population. For some projects an income survey is provided for a targeted neighborhood. A community may chose a project that benefits a limited clientele population such as senior citizens. The HOME program benefits low to moderate income individuals throughout the six county MTHC area, most commonly on a household basis such as homebuyer assistance or homeowner housing rehabilitation. Elderly Congregate Housing projects are developed in communities where an extensive market analysis shows the need for affordable apartments for senior citizens.

Discussion

Affordable Housing

AP-55 Affordable Housing - 91.420, 91.220(g)

Introduction

One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported	
Homeless	0
Non-Homeless	0
Special-Needs	0
Total	0

Table 59 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement

One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through	
Rental Assistance	0
The Production of New Units	3
Rehab of Existing Units	0
Acquisition of Existing Units	0
Total	3

Table 60 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type

Discussion

AP-60 Public Housing - 91.420, 91.220(h)

Introduction

There are three public housing agencies located in the MTHC Consortium area: The Bristow Public Housing Authority operates 159 units and the Drumright Public Housing Authority operates 148 units. The Osage County Public Housing Authority operates 282 units at these six locations in Osage County: Barnsdall, Cedar Ridge, Fairfax, Hominy, Osage, and Shidler. In the CDBG Urban County Tulsa County and the Cities of Bixby, Broken Arrow, Collinsville, Glenpool, Jenks, Owasso, Sand Springs, Sapulpa, Skiatook, and Sperry do not operate Public Housing authorities.

Actions planned during the next year to address the needs to public housing

The Bristow, Drumright, and Osage County Housing Authorities will submit annual reports to HUD and apply for Capital Fund Grants. The authorities will utilize their CFP grants to maintain and update their housing communities.

Actions to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership

None have been identified by the three housing authorities.

If the PHA is designated as troubled, describe the manner in which financial assistance will be provided or other assistance

The three Public Housing Authorities in the MTHC Consortium area are not designated by as HUD "troubled" authorities.

Discussion

AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities - 91.420, 91.220(i)

Introduction

An accurate count of the number of homeless persons and subpopulations continues to be difficult yet agencies are experiencing significant demand under healthy economic conditions. One strategy is to continue coordination with Homeless Services Network and Housing and Urban Development to Strengthen Efforts for Assessing Homeless. Estimates from the City of Tulsa and the State indicate there are rural homeless not accounted for in survey data. In recent years assessments have been conducted primarily within the City of Tulsa; however the City of Broken Arrow has participated in the Point in Time One-night Consumer Survey counts the last six years with the 2013 count held on January 30, 2013. Efforts are continuing to work with the Network and area agencies to develop an improved system.

Describe the jurisdictions one-year goals and actions for reducing and ending homelessness including

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

The MTHC does not received funding for homelessness assistance or rapid re-housing therefore there are no specific goals on-year goals.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

Shelters and transitional housing units are located in the City of Tulsa that serve the homeless population in the Greater Tulsa Area.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again

The MTHC does not receive funding to address this issue.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); or, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs.

The MTHC does not receive funding to address this issue.

Discussion

None.

AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing - 91.420, 91.220(j)

Introduction

There are several complex factors which prevent lower income households from obtaining affordable housing. Many of these factors are influenced by elements which are beyond the control of government. These factors include; economic conditions, interest rates, labor and material cost, wage levels, and non local tax policies. We should encourage our 24 local governments to look at factors such as land use and development regulations, development fees and building codes that may not be conducive to promote affordable housing. Cities and counties in the Consortium all participate in the promotion of fair housing within their communities. All 24 local governments are current or former recipients of CDBG funds and have conducted activities to promote fair housing. Such activities have included promoting April as Fair Housing Month, adopting or updating local Fair Housing Ordinances and making available a Fair Housing Brochure.

Actions it planned to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment

The Tulsa Metropolitan Area and the State of Oklahoma do not have restrictive public policies in place that might be barriers to the creation of affordable housing. Housing costs in Oklahoma and the Tulsa region are generally among the most affordable in the country.

Discussion

AP-85 Other Actions - 91.420, 91.220(k)

Introduction

Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs

Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing

Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards

Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

Actions planned to develop institutional structure

Actions planned to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies

Discussion

Program Specific Requirements

AP-90 Program Specific Requirements - 91.420, 91.220(I)(1,2,4)

Introduction

Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)

Reference 24 CFR 91.220(I)(1)

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

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

Other CDBG Requirements

1. The amount of urgent need activities	0
2. The estimated percentage of CDBG funds that will be used for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income. Overall Benefit - A consecutive period of one, two or three years may be used to determine that a minimum overall benefit of 70% of CDBG funds is used to benefit persons of low and moderate income. Specify the years covered that include this Annual Action Plan.	100.00%

HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME)

Reference 24 CFR 91.220(I)(2)

1. A description of other forms of investment being used beyond those identified in Section 92.205 is as follows:

2. A description of the guidelines that will be used for resale or recapture of HOME funds when used for homebuyer activities as required in 92.254, is as follows:

The following terms and conditions apply to the MTHC Homebuyer Assistance Program: Qualified applicants can obtain a self-amortizing five (5) year zero percent (0%) interest loan with a due on sale clause secured by a mortgage instrument (1/5 of loan forgiven each year of occupancy to encourage neighborhood stability). Loan funds returned by homebuyers shall be forwarded to the Metropolitan Tulsa HOME Consortium and shall be retained in a HOME fund account for redistribution to other HOME eligible projects. A resale restriction is in place that states that the homebuyer shall repay a prorated share of HOME funds if property is sold prior to the agreed-upon time period with funds returned to the Consortium. Other items pertaining to the recapture of HOME investment are as follows: No restriction on subsequent buyer. HOME investment funds subject to recapture shall be derived from net proceeds at the time of sale. If net proceeds are insufficient the repayment obligation will be reduced.

3. A description of the guidelines for resale or recapture that ensures the affordability of units acquired with HOME funds? See 24 CFR 92.254(a)(4) are as follows:
4. Plans for using HOME funds to refinance existing debt secured by multifamily housing that is rehabilitated with HOME funds along with a description of the refinancing guidelines required that will be used under 24 CFR 92.206(b), are as follows:

No plans.

Discussion