

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Outreach

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

No  
 SNAP Outreach is currently being provided in Cache County only. There is an RFP process currently occurring which should bring onboard a provider that will expand the program statewide which is the goal.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:			0.2%
Box Elder:			1.8%
Cache:	\$3,540	100.0%	4.0%
Carbon:			0.7%
Daggett:			0.0%
Davis:			11.1%
Duchesne:			0.7%
Emery:			0.4%
Garfield:			0.2%
Grand:			0.3%
Iron:			1.6%
Juab:			0.4%
Kane:			0.3%
Millard:			0.4%
Morgan:			0.4%
Piute:			0.1%
Rich:			0.1%
Salt Lake:			37.2%
San Juan:			0.5%
Sanpete:			1.0%
Sevier:			0.7%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Summit:			1.3%
Tooele:			2.1%
Uintah:			1.2%
Utah:			19.0%
Wasatch:			0.9%
Washington:			5.1%
Wayne:			0.1%
Weber:			8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$3,540</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

The funding is currently distributed to Bear River Association of Governments, which in turn contracts with three Cache Valley food pantries to provide SNAP Outreach.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

While the current distribution of funds is completely in Cache County, future expenditures will increasingly be statewide. An RFP has been issued for a new Outreach contractor who will have the direction to expand this program statewide.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

In the past there has only been one provider willing and able to provide this outreach.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

50% of SNAP Outreach expenses are reimbursed by SNAP. DWS requires our outreach partner to come up with the remaining 50% match from their funds. Due to this requirement, there haven't been any other partners in the past that have been willing to provide SNAP outreach. Going forward, we anticipate being able to find other food pantries throughout the state that will provide this service, with the help of a new Outreach Manager (which we are currently bringing on board through the RFP Process)

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No
N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Nutritional Education

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes  
While this funding is distributed solely to Utah State University (USU) in Cache County, the services USU provides are for the entire state.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:			0.2%
Box Elder:			1.8%
Cache:	\$754,354	100.0%	4.0%
Carbon:			0.7%
Daggett:			0.0%
Davis:			11.1%
Duchesne:			0.7%
Emery:			0.4%
Garfield:			0.2%
Grand:			0.3%
Iron:			1.6%
Juab:			0.4%
Kane:			0.3%
Millard:			0.4%
Morgan:			0.4%
Piute:			0.1%
Rich:			0.1%
Salt Lake:			37.2%
San Juan:			0.5%
Sanpete:			1.0%
Sevier:			0.7%
Summit:			1.3%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Tooele:			2.1%
Uintah:			1.2%
Utah:			19.0%
Wasatch:			0.9%
Washington:			5.1%
Wayne:			0.1%
Weber:			8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$754,354</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

The funds are distributed to Utah State University (USU) through an inter-agency agreement for purposes of providing statewide nutritional education.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

As the services provided benefit the entire state, the distribution reflects actual need as expressed by population.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

N/A

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

N/A

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

N/A

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Voices

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

No  
The organization identified qualified CCDF Match expenditures to draw down additional CCDF Funds and expand a pilot pre-school program.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:		0.0%	0.2%
Box Elder:		0.0%	1.8%
Cache:		0.0%	4.0%
Carbon:		0.0%	0.7%
Daggett:		0.0%	0.0%
Davis:		0.0%	11.1%
Duchesne:		0.0%	0.7%
Emery:		0.0%	0.4%
Garfield:		0.0%	0.2%
Grand:		0.0%	0.3%
Iron:		0.0%	1.6%
Juab:		0.0%	0.4%
Kane:		0.0%	0.3%
Millard:		0.0%	0.4%
Morgan:		0.0%	0.4%
Piute:		0.0%	0.1%
Rich:		0.0%	0.1%
Salt Lake:	\$134,909	100.0%	37.2%
San Juan:		0.0%	0.5%
Sanpete:		0.0%	1.0%
Sevier:		0.0%	0.7%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Summit:		0.0%	1.3%
Tooele:		0.0%	2.1%
Uintah:		0.0%	1.2%
Utah:		0.0%	19.0%
Wasatch:		0.0%	0.9%
Washington:		0.0%	5.1%
Wayne:		0.0%	0.1%
Weber:		0.0%	8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$134,909</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

These funds were distributed to an organization with the ability to provide significant match expenditures, which allowed DWS to draw down additional CCDF funding and expand the pilot pre-school program.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

These funds are distributed only within Salt Lake County because the organization which provided matching funds is located in Salt Lake County.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

There is only one organization receiving this funding and they are located in Salt Lake County.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

There is only one organization receiving this funding and they are located in Salt Lake County.

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

N/A

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Infant/Toddler

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes
The funds are distributed through a statewide Request for Grant (RFG) process. Providers throughout the state have an opportunity to apply for these grants.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:		0.0%	0.2%
Box Elder:	\$6,500	0.8%	1.8%
Cache:	\$19,613	2.4%	4.0%
Carbon:		0.0%	0.7%
Daggett:		0.0%	0.0%
Davis:	\$52,627	6.4%	11.1%
Duchesne:		0.0%	0.7%
Emery:		0.0%	0.4%
Garfield:		0.0%	0.2%
Grand:		0.0%	0.3%
Iron:		0.0%	1.6%
Juab:		0.0%	0.4%
Kane:		0.0%	0.3%
Millard:		0.0%	0.4%
Morgan:	\$7,120	0.9%	0.4%
Piute:		0.0%	0.1%
Rich:		0.0%	0.1%
Salt Lake:	\$442,817	53.7%	37.2%
San Juan:		0.0%	0.5%
Sanpete:	\$3,115	0.4%	1.0%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Sevier:	\$1,927	0.2%	0.7%
Summit:	\$13,660	1.7%	1.3%
Tooele:	\$25,811	3.1%	2.1%
Uintah:		0.0%	1.2%
Utah:	\$99,561	12.1%	19.0%
Wasatch:	\$15,260	1.9%	0.9%
Washington:	\$32,086	3.9%	5.1%
Wayne:		0.0%	0.1%
Weber:	\$103,799	12.6%	8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$823,897</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

These funds are distributed through a statewide public RFG process which is competitive. Grants are awarded based on proposals with high overall scores.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

The distribution of funds reflects the number of applications and awards submitted through the RFG process rather than the population of the counties.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

The distribution of funds reflects the number of applications and awards submitted through the RFG process rather than the population of the counties.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Funds are distributed through a statewide public RFG process which is competitive. Grants are awarded based on proposals with high overall scores.

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

N/A

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Quality Environment

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes
The funds are distributed through a statewide Request for Grant (RFG) process. Providers throughout the state have an opportunity to apply for these grants.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:		0.0%	0.2%
Box Elder:	\$4,458	0.8%	1.8%
Cache:	\$26,235	4.5%	4.0%
Carbon:	\$1,600	0.3%	0.7%
Daggett:		0.0%	0.0%
Davis:	\$79,644	13.8%	11.1%
Duchesne:		0.0%	0.7%
Emery:		0.0%	0.4%
Garfield:		0.0%	0.2%
Grand:		0.0%	0.3%
Iron:		0.0%	1.6%
Juab:		0.0%	0.4%
Kane:		0.0%	0.3%
Millard:	\$4,500	0.8%	0.4%
Morgan:		0.0%	0.4%
Piute:		0.0%	0.1%
Rich:		0.0%	0.1%
Salt Lake:	\$235,531	40.7%	37.2%
San Juan:	\$4,500	0.8%	0.5%
Sanpete:	\$4,453	0.8%	1.0%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Sevier:		0.0%	0.7%
Summit:	\$5,000	0.9%	1.3%
Tooele:	\$18,300	3.2%	2.1%
Uintah:	\$5,500	1.0%	1.2%
Utah:	\$32,500	5.6%	19.0%
Wasatch:	\$5,000	0.9%	0.9%
Washington:	\$55,300	9.6%	5.1%
Wayne:		0.0%	0.1%
Weber:	\$96,300	16.6%	8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$578,821</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

These funds are distributed through a statewide public RFG process which competitive. Grants are awarded based on proposals with high overall scores.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

The distribution of funds reflects the number of applications and awards submitted through the RFG process. The distribution of funds is largely in line with the population distribution for the state.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

N/A

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Funds are distributed through a statewide public RFG process which is competitive. Grants are awarded based on proposals with high overall scores.

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

N/A

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Association Support

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes  
While the organizations receiving funding for providing these services are all located within Salt Lake County, they provide services to child care providers statewide.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:		0.0%	0.2%
Box Elder:		0.0%	1.8%
Cache:		0.0%	4.0%
Carbon:		0.0%	0.7%
Daggett:		0.0%	0.0%
Davis:		0.0%	11.1%
Duchesne:		0.0%	0.7%
Emery:		0.0%	0.4%
Garfield:		0.0%	0.2%
Grand:		0.0%	0.3%
Iron:		0.0%	1.6%
Juab:		0.0%	0.4%
Kane:		0.0%	0.3%
Millard:		0.0%	0.4%
Morgan:		0.0%	0.4%
Piute:		0.0%	0.1%
Rich:		0.0%	0.1%
Salt Lake:	\$10,133	100.0%	37.2%
San Juan:		0.0%	0.5%
Sanpete:		0.0%	1.0%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Sevier:		0.0%	0.7%
Summit:		0.0%	1.3%
Tooele:		0.0%	2.1%
Uintah:		0.0%	1.2%
Utah:		0.0%	19.0%
Wasatch:		0.0%	0.9%
Washington:		0.0%	5.1%
Wayne:		0.0%	0.1%
Weber:		0.0%	8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$10,133</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

These funds are distributed to child care associations who assist in the planning and administration of the Annual Child Care and After School Provider Conferences serving providers statewide.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

While all of the associations receiving this funding are located within Salt Lake County, the services they provide in return for this funding benefit Child Care providers statewide.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

There are no know child care associations in Utah outside of Salt Lake County.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

All of the child care associations are located within Salt Lake County.

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

N/A

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Kindergarten Match

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

No

This is not a statewide program, but it does not exclude rural areas of the state. Three school districts throughout the state have been identified to participate in this program. These districts were identified based on the high percentage of youth participating in the Free School Lunch program, as well as the amount of match expenditures these districts were able to provide which allows DWS to draw down additional CCDF funds.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:		0.0%	0.2%
Box Elder:		0.0%	1.8%
Cache:		0.0%	4.0%
Carbon:		0.0%	0.7%
Daggett:		0.0%	0.0%
Davis:	\$199,946	62.6%	11.1%
Duchesne:		0.0%	0.7%
Emery:		0.0%	0.4%
Garfield:		0.0%	0.2%
Grand:		0.0%	0.3%
Iron:		0.0%	1.6%
Juab:		0.0%	0.4%
Kane:		0.0%	0.3%
Millard:		0.0%	0.4%
Morgan:		0.0%	0.4%
Piute:		0.0%	0.1%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Rich:		0.0%	0.1%
Salt Lake:		0.0%	37.2%
San Juan:		0.0%	0.5%
Sanpete:		0.0%	1.0%
Sevier:		0.0%	0.7%
Summit:		0.0%	1.3%
Tooele:		0.0%	2.1%
Uintah:	\$65,000	20.3%	1.2%
Utah:		0.0%	19.0%
Wasatch:		0.0%	0.9%
Washington:	\$54,479	17.1%	5.1%
Wayne:		0.0%	0.1%
Weber:		0.0%	8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$319,426</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

These funds were distributed to school districts who serve a high percentage of low income youth and who also have the ability to provide DWS with significant Kindergarten match expenditures to draw down additional CCDF funds.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

Due to the limited amount of funds allocated to this program, the maximum number of districts are currently being funded. Over 37% of the funds are spent with rural school districts, which is reflective of the population of rural Utah.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

See above.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Due to the limited amount of kindergarten match DWS can claim, this program is limited to the current three participating districts. Additional funding spent in this program would not increase the amount of CCDF match dollars available.

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

N/A

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Statewide

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes, these funds are distributed to agencies who provide services throughout the state.  
N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"  
If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses
Utah State University (USU) - Professional Development Institute	\$1,453,569
Department of Health (DOH) - Child Care Licensing	\$1,692,324
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,145,893</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

Funds are distributed to Utah State University (USU) and the Department of Health (DOH) through an inter-agency agreement. These entities provide child care services throughout the state.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

The distribution of funds mirrors need as expressed by population as services are provided throughout the state.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

N/A

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

N/A

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No

N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Resource and Referral

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes, this is a statewide program.

N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

Description	SFY2014 Total Expenses	Percent of Total	FFY2014 Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Bear River ESA (Box Elder, Cache, & Rich Counties)	\$551,159	19.15%	\$548,755	16.62%	5.86%
Castle Country ESA (Carbon & Emery Counties)					
Southeast ESA (Grand & San Juan Counties)	\$261,761	9.09%	\$282,006	8.54%	3.90%
Uintah Basin ESA (Daggett, Duchesne, & Uintah Counties)					
Mountainland ESA (Juab, Summit, Utah, & Wasatch Counties)	\$285,091	9.90%	\$433,703	13.14%	21.62%
Southwest ESA (Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, & Washington Counties)					
Central Utah ESA (Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, & Wayne Counties)	\$456,914	15.87%	\$527,661	15.98%	9.63%
Wasatch Front North ESA (Davis, Morgan, & Weber Counties)	\$484,983	16.85%	\$521,288	15.79%	19.68%
Wasatch Front South ESA (Salt Lake & Tooele Counties)	\$838,778	29.14%	\$987,680	29.92%	39.32%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$2,878,685</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$3,301,093</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

Funds are distributed to 6 agencies who administer the CCDF Resource and Referral (R&R) program for different regions of the state. These 6 regions correspond with the geographic area of our Economic Service Areas (ESAs). Funds are distributed to five of the six R&R agencies through an inter-agency agreement. The sixth R&R agency, which is responsible for the program for the Wasatch Front South area, is funded through an RFP process.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

With the exception of the Bear River ESA, the distribution of funds is somewhat in line with the population distribution. The Bear River ESA receives additional R&R funding allocation because they maintain the statewide Child Care Referral Database and the statewide Caregiver Registry.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

The Bear River ESA provides statewide services in addition to serving their ESA area. They also maintain the statewide Child Care Referral Database and the statewide Caregiver Registry.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

N/A

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No

N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Sole Source

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes, while funds are distributed to an organization in Salt Lake County, this organization provides support throughout the state.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

N/A

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:		0.0%	0.2%
Box Elder:		0.0%	1.8%
Cache:		0.0%	4.0%
Carbon:		0.0%	0.7%
Daggett:		0.0%	0.0%
Davis:		0.0%	11.1%
Duchesne:		0.0%	0.7%
Emery:		0.0%	0.4%
Garfield:		0.0%	0.2%
Grand:		0.0%	0.3%
Iron:		0.0%	1.6%
Juab:		0.0%	0.4%
Kane:		0.0%	0.3%
Millard:		0.0%	0.4%
Morgan:		0.0%	0.4%
Piute:		0.0%	0.1%
Rich:		0.0%	0.1%
Salt Lake:	\$35,000	100.0%	37.2%
San Juan:		0.0%	0.5%
Sanpete:		0.0%	1.0%
Sevier:		0.0%	0.7%
Summit:		0.0%	1.3%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Tooele:		0.0%	2.1%
Uintah:		0.0%	1.2%
Utah:		0.0%	19.0%
Wasatch:		0.0%	0.9%
Washington:		0.0%	5.1%
Wayne:		0.0%	0.1%
Weber:		0.0%	8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$35,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

The organization which received the funds is the only organization in the state that offers professional development and technical assistance specific to school age and afterschool programs. These funds were distributed based on a sole source agreement.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

The distribution is reflective of population as services provided are through a statewide program.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

N/A

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

Funds are distributed through a sole source agreement as this organization is the only organization in the state that provides this service.

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

No
N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) Technical Assistance

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes, funds are awarded through a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process, which is available to grantees statewide.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

N/A

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:		0.0%	0.2%
Box Elder:		0.0%	1.8%
Cache:		0.0%	4.0%
Carbon:		0.0%	0.7%
Daggett:		0.0%	0.0%
Davis:		0.0%	11.1%
Duchesne:		0.0%	0.7%
Emery:		0.0%	0.4%
Garfield:		0.0%	0.2%
Grand:		0.0%	0.3%
Iron:		0.0%	1.6%
Juab:		0.0%	0.4%
Kane:		0.0%	0.3%
Millard:		0.0%	0.4%
Morgan:		0.0%	0.4%
Piute:		0.0%	0.1%
Rich:		0.0%	0.1%
Salt Lake:	\$229,321	100.0%	37.2%
San Juan:		0.0%	0.5%
Sanpete:		0.0%	1.0%
Sevier:		0.0%	0.7%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Summit:		0.0%	1.3%
Tooele:		0.0%	2.1%
Uintah:		0.0%	1.2%
Utah:		0.0%	19.0%
Wasatch:		0.0%	0.9%
Washington:		0.0%	5.1%
Wayne:		0.0%	0.1%
Weber:		0.0%	8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$229,321</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

These funds are distributed to organizations that can provide the best technical assistance to the programs statewide. This is determined utilizing a bid process through State Purchasing. Proposals are reviewed and scored, with funds being awarded to the organizations that best meet the requirements of the RFP.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

All of the funds are currently distributed to organizations in Salt Lake County, as all of the organizations who submitted proposals were from this county. While these organizations are located in Salt Lake County, they provide services to providers statewide.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

N/A

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

Funds are distributed through a statewide public RFP process.

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No
N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) After School Programs

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes, funds are awarded through an RFG process, which is available to grantees statewide.
N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:		0.0%	0.2%
Box Elder:		0.0%	1.8%
Cache:	\$32,730	3.0%	4.0%
Carbon:		0.0%	0.7%
Daggett:		0.0%	0.0%
Davis:	\$124,000	11.3%	11.1%
Duchesne:		0.0%	0.7%
Emery:		0.0%	0.4%
Garfield:		0.0%	0.2%
Grand:		0.0%	0.3%
Iron:		0.0%	1.6%
Juab:		0.0%	0.4%
Kane:		0.0%	0.3%
Millard:		0.0%	0.4%
Morgan:		0.0%	0.4%
Piute:		0.0%	0.1%
Rich:		0.0%	0.1%
Salt Lake:	\$923,665	84.0%	37.2%
San Juan:		0.0%	0.5%
Sanpete:		0.0%	1.0%
Sevier:		0.0%	0.7%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Summit:		0.0%	1.3%
Tooele:		0.0%	2.1%
Uintah:		0.0%	1.2%
Utah:		0.0%	19.0%
Wasatch:		0.0%	0.9%
Washington:	\$19,607	1.8%	5.1%
Wayne:		0.0%	0.1%
Weber:		0.0%	8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$1,100,002</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

Funds are distributed through a public statewide RFG process. The RFG requires a minimum match requirement of \$20,000, which allows DWS to draw additional CCDF funding. Grant proposals are reviewed by a committee, and proposals that adequately answer the RFG questions and can meet the minimum match requirement are awarded the grant.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

With the exception of Salt Lake County, the distribution is comparable to actual need expressed by population except in counties where no grant proposals are received. Salt Lake County receives a greater share of the distribution due to the number of proposals submitted from this area.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

The distribution of funds is reflective of the counties from which we receive grant proposals.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Funds are distributed through a statewide public RFG process which includes a minimum match requirement.

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

N/A

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) After School Programs - Allocation by ESA

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes, all areas can potentially be served with this program; however, we may not receive grant proposals that meet the minimum score requirements from organizations in each DWS Economic Service Area (ESA).

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

N/A

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:	\$30,997	2.3%	0.2%
Box Elder:		0.0%	1.8%
Cache:	\$255,133	19.2%	4.0%
Carbon:		0.0%	0.7%
Daggett:		0.0%	0.0%
Davis:	\$37,543	2.8%	11.1%
Duchesne:		0.0%	0.7%
Emery:	\$31,000	2.3%	0.4%
Garfield:		0.0%	0.2%
Grand:	\$3,107	0.2%	0.3%
Iron:		0.0%	1.6%
Juab:		0.0%	0.4%
Kane:		0.0%	0.3%
Millard:		0.0%	0.4%
Morgan:		0.0%	0.4%
Piute:		0.0%	0.1%
Rich:		0.0%	0.1%
Salt Lake:	\$592,349	44.6%	37.2%
San Juan:		0.0%	0.5%
Sanpete:		0.0%	1.0%
Sevier:		0.0%	0.7%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Summit:	\$93,000	7.0%	1.3%
Tooele:		0.0%	2.1%
Uintah:		0.0%	1.2%
Utah:	\$284,095	21.4%	19.0%
Wasatch:		0.0%	0.9%
Washington:		0.0%	5.1%
Wayne:		0.0%	0.1%
Weber:		0.0%	8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$1,327,223</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

Funding is allocated to each of the nine DWS Economic Service Areas (ESAs), based on the population of youth ages 5-12 within the ESA. Funds are awarded utilizing an RFG process, which includes a match requirement from the grant applicant. Grant proposals for after school programs are received and scored within each ESA. After grant proposals that meet the minimum score are funded, remaining funding is allocated to grant proposals within other ESAs and is redistributed based on scoring of the grant proposals. If there are no grant proposals received from within an ESA, the allotment for that ESA is re-distributed to the rest of the state based on grant proposal scoring. In the 2016 release of these grants, priority points will be given to programs operating in rural counties.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

The distribution is comparable to actual need expressed by youth population except in counties where no grant proposals are received or where the portion of funding for the ESA is less than \$62,000.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

If no proposals are received from any of the counties in an ESA, the funding for that ESA will be re-distributed to proposals in other ESAs based on scoring of grant proposals. In cases where the funding allotment is less than \$62,000, the funding allotment will be rounded up to \$62,000 to that ESA to enable 2 grants of \$31,000 each to be approved.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

The DWS Office of Child Care (OCC) has set the target size for these grants at \$31,000 each. OCC would like a minimum of two grants in each service area.

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No

N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund (OWHLF)

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes. This program can serve populations throughout the state. In a given year, however, we may not have projects in all regions of the state.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

N/A

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

		Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
	Beaver:	\$70,000	0.56%	0.2%
	Box Elder:		0.00%	1.8%
	Cache:		0.00%	4.0%
	Carbon:	\$58,520	0.47%	0.7%
	Daggett:	\$180,000	1.44%	0.0%
	Davis:		0.00%	11.1%
	Duchesne:	\$26,000	0.21%	0.7%
	Emery:	\$15,000	0.12%	0.4%
	Garfield:		0.00%	0.2%
	Grand:		0.00%	0.3%
	Iron:		0.00%	1.6%
	Juab:		0.00%	0.4%
	Kane:		0.00%	0.3%
	Millard:		0.00%	0.4%
	Morgan:		0.00%	0.4%
	Piute:		0.00%	0.1%
	Rich:		0.00%	0.1%
	Salt Lake:	\$5,005,146	40.10%	37.2%
	San Juan:		0.00%	0.5%
	Sanpete:	\$21,500	0.17%	1.0%
	Sevier:	\$59,804	0.48%	0.7%
	Summit:	\$120,000	0.96%	1.3%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Tooele:		0.00%	2.1%
Uintah:	\$1,015,000	8.13%	1.2%
Utah:	\$4,880,396	39.10%	19.0%
Wasatch:	\$30,000	0.24%	0.9%
Washington:		0.00%	5.1%
Wayne:		0.00%	0.1%
Weber:	\$1,000,000	8.01%	8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$12,481,366</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

Project applications are submitted to the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund Board by local government entities, non-profit entities, and professional developers that specialize in affordable housing. The applications are approved based on their underwriting qualifications and ranking in the competitive environment. Once a project application is approved, a contract is written with the subrecipient and funds are paid out on a reimbursement basis.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

Project viability is considered during the underwriting review. Viability is largely determined by need, for if there is no real target audience for a project, the loan revenue won't be supported by adequate rents. Need, therefore, is not necessarily a reflection of a regional population.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

Distributions represent need but may not reflect regional population.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

There are many variables considered before a project is funded: need, ability to complete on time, viability (ability to maintain rent restrictions required by the state or federal rules, adequate cash flow, etc.), ability to repay the loan, etc. In addition, because these are competitive applications, we must actually have a developer that is willing to apply for funds.

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Yes. UCA §§35A-8-504, -505 mandates how the funds shall be distributed.

Not less than 30% must be targeted to rural areas; at least 50% must be loaned, with at least 50% of that portion to be distributed to benefit persons whose annual income is at or below 50% of the AMI for the state, and 50% distributed to those with annual income at or below 80% of AMI; 90% of grant money must benefit those with income at or below 50% of the AMI. Funds are to be used for the following activities: acquisition, rehabilitation or construction of affordable housing units, special-needs rental assistance, construction of accessible housing, construction of transitional housing for the homeless, etc. Likewise, there are restrictions on who can apply for the funding.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)

*Also called the HEAT Program in Utah*

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes.	Please respond "Yes" or "No"
N/A	If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:	\$61,464	0.43%	0.22%
Box Elder:	\$223,040	1.57%	1.75%
Cache:	\$712,038	5.01%	4.03%
Carbon:	\$359,528	2.53%	0.72%
Daggett:	\$8,743	0.06%	0.04%
Davis:	\$877,619	6.17%	11.10%
Duchesne:	\$154,026	1.08%	0.70%
Emery:	\$136,208	0.96%	0.37%
Garfield:	\$50,076	0.35%	0.18%
Grand:	\$165,337	1.16%	0.32%
Iron:	\$454,335	3.19%	1.61%
Juab:	\$69,365	0.49%	0.36%
Kane:	\$63,740	0.45%	0.25%
Millard:	\$118,187	0.83%	0.44%
Morgan:	\$6,074	0.04%	0.35%
Piute:	\$26,666	0.19%	0.05%
Rich:	\$8,226	0.06%	0.08%
Salt Lake:	\$4,913,711	34.55%	37.22%
San Juan:	\$449,580	3.16%	0.52%
Sanpete:	\$332,202	2.34%	0.97%
Sevier:	\$325,891	2.29%	0.72%
Summit:	\$34,585	0.24%	1.33%
Tooele:	\$401,495	2.82%	2.09%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Uintah:	\$204,285	1.44%	1.23%
Utah:	\$1,404,504	9.87%	19.03%
Wasatch:	\$59,707	0.42%	0.91%
Washington:	\$912,587	6.42%	5.10%
Wayne:	\$45,916	0.32%	0.09%
Weber:	\$1,644,704	11.56%	8.22%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$14,223,837</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

Funds are distributed to eligible applicants based on their income, household size, household make-up (e.g., seniors, disabled, or children under 6 included in household), and poverty level. However, payments are actually made directly to the utility providers.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

Since all eligible applicants receive benefits, we can assume that total benefits paid out reflect need in the specific region and are commensurate with the population of any county/community.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

Distributions are made according to the applications received. Presumably, they reflect the regional population.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

N/A

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

Yes. UCA §35A-8-1402 mandates how the funds shall be distributed.

Eligibility is determined by vulnerability and income at or below 150% of poverty. The benefit payment is determined by the household's percent of poverty, which is based on household size, the energy burden, and whether the household includes elderly, disabled, and children under age 6.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

No.

While the federal CDBG funding is provided communities statewide, the "Balance of State" program operated by the DWS Housing & Community Development Division (HCD) is available only to towns and cities with populations of less than 50,000, and counties with populations of less than 200,000. Communities and counties with populations in excess of 50,000 and 200,000, respectively, are considered "Entitlement Communities" and receive CDBG funds directly from HUD.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:	\$168,000	4.02%	0.2%
Box Elder:	\$138,536	3.31%	1.8%
Cache:	\$238,536	5.70%	4.0%
Carbon:	\$166,250	3.97%	0.7%
Daggett:	\$84,713	2.02%	0.0%
Davis:		0.00%	11.1%
Duchesne:	\$83,713	2.00%	0.7%
Emery:	\$46,250	1.11%	0.4%
Garfield:	\$18,000	0.43%	0.2%
Grand:	\$236,896	5.66%	0.3%
Iron:	\$187,418	4.48%	1.6%
Juab:	\$88,256	2.11%	0.4%
Kane:	\$18,000	0.43%	0.3%
Millard:	\$122,999	2.94%	0.4%
Morgan:		0.00%	0.4%
Piute:	\$102,899	2.46%	0.1%
Rich:	\$93,537	2.24%	0.1%
Salt Lake:		0.00%	37.2%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

San Juan:	\$46,250	1.11%	0.5%
Sanpete:	\$171,849	4.11%	1.0%
Sevier:	\$24,999	0.60%	0.7%
Summit:	\$298,664	7.14%	1.3%
Tooele:	\$430,000	10.28%	2.1%
Uintah:	\$457,463	10.93%	1.2%
Utah:		0.00%	19.0%
Wasatch:	\$166,564	3.98%	0.9%
Washington:	\$468,000	11.19%	5.1%
Wayne:	\$25,001	0.60%	0.1%
Weber:	\$301,000	7.19%	8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$4,183,792</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

A statewide formula utilizing a base amount and a per capita population distribution is used to allocate funds regionally. Regional steering committees then review consolidated plans, pre-applications and other information to prioritize long-range funding plans. Finally, applications are reviewed for project "readiness" and other eligibility requirements before funding is awarded.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

Population is actually an inverse factor throughout the state, since cities and towns with populations greater than 50,000 and counties with populations greater than 200,000 are not eligible to apply for the "Balance of State" allocation.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

Population in small cities, towns and counties is one factor in the distribution formula used to distribute funding regionally.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

N/A

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

N/A

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Permanent Community Impact Fund Board (CIB)

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

No.
The Permanent Community Impact Fund Board (CIB) is a program of the state of Utah which provides loans and/or grants to state agencies and subdivisions of the state which are or may be socially or economically impacted, directly or indirectly, by mineral resource development on federal lands.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:	\$77,700	0.06%	0.2%
Box Elder:	\$0	0.00%	1.8%
Cache:	\$11,060,000	8.25%	4.0%
Carbon:	\$16,850,000	12.58%	0.7%
Daggett:	\$0	0.00%	0.0%
Davis:	\$0	0.00%	11.1%
Duchesne:	\$42,221,225	31.51%	0.7%
Emery:	\$3,626,300	2.71%	0.4%
Garfield:	\$2,878,797	2.15%	0.2%
Grand:	\$100,000	0.07%	0.3%
Iron:	\$5,370,000	4.01%	1.6%
Juab:	\$193,690	0.14%	0.4%
Kane:	\$1,187,000	0.89%	0.3%
Millard:	\$1,088,500	0.81%	0.4%
Morgan:	\$0	0.00%	0.4%
Piute:	\$1,479,000	1.10%	0.1%
Rich:	\$0	0.00%	0.1%
Salt Lake:	\$0	0.00%	37.2%
San Juan:	\$8,370,000	6.25%	0.5%
Sanpete:	\$2,290,549	1.71%	1.0%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Sevier:	\$2,580,965	1.93%	0.7%
Summit:	\$30,000	0.02%	1.3%
Tooele:	\$0	0.00%	2.1%
Uintah:	\$25,495,707	19.03%	1.2%
Utah:	\$0	0.00%	19.0%
Wasatch:	\$7,900,000	5.90%	0.9%
Washington:	\$898,035	0.67%	5.1%
Wayne:	\$294,000	0.22%	0.1%
Weber:	\$0	0.00%	8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$133,991,468</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

The source of the CIB's funding are the mineral lease royalties returned to the state by the federal government. Funds are distributed to eligible applicants for eligible projects (both defined in statute) based on a competitive application process. An 11-member board, appointed by the Governor, awards funds based on an applicant's ability to accept debt, bonding capacity, overall cost/benefit of the project, population served, etc.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

There is no real correlation between the distribution of funds and population.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

The CIB is prohibited from funding projects in counties along the Wasatch Front -- Salt Lake, Utah, Davis and Weber counties -- which is, of course, the largest population center. Likewise, non-revenue producing counties are less likely to be considered for funding.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

Several counties are ineligible to apply for funds.

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

N/A

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Weatherization Assistance

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes.	Please respond "Yes" or "No"
N/A	If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Beaver:	\$24,994	0.35%	0.2%
Box Elder:	\$332,537	4.62%	1.8%
Cache:	\$332,537	4.62%	4.0%
Carbon:	\$266,748	3.70%	0.7%
Daggett:	\$4,364	0.06%	0.0%
Davis:	\$332,384	4.61%	11.1%
Duchesne:	\$148,391	2.06%	0.7%
Emery:	\$75,769	1.05%	0.4%
Garfield:	\$85,585	1.19%	0.2%
Grand:	\$0	0.00%	0.3%
Iron:	\$196,921	2.73%	1.6%
Juab:	\$4,259	0.06%	0.4%
Kane:	\$7,574	0.11%	0.3%
Millard:	\$8,519	0.12%	0.4%
Morgan:	\$0	0.00%	0.4%
Piute:	\$8,519	0.12%	0.1%
Rich:	\$0	0.00%	0.1%
Salt Lake:	\$2,035,894	28.26%	37.2%
San Juan:	\$695,414	9.65%	0.5%
Sanpete:	\$151,210	2.10%	1.0%
Sevier:	\$253,436	3.52%	0.7%
Summit:	\$22,282	0.31%	1.3%
Tooee:	\$167,455	2.32%	2.1%

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Uintah:	\$283,688	3.94%	1.2%
Utah:	\$826,132	11.47%	19.0%
Wasatch:	\$8,570	0.12%	0.9%
Washington:	\$442,316	6.14%	5.1%
Wayne:	\$0	0.00%	0.1%
Weber:	\$489,666	6.80%	8.2%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$7,205,164</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

To be eligible for weatherization assistance, gross annual household income must be at or below 200% of the federal poverty level. Funds are allocated to 8 provider organizations based on geographic service area, percentage of poverty, fuel costs, weather, etc. Agencies that receive allocations are not required to spend by county, but address a waiting list of applications and prioritize based on several factors.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

While population is not the basis for distribution, it can be assumed there is a correlation between population and the number of eligible applicants in any geographic area.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

Need is determined by household circumstance, not geography.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

See above.

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

Yes.  
Federal program rules have helped to define the allocation principles.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

hat

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Community Services Block Grant (CSBG)

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes. However, funding is not allocated to each county but to a coordinating entity, as mandated by the federal government.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

N/A

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

Entity	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
Bear River Association of Governments (Box Elder, Cache, Rich):	\$240,860	7.53%	5.91%
Community Action Services of Provo (Summit, Utah, Wasatch):	\$620,202	19.39%	21.45%
Family Connection Center (Davis):	\$245,090	7.66%	11.20%
Five County AOG (Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, Washington):	\$292,937	9.16%	7.42%
Ogden Weber Community Action Program (Weber):	\$282,628	8.84%	8.29%
Salt Lake Community Action Program (Salt Lake, Tooele):	\$1,051,885	32.89%	39.66%
Six County Association of Governments (Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, Wayne):	\$135,914	4.25%	2.66%
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (Carbon, Emery, Grand):	\$130,627	4.08%	1.43%
Uintah Basin Association of Governments ( Daggett, Duchesne, Uintah):	\$93,353	2.92%	1.98%
UCAPA (Statewide):	\$105,000	3.28%	
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$3,198,496</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

Funding is allocated, by federal statute, to community action agencies to accomplish specific objectives that address poverty in their local area. There are 9 CAPs that receive this funding in Utah; allocations are based on population.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

CSBG is a flexible source of funding in that it allows each community to properly address the issues of poverty that reflect needs in the local area. Each grantee organization operates the program under the direction of a tri-partite board comprised of elected officials, business representatives, and low-income individuals. These boards are charged with identifying the specific problems in the community and developing work plans and structuring programs to address these issues.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

N/A

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

N/A

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

Yes.

The Community Services Block Grant program was created by the federal Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. Federal law mandates that states distribute their CSBG funds in the following manner: 90% to the State's network of community action programs (CAPs). The funds are allocated among the CAPs according to a poverty population-based formula.

The remaining funds are distributed as follows: 5% to CAAs or other eligible public or private organizations for discretionary antipoverty programs and 5% for state administration, monitoring and technical assistance activities.

Uses, restrictions and eligibility is further defined in the Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance, Number 93.569.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes	Please respond "Yes" or "No"
N/A	If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

Description / Economic Service Area (ESA)	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
<b>Statewide - Benefit Payments</b>	\$23,468,207		
<b>Bear River ESA</b> (Box Elder, Cache, & Rich Counties)	\$1,152,091	13.36%	5.86%
<b>Castle Country ESA</b> (Carbon & Emery Counties)	\$79,163	0.92%	1.09%
<b>Central Utah ESA</b> (Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, & Wayne Counties)	\$22,199	0.26%	2.28%
<b>Mountainland ESA</b> (Juab, Summit, Utah, & Wasatch Counties)	\$928,616	10.77%	21.62%
<b>Southeast ESA</b> (Grand & San Juan Counties)	\$100,257	1.16%	0.84%
<b>Southwest ESA</b> (Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, and Washington Counties)	\$416,698	4.83%	7.36%
<b>Uintah Basin ESA</b> (Daggett, Duchesne, & Uintah Counties)	\$33,030	0.38%	1.96%
<b>Wasatch Front North ESA</b> (Davis, Morgan, & Weber Counties)	\$544,687	6.32%	19.68%
<b>Wasatch Front South ESA</b> (Salt Lake & Tooele Counties)	\$5,348,056	62.01%	39.32%
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$32,093,003</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

Funds, in general, are statewide. Benefits/support services are paid to eligible individuals no matter where in the state they reside. Contracts/grants are awarded based on a competitive process with contracts/grants being awarded where services are most needed.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

The TANF-funded cash assistance program (FEP) provides a cash benefit to families with very little or no income. It is meant to be a financial safety net program when families lose employment or are unable to work due to various employment barriers. TANF funds help address the barriers to employment and lead parents to job opportunities that can sustain their families. Pre- and post-recession caseload numbers show a correlation between high caseloads and high unemployment rates. Similarly, caseloads declined following the recession as unemployment rates declined. TANF cash benefits are also given to relatives who assume financial responsibility of children in their extended family or if a parent is on SSI, their children can continue to receive a TANF cash benefit. These are known as TANF child only cases. These cases make up about half of all TANF cash assistance cases in Utah. As the need to provide cash assistance to children in these situations continues to increase, TANF provides the assistance that is needed to supplement financial needs.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

Contracts/grants to provide services are awarded on a RFG/RFP process. Bids are solicited and contracts/grants awarded based on proposal scores. Additional points are awarded for proposals from entities in rural areas.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

Client benefits are awarded based on those that apply for benefits, regardless of location within the state. Contracts/grants are awarded using a competitive process. Because of a need for services in rural areas, bids from rural areas are given additional points in the scoring system.

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No

N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Refugee Assistance

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes	Please respond "Yes" or "No"
N/A	If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

While the Refugee Program is a statewide program, Refugee funds are spent almost exclusively in Salt Lake County because the population the funds support (i.e., refugees resettled in Utah within the last 5 years) live almost exclusively in Salt Lake County. The Federal government resettles refugees within 50 miles of a Resettlement Agency, and the Resettlement Agency that serves Utah is located in Salt Lake City.

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

The refugee agencies DWS contracts with are located in Salt Lake County. While they provide services to refugees statewide, almost all refugees in Utah live in the Salt Lake area.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

This distribution does compare to the need expressed by the refugee population.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

N/A

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

N/A

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No	Please respond "Yes" or "No"
N/A	If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Veterans' Employment and Training Services (VETS)

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes	Please respond "Yes" or "No"
N/A	If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

VETS funds were spent statewide for FTEs among the DWS service areas. SFY2014 expenses were \$1,205,653.
--

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

No funding was distributed for this statewide program.
--

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

N/A
-----

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

N/A
-----

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

N/A
-----

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No	Please respond "Yes" or "No"
----	------------------------------

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

N/A

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Trade Adjustment Act Assistance

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

Yes

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

No  
There may not be a Trade Petition approved in all areas of the State, but the funds are available for all areas if a Trade Petition exists and there are customers to serve.

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

DWS Economic Service Area (ESA)	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
<b>State Level (On Behalf of all ESAs)</b>	73,230		
<b>Bear River ESA</b> (Box Elder, Cache, & Rich Counties)	27,308	3.20%	5.86%
<b>Castle Country ESA</b> (Carbon & Emery Counties)	-	0.00%	1.09%
<b>Central Utah ESA</b> (Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, & Wayne Counties)	(3)	0.00%	2.28%
<b>Mountainland ESA</b> (Juab, Summit, Utah, & Wasatch Counties)	96,764	11.34%	21.62%
<b>Southeast ESA</b> (Grand & San Juan Counties)	-	0.00%	0.84%
<b>Southwest ESA</b> (Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, and Washington Counties)	20,787	2.44%	7.36%
<b>Uintah Basin ESA</b> (Daggett, Duchesne, & Uintah Counties)	-	0.00%	1.96%
<b>Wasatch Front North ESA</b> (Davis, Morgan, & Weber Counties)	285,112	33.41%	19.68%
<b>Wasatch Front South ESA</b> (Salt Lake & Tooele Counties)	423,371	49.61%	39.32%
<b>Sub-Total Amount Expended in FY14</b>	<b>853,340</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Grand Total Amount Expended in FY14</b>	<b>926,569</b>		

No Trade eligible customers  
No Trade eligible customers  
(this is a credit against FY 2013 expenses)

No Trade eligible customers

No Trade eligible customers

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

The funds are distributed based on eligible customer need for each of the ESAs at the beginning of the State fiscal year. Funds are then moved between the ESAs if needed throughout the year.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

The funds are distributed based on eligible customer need and approved Trade Petitions from companies downsizing or going out of business (not based on population).

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

The funds are distributed based on eligible customer need and approved Trade Petitions from companies downsizing or going out of business (not based on population).

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

The funds are distributed based on eligible customer need and approved Trade Petitions from companies downsizing or going out of business (not based on population).

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No, only driven by approved petitions and based on eligible companies/customers

N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Workforce Investment Act Assistance (WIA)/GenLEX

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)? Yes

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes	Please respond "Yes" or "No" If "No" in the previous cell, explain why
N/A	

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering] Data not available by County, only by DWS ESA

DWS Economic Service Area (ESA)	Total Expenses	Percent of Total	Population Percentage
<b>State Level (On Behalf of all ESAs as well as the GenLEX Grant)</b>	482,896		
Bear River ESA (Box Elder, Cache, & Rich Counties)	272,652	5.51%	5.86%
Castle Country ESA (Carbon & Emery Counties)	114,433	2.31%	1.09%
Central Utah ESA (Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, & Wayne Counties)	157,975	3.19%	2.28%
Mountainland ESA (Juab, Summit, Utah, & Wasatch Counties)	863,784	17.47%	21.62%
Southeast ESA (Grand & San Juan Counties)	54,339	1.10%	0.84%
Southwest ESA (Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, and Washington Counties)	463,784	9.38%	7.36%
Uintah Basin ESA (Daggett, Duchesne, & Uintah Counties)	145,863	2.95%	1.96%
Wasatch Front North ESA (Davis, Morgan, & Weber Counties)	853,111	17.25%	19.68%
Wasatch Front South ESA (Salt Lake & Tooele Counties)	2,019,782	40.84%	39.32%
<b>Sub-Total Amount Expended in FY14</b>	<b>4,945,724</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Grand Total Amount Expended in FY14</b>	<b>5,428,619</b>		

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

The WIA funds are distributed based on a formula which includes eligible customer need and economically disadvantaged population factors throughout the State of Utah. The GenLEX Grant is a 5 year grant enabling DWS to update the UWORKS MIS System and is not distributed for customer expenses (expenses represent funds passed through to the State of Montana and the University of Utah).

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

See chart above.

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

**If there is a greater need for any one area in the state based on eligible customers, funds may be transferred during the year. This is because Utah is considered a Single-Area State for WIA purposes.**

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

**It is done by economically disadvantaged population as well as unemployment statistics.**

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

**Yes**

**There is a formula in the Workforce Investment Act; however, because the State of Utah has a Single Area State designation for WIA, the state uses a different formula to distribute the funds to the ESAs within DWS based on actual needs.**

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Other Assistance (NJX)

- (1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?  
 a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

It depends on the program

**No**

The programs are targeted to specific areas based on type of program (e.g., Job Growth Small Business Bridge Grants are targeted to small businesses only). There are also programs which are funded at the state level and accessed based on need (e.g., Education Training Voucher [ETV] serves customers aging out of Foster Care and attending post secondary education). These programs cannot be broken out easily by county. The majority of these funds are from State General Fund, Transfers from another State Agency or Special Admin Fund (Restricted Funds).

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

- (2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

Due to the nature of how these programs are run, data is not readily available by County for State Level run programs

DWS Economic Service Area (ESA)	Total Expenses
State Level (On Behalf of all ESAs or run at the State Level)	5,524,486
Bear River ESA (Box Elder, Cache, & Rich Counties)	666
Castle Country ESA (Carbon & Emery Counties)	-
Central Utah ESA (Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, & Wayne Counties)	-
Mountainland ESA (Juab, Summit, Utah, & Wasatch Counties)	-
Southeast ESA (Grand & San Juan Counties)	-
Southwest ESA (Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, and Washington Counties)	-
Uintah Basin ESA (Daggett, Duchesne, & Uintah Counties)	-
Wasatch Front North ESA (Davis, Morgan, & Weber Counties)	1,844
Wasatch Front South ESA (Salt Lake & Tooele Counties)	1,698
<b>Total Amount Expended in SFY14</b>	<b>5,528,693</b>

See Below for Breakouts by Program  
 State Other (Paid costs that would have been disallowed Federal program costs)

Short Term Child Care & Job Growth  
 Job Growth

Program Type	Total Expenses		Statewide
State CHIP	(22,859)	Transfer from another Agency	Statewide
Medicaid	1,332	Transfer from another Agency	Statewide
Education Training Voucher (ETV)	178,172	Transfer from another Agency	Statewide
Other State funded Programs (TANF 2 Parent, State Short Term Child Care, Homeless Expungement Pilot)	135,619	State General Fund	Statewide

### DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Wagner-Peyser Contract (USOR)	<b>77,583</b>	Federal Funds	<b>Statewide</b>		
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes UCAP)	<b>554,741</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Statewide</b>		
Special Admin Fund Veteran's ACE Customer Services	<b>69,528</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Statewide</b>		
HCTC Participant Portion (27.5% of the health care premiums from participants)	<b>639</b>	Dedicated Credits	<b>Statewide</b>		
TITLE XX SERVICES	<b>15,000</b>	Transfer from another Agency	<b>Statewide</b>		
				<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>Population Percentage</b>
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	-	Restricted Funds	<b>Beaver</b>	0.00%	0.22%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>162,500</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Box Elder</b>	3.60%	1.75%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>377,175</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Cache</b>	8.35%	4.03%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>31,745</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Carbon</b>	0.70%	0.72%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	-	Restricted Funds	<b>Daggett</b>	0.00%	0.04%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>367,176</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Davis</b>	8.13%	11.10%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>67,118</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Duchesne</b>	1.49%	0.70%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>4,000</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Emery</b>	0.09%	0.37%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	-	Restricted Funds	<b>Garfield</b>	0.00%	0.18%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>56,286</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Grand</b>	1.25%	0.32%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>89,000</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Iron</b>	1.97%	1.61%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>35,000</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Juab</b>	0.77%	0.36%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	-	Restricted Funds	<b>Kane</b>	0.00%	0.25%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>41,500</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Millard</b>	0.92%	0.44%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	-	Restricted Funds	<b>Morgan</b>	0.00%	0.35%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	-	Restricted Funds	<b>Piute</b>	0.00%	0.05%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	-	Restricted Funds	<b>Rich</b>	0.00%	0.08%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>714,500</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Salt Lake</b>	15.81%	37.22%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>93,056</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>San Juan</b>	2.06%	0.52%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>4,500</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Sanpete</b>	0.10%	0.97%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>36,000</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Sevier</b>	0.80%	0.72%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>122,500</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Summit</b>	2.71%	1.33%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>33,662</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Tooele</b>	0.74%	2.09%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>190,982</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Uintah</b>	4.23%	1.23%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>965,589</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Utah</b>	21.37%	19.03%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>53,500</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Wasatch</b>	1.18%	0.91%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>759,898</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Washington</b>	16.82%	5.10%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>3,000</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Wayne</b>	0.07%	0.09%
Special Admin Fund Job Growth grants (includes Small Business Bridge & UCAP)	<b>310,252</b>	Restricted Funds	<b>Weber</b>	6.87%	8.22%
<b>Sub-Total Amount Expended in SFY14</b>	<b>4,518,938</b>			<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Grand Total Amount Expended in SFY14</b>	<b>5,528,693</b>				

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

It depends on the program as there are various programs included in this Appropriation Unit. These include Medicaid and other General Fund programs, Education Training Voucher (ETV), Wagner-Peyser Employment Services contracts, Special Admin Expense Account Job Growth Small Business Bridge Grants, Job Growth Utah Cluster Acceleration Projects and Job Growth Veterans ACE Services.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

The funds are distributed based on actual program customer need, not necessarily by population. Most of the funds are for training services (ETV), contracts and grants associated with specific funds (ETV, Wagner-Peyser, Special Admin Expense Account Job Growth grants, etc.).

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

These funds are program driven. For the Job Growth grants broken out by county above, the grants are marketed to small businesses but are awarded based on applications, not by population.

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

The funds are distributed based on program and program purposes not necessarily by population as the programs in this Appropriation Unit are for specific purposes.

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No

N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"  
 If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### General Assistance (NKA)

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

Yes

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes

N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

Data not readily available by County, the program is run at a State Level

Program Type	Total Expenses
Transient Assistance	5,289
SSI Nursing Home	95,655
SSI Supplement	236,703
Z Funds	215,523
General Assistance Benefits	3,682,410
<b>Total Amount Expended in SFY14</b>	<b>4,235,579</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

The funds are distributed based on the needs of the eligible program customers wherever they reside.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

The funds are distributed based on the needs of the eligible program customers wherever they reside.

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

The funds are distributed based on the needs of the eligible program customers wherever they reside.

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

The customers eligible for these programs reside throughout Utah and the program is run at a state level rather than locally.

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No.

N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Facilities and Pass Through (NJB)

(1) Is the program considered a statewide program (this would include something that serves all rural areas)?

a. Is the implementation of the program really statewide? If not, is there a compelling reason why?

Yes. DWS facilities are located throughout the state.
N/A

Please respond "Yes" or "No"

If "No" in the previous cell, explain why

(2) Who gets the money (by county)? [or other appropriate breakout like service area, group covering a certain geographic area, etc.]

Description / DWS Economic Service Area (ESA)	Total Expenses
<b>State Level (Employee Tuition Reimbursement)</b>	144,519
<b>State Level (Utah EBT Card)</b>	1,312,640
<b>State Level (MetLife)</b>	1,804,800
<b>State Level (P-card)</b> - amounts not allocated prior to closing the fiscal year	21,672
<b>State Level (Major Facility Projects)</b>	510,944
<b>Eligibility Services Division (ESD) Facilities</b> (Salt Lake, Weber, Utah, & Wasatch Counties)	
O&M	495,198
Bond	217,634
<b>Bear River ESA</b> (Box Elder, Cache, & Rich Counties)	
Lease	71,825
O&M	134,417
<b>Castle Country ESA</b> (Carbon & Emery Counties) - Rent	348,937
<b>Central Utah ESA</b> (Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, & Wayne Counties)	
Lease	132,215
O&M	78,819
Parking	4,852
<b>Mountainland ESA</b> (Juab, Summit, Utah, & Wasatch Counties)	
Advertising & Legal Publications	531
Lease	448,173
O&M	148,025
<b>Southeast ESA</b> (Grand & San Juan Counties) - Rent	351,275
<b>Southwest ESA</b> (Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, and Washington Counties)	

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Lease	342,975
O&M	98,743
<b>Uintah Basin ESA (Daggett, Duchesne, &amp; Uintah Counties)</b>	
Lease	159,885
O&M	56,152
Bond	77,813
<b>Wasatch Front North ESA (Davis, Morgan, &amp; Weber Counties)</b>	
Moving Expense	948
Lease	288,538
O&M	296,761
Office Supplies	20
<b>Wasatch Front South ESA (Salt Lake &amp; Tooele Counties)</b>	
Lease	452,609
O&M	702,562
<b>Total Amount Expended in SFY14</b>	<b>8,703,482</b>

(3) What is the methodology for distributing the money?

Costs related to lease and O&M agreements for facilities located throughout the state.

a. How does the distribution compare to actual need as expressed by population?

N/A

i. [If distributions are not reflecting current need (as represented by population), please explain why not?]

N/A

b. If not done by population, what is the reason?

N/A

(4) Does statute say anything about distribution and equity for the program?

No Please respond "Yes" or "No"

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

N/A

If "Yes" in the previous cell, give a brief explanation of what the law indicates as well as a reference to that law

DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

Annual Estimates of Utah's Resident Population: July 1, 2013

County	2013	Percentage
Beaver County	6,459	0.22%
Box Elder County	50,794	1.75%
Cache County	116,909	4.03%
Carbon County	20,988	0.72%
Daggett County	1,127	0.04%
Davis County	322,094	11.10%
Duchesne County	20,308	0.70%
Emery County	10,749	0.37%
Garfield County	5,083	0.18%
Grand County	9,360	0.32%
Iron County	46,780	1.61%
Juab County	10,348	0.36%
Kane County	7,260	0.25%
Millard County	12,662	0.44%
Morgan County	10,173	0.35%
Piute County	1,510	0.05%
Rich County	2,288	0.08%
Salt Lake County	1,079,721	37.22%
San Juan County	14,973	0.52%
Sanpete County	28,237	0.97%
Sevier County	20,852	0.72%
Summit County	38,486	1.33%
Tooele County	60,762	2.09%
Uintah County	35,555	1.23%
Utah County	551,891	19.03%
Wasatch County	26,437	0.91%
Washington County	147,800	5.10%
Wayne County	2,747	0.09%
Weber County	238,519	8.22%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,900,872</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

Population Percentages for CSBG Tab

	Population	%
Bear River Association of Governments (Box Elder, Cache, Rich):	169,991	5.91%
Community Action Services of Provo (Summit, Utah, Wasatch):	616,814	21.45%
Family Connection Center (Davis):	322,094	11.20%
Five County AOG (Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, Washington):	213,382	7.42%
Ogden Weber Community Action Program (Weber):	238,519	8.29%
Salt Lake Community Action Program (Salt Lake, Tooele):	1,140,483	39.66%
Six County Association of Governments (Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, Wayne):	76,356	2.66%
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments (Carbon, Emery, Grand):	41,097	1.43%
Uintah Basin Association of Governments (Daggett, Duchesne, Uintah):	56,990	1.98%
UCAPA (Statewide):		
	2,875,726	100.00%

Annual Estimates of the Resident Population: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division

Release Dates: For the United States, regions, divisions, states, and Puerto Rico Commonwealth, December 2013. For counties, municipios, metropolitan statistical areas, micropolitan statistical areas, metropolitan divisions, and combined statistical areas, March 2014. For Cities and Towns (Incorporated Places and Minor Civil Divisions), May 2014.

## DWS Statewide Distribution of Funds

### Utah 2013 Population by ESA

	Population	% of Total
<b>Bear River ESA</b> (Box Elder, Cache, & Rich Counties)	169,991	5.86%
<b>Castle Country ESA</b> (Carbon & Emery Counties)	31,737	1.09%
<b>Central Utah ESA</b> (Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, & Wayne Counties)	66,008	2.28%
<b>Mountainland ESA</b> (Juab, Summit, Utah, & Wasatch Counties)	627,162	21.62%
<b>Southeast ESA</b> (Grand & San Juan Counties)	24,333	0.84%
<b>Southwest ESA</b> (Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, and Washington Counties)	213,382	7.36%
<b>Uintah Basin ESA</b> (Daggett, Duchesne, & Uintah Counties)	56,990	1.96%
<b>Wasatch Front North ESA</b> (Davis, Morgan, & Weber Counties)	570,786	19.68%
<b>Wasatch Front South ESA</b> (Salt Lake & Tooele Counties)	1,140,483	39.32%
<b>TOTALS</b>	2,900,872	100.00%