

R6 Regional Council - Executive Board Meeting
Wednesday, March 5, 2025
82 East 600 North, Richfield UT 84701

8:55	Annual Action Plan Hearing	Commissioner Bartholomew	
9:00	Welcome/Meeting Called to Order	Commissioner Bartholomew	_____
	1. Opening Remarks		
	2. Pledge of Allegiance		
	3. Minutes Approved		_____
	-Executive Board Meeting 01.08.25		
	4. Clearinghouse Review		
	5. FYI	Travis Kyhl	_____
9:10	R6 Programs, Ongoing Projects & Reports		
	1. Annual Action Plan	Shay Morrison	_____
	2. CDBG Rating and Ranking	Shay Morrison	
	3. Utah Project Portal Update	Travis Kyhl/Shay Morrison	
	4. CIB Application Reviews	Community Advisors	_____
	5. Financial Report	Amy Rosquist	
	6. Congressional Briefing Update	Comm. Bartholomew/Travis Kyhl	
	7. Multi-Family Housing Project Hinckley	KerriLynn Beard	_____
	8. Other	Commissioner Bartholomew	
9:50	Economic Development District		_____
	Regional Priorities		
	County Updates		
10:15	Congressional/State Reports		_____
	Senator Lee	Gary Webster	
	Senator Curtis	Jeff Raisor	_____
	Rep. Owens	Holly Sweeten	
	Rep. Maloy	Cindy Bulloch/Evelyn Warnick	
	State Agencies - Time Permitting	Representatives	_____
10:45	Adjourn		
	<i>According to the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act, the board may enter a closed session at any time</i>		_____

**MINUTES
R6 REGIONAL COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING**

DATE: January 8, 2025
PLACE: 82 E 600 N, Richfield
TIME: 9:00 a.m.

ATTENDING:

Executive Board

Commissioner Scott Bartholomew
 Commissioner Roger Brian
 Commissioner Greg Jensen
 Commissioner Trevor Johnson
 Commissioner Sam Steed

Mayor Chuck Bigelow
 Mayor Bill Davis
 Mayor Noreen Johnson
 Mayor Justin Seely
 Mayor Ron Torgerson

Staff

KerrieLynn Beard
 Brock Jackson
 Shaun Kjar
 Doug Kirkham
 Travis Kyhl
 Pam Morrison
 Shay Morrison
 Cade Penney
 Jess Peterson
 Amy Rosquist
 JaLyne Roundy
 Tyler Timmons

Congressional Staff

Cindy Bulloch
 Larry Ellertson
 Jeff Raisor
 Holly Sweeten
 Evelyn Warnick
 Gary Webster

Other

Stan Anderson
 Representative Carl Albrecht
 Kevin Bunnell
 Gabe Miller
 Shea Owens
 Commissioner Marty Palmer
 Rick Roberts
 Kenley Steck
 Forest Turner
 Kevin Wright

Welcome/ Meeting Called to Order

Commissioner Scott Bartholomew welcomed all and called the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes- Commissioner Greg Jensen made a motion to approve the minutes from the 11.6.24 and 12.4.24 Executive Board Meetings. Commissioner Scott Bartholomew seconded the motion. Motion approved.

FYI- Ms. KerrieLynn Beard announced that the agency was awarded \$1.4 million from HUD to run a home rehabilitation program aimed at keeping seniors in their homes. Mr. Travis Kyhl commended Ms. Beard on the successful application and told the board members that the funding opportunity was highly competitive.

Representative Carl Albrecht- Representative Albrecht reported on significant issues relating to the upcoming legislative session. He mentioned energy, water, voting security, housing, and homelessness, among other topics. Representative Albrecht addressed questions and concerns mentioned by board members.

R6 Programs, Ongoing Projects & Reports

Six County AOG FY24 Audit Report- Copies of the audit report were distributed to board members. Mr. Gabe Miller and Mr. Rick Roberts gave brief reports on the audit and stated that the agency is compliant with state and federal regulations. Commissioner Roger Brian made a motion to approve the audit report. Mayor Justin Seely seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Action: No action needed

CDBG Policy Board Appointment- Mr. Shay Morrison told the board that although they had previously nominated Commissioner Greg Jensen to represent them on the CDBG Policy Board, the governor's office asked for two nominees to choose between. Mayor Chuck Bigelow made a motion to nominate Mayor Justin Seely as the second nominee. Commissioner Roger Brian seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Action: No action needed

Utah Project Portal Demo- Mr. Shay Morrison said there is a need to organize municipal projects in order for the state to accurately see the needs. The Utah Project Portal is an idea that has been in the works for several months. After receiving a \$30k grant from CDBG, the agency was able to hire Jones and DeMille to create the software to track capital improvement projects in the region. Mr. Morrison gave a brief demonstration of the site and reported that the demo will be presented to the state. Mr. Morrison answered questions that arose.

Action: No action needed

Congressional Briefing Review Committee- Mr. Travis Kyhl reminded the board that Commissioners Painter, Brian and Bartholomew served on the Congressional Briefing Committee in 2024. He asked the group to nominate three commissioners for the 2025 committee. Commissioner Marty Palmer made a motion to keep the same three commissioners on the 2025 committee. Commissioner Sam Steed seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Action: No action needed

Hwy 6 UDOT Support Letter- Mr. Cade Penney reported that Sunrise Engineering asked if the council would support the proposed Hwy. 6 project. Mr. Penney explained an overview of the project's scope of work, noting that while the project is not in the region, the road acts as a corridor to and from the six-county region. Board members expressed approval of the proposal. Commissioner Greg Jensen made a motion to approve a support letter from the board regarding the project. Commissioner Roger Brian seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Action: No action needed

Central Utah Agri-Park Update- Mr. Shaun Kjar announced that the land is under contract, but the contract has been extended to allow more time for due diligence. Mr. Kjar reported on site visits with local producers. He encouraged people to visit the website or contact him to learn more about the project or ask questions.

Action: No action needed

R6/County Communication & Education- Mr. Travis Kyhl told the board members that he plans to communicate more often about the agency's activities. He will report in board meetings and commission meetings.

Action: No action needed

Financial Reports- Ms. JaLyne Roundy directed board members to turn their attention to the financial statements provided to them. She gave an update on the agency's financial situation at this point in the fiscal year. Ms. Roundy reminded the group that there will continue to be a minimal amount of activity for Six County AOG and provided a brief update. Commissioner Trevor Johnson made a motion to approve both of the financial reports. Mayor Ron Torgerson seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Action: No action needed

Public Lands Update

Fishlake National Forest - Mr. Stan Anderson talked about the recent decisions affecting the Deer Trail Mine. He mentioned a prescribed fire decision in Sevier County and some plans to plant shrubs above Oak City in Millard County.

Dixie National Forest - Mr. Kevin Wright said that a forest wide prescribed burn plan had been signed. Mr. Wright voiced his support for the Utah Congressional Briefing and offered to help in any way.

DWR- Mr. Kevin Bunnell said that the DWR is working with their partners to add projects to the database, noting good partnerships. He also mentioned the Boulder NEPA and the Loa Fish Hatchery Project.

PLPCO- Mr. Shea Owens reported from Utah Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office. Mr. Owens spoke about the Endangered Species List and the Grand Staircase National Monument management plan.

Action: No action needed

Economic Development District

County Updates- Commissioner Sam Steed said that Piute County is focusing on flood recovery currently. Commissioner Greg Jensen shared some information about the Seven County Coalition railroad project. Commissioner Trevor Johnson, Millard County, reported on the Intermountain Power Plant renewal project.

Action: No action needed

Congressional/State Reports

Senator Lee- Mr. Gary Webster reported on Senator Lee's activity. For information on Senator Lee, please refer to his website at lee.senate.gov.

Representative Maloy- Ms. Cindy Bulloch and Ms. Evelyn Warnick reported on Representative Maloy's activity. For information on Representative Maloy, please refer to her website at maloy.house.gov.

Representative Curtis- Mr. Larry Ellertson reported on Representative Curtis's activity. He introduced Mr. Jeff Raisor, the newly hired Southern Utah Outreach Advisor. For information on Representative Curtis, please refer to his website at curtis.house.gov.

Representative Owens- Ms. Holly Sweeten reported on Representative Owens's activity. For information on Representative Owens, please refer to his website at owens.house.gov.

State/Federal Agency Reports

GOEO- Mr. Forest Turner announced that Ms. Kori Ann Edwards had left her position at GOEO. Mr. Turner talked about the awesome response to the Rural Communities Opportunity Grant.

Snow College- Mr. Kenley Steck shared some information about the Technical Education Road Show.

Action: No action requested by Congressional or State Representatives.

Clearinghouse Review- Commissioner Greg Jensen made a motion to approve the clearinghouse review. Chuck Bigelow seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Adjourn 10:57 a.m.

R6 Regional Council/Six County AOG Community Development Block Grant 2025 Awards								
Rank	Applicant	CDBG Ask	Balance					
	<i>Projected Funds received:</i>		\$1,048,261					
Set Aside	SCAOG Admin/Con Plan	\$50,000	\$998,261					
Set Aside	SCAOG SF Rehab	\$100,000	\$898,261					
Set Aside	SCAOG Regional Planning	\$50,000	\$848,261					
1	Wayne County	\$265,179	\$583,082					
2	Bicknell	\$30,501	\$552,581					
3	Lynndyl	\$40,684	\$511,897					
4	Manti	\$236,152	\$275,745					
5	Levan	\$110,475	\$165,270					
6	Salina	\$182,664	(\$17,394)					
7	Sevier County	\$205,000	(\$222,394)					
8			(\$222,394)					
9			(\$222,394)					

R6 Regional Council 2025 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet				Total Project Cost:		\$33,902		Non-CDBG Funds:		\$3,401	
Applicant & Project: Bicknell - Community Greenhouse				CDBG Request:		\$30,501		Source of Funds:		Bicknell	
CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description				Data Range/Score (Mark only one for each criteria)						Score:	Notes:
1	Capacity To Carry Out The Grant: Rated by state staff. (See Note #1 for scoring)			5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 points		5	Score from state
2	Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by Total Project										
2a	Jurisdictions with a population less than 500			>10%	7.01-10%	4.01-7%	1.01-4%	<1%		5	2020 Population: 328, \$3,401.00/\$33,902 x 100 = 10+%
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
2 b	Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000			>20%	15.01-20%	10.01-15%	5.01-10%	1-5%			
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
2 c	Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000			>30%	25.01-30%	20.01-25%	15.01-20%	1-15%			
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
2 d	Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000			>40%	35.01-40%	30.01-35%	25.01-30%	1-25%			
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
3	Non-CDBG Funds Secured: Non-CDBG funds have been Secured, Partially Secured, or Applied for.			Secured 3 points	Partial 2 points	Applied 1 point				3	COF Secured
4	CDBG Funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by the number of project beneficiaries.			\$01-100.99 5 points	\$101-200.99 4 points	\$201-400.99 3 points	\$401-800.99 2 points	\$801 or > 1 point		5	\$30,502/328=92.99
5	Jurisdicitons with a population of less than 5,000 will recieve 1 point.			Yes 1 Point	No 0 Point					1	2020 population of 328
6	Project's Geographical Impact: Projects will be rated on their relative impact in the community both in terms of numbers and relative need.			Multiple Counties	County	Portion of County	Community	Portion of Community		2	Community Project
7	LMI Population: Percent of the projects beneficiaries considered 80 percent or less LMI. (based on HUD Pre-Approved LMI Communities or an LMI survey)			5 Points >80%	4 points 75.01-80%	3 points 60.01-75%	2 points 55.01-60%	1 point 51-55%		5	92.57% LMI
8	Extent Of Poverty: The percentage of Low Income (LI: 50% AMI) and Very Low Income (VLI: 30% AMI) persons directly benefiting from the project.			5 points >20%	4 points 15.01-20%	3 points 10.01-15%	2 points 5.01-10%	1 points 1-5%		5	LOW 115/328 * 100 = 35.1%
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)			2 Points	1 point					2	A CDBG compliant procurement process has been followed for equipment purchases
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:			2020 and Prior 4 points	2021 3 points	2022 2 points	2023 1 point			2	Funded in 2022
11	Project Priority: Determined by R6 Executive Board members. This Board is composed of a mayor and commissioner from each of the Six Counties.			Water Infrastructure Improvements	Street/Sidewalk Improvements	Recreation Facility Improvements	Sewer/Storm Infrastructure	Public Facilities, Public Health/Safety	LMI Housing	2	Greenhouse - Public Facility
				6 points	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point		
12	National Objective Compliance: When a project is deemed to fall under Limited Clientele Activities, Targeted Activities, ADA Accessibility, Planning-only Activities, as highlighted under the "National Objectives, Eligible Activities and Federal Compliance Requirements" section of the State of Utah's CDBG Application Policies and Procedures, that applicant will receive 4 points.			Yes 4 Points	No 0 Point					0	No
13	Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA): Is the entire project solely focused on ADA compliance?			Yes 2 points	No 0 point					0	No
14	Health And Safety: Does the project address serious health and safety threats.			Yes 3 points	No 0 point					0	No
15	LMI Housing Stock: Infrastructure for the units, rehabilitation of units, new units and/or accessibility of units for LMI residents. (See Note #15 & #16 for scoring)			>20 units 6 points	15 - 20 units 5 points	10 - 14 units 4 points	5 - 9 units 3 points	1 - 4 units 2 points		0	Not housing project
16	Affordable Housing Plan Implementation: City/County has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project addresses some element of that plan. (See Note #15 & #16 for scoring)			Yes 2 points	No 0 point					0	Not housing project
17	Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #16 for scoring)			4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			4	All items complete
18	Civil Rights Compliance: Applicant is in compliance with federal laws and regulations related to civil rights. (See Note #18 for scoring)			2 points	1 point	0 point				2	Done since 2022
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring			1 point	0 point					0	Submitted late
Notes:									Total Score:	43	
#1 - This score will come from the CDBG state staff rating, which can be found under "Capacity to Carry Out the Grant" in the CDBG policies and procedures handbook.											
#9 - One point will be awarded if an architect/engineer is already selected and is actively involved in the application process, or a CDBG compliant procurement process has been followed for equipment purchases. One point will be awarded if architectural/engineering designs/plans are completed for the project or a vendor has been selected for an equipment purchase.											
#15 & #16 - Both of these scoring criteria will only be utilized when scoring a housing project.											
#17 - One point will be awarded if the applicants general plan has been updated in the previous 5 years (ex. For the 2025 cycle: updated during or after 2020). One point will be awarded if the applicant maintains a detailed Capital Improvements List for future projects. One point will be awarded if the applicant keeps a detailed Asset Inventory list. One point will be awarded if the applicant can document an active planning and zoning commission. The Capital Improvements List, Asset Inventory list, and documentation of an active Planning and Zoning Commission must be submitted by the R6 December 15th, 2024 deadline.											
#18 - One point will be awarded if the applicant has completed the "ADA Checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal" form. One point will be awarded if the applicant has adopted all of the following policies prior to the SCAOG December 15th, 2024 deadline: Grievance Procedure under the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 and ADA Effective Communication Policy, Language Access Plan, and Section 504 and ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy. (Forms available from R6)											
#19 - One point will be awarded to applications that contain all correct required documentation under attachments in Webgrants 3 (i.e.: engineers estimate, scope of work, project location map, public hearing notice proof, public hearing minutes, SAM Registration and photographs of the project area.) at the time of application submission, by the December 15th, 2024 R6 deadline.											
*All population figures will be sourced from the most recent data available in the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey.											

R6 Regional Council 2025 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet			Total Project Cost:		\$45,234.00		Non-CDBG Funds:		\$4,550.00	
Applicant & Project: Lynndyl - Water Pump			CDBG Request:		\$40,684.00		Source of Funds:		Lynndyl	
CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description			Data Range/Score (Mark only one for each criteria)					Score:	Notes:	
1	Capacity To Carry Out The Grant: Rated by state staff. (See Note #1 for scoring)		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 points		2.5	Score from state
2	Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by Total Project									
2a	Jurisdictions with a population less than 500		>10%	7.01-10%	4.01-7%	1.01-4%	<1%		5	2020 Population: 111, \$4,550/\$45,234X100=10.1%
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
		>20%	15.01-20%	10.01-15%	5.01-10%	1-5%				
2 b	Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
		>30%	25.01-30%	20.01-25%	15.01-20%	1-15%				
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
2 c	Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000		>40%	35.01-40%	30.01-35%	25.01-30%	1-25%			
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
2 d	Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000									
		Secured	Partial	Applied						
3	Non-CDBG Funds Secured: Non-CDBG funds have been Secured, Partially Secured, or Applied for.		3 points	2 points	1 point				3	COF, Secured
4	CDBG Funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by the number of project beneficiaries.		\$01-100.99	\$101-200.99	\$201-400.99	\$401-800.99	\$801 or >		3	\$40,684/111=\$366.52
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
5	Jurisdictions with a population of less than 5,000 will recieve 1 point.		Yes	No					1	2020 Population=111
		1 Point	0 Point							
6	Project's Geographical Impact: Projects will be rated on their relative impact in the community both in terms of numbers and relative need.		Multiple Counties	County	Portion of County	Community	Portion of Community		2	Community Project
		5 Points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
7	LMI Population: Percent of the projects beneficiaries considered 80 percent or less LMI. (based on HUD Pre-Approved LMI Communities or an LMI survey)		>80%	75.01-80%	60.01-75%	55.01-60%	51-55%		3	64.70% LMI
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 points				
8	Extent Of Poverty: The percentage of Low Income (LI: 50% AMI) and Very Low Income (VLI: 30% AMI) persons directly benefiting from the project.		>20%	15.01-20%	10.01-15%	5.01-10%	1-5%		3	LOW 15/111X100=13.51%
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)		2 Points	1 point					2	RFB Used, Estimate Attached
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:		2020 and Prior	2021	2022	2023			4	Not funded
		4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point					
11	Project Priority: Determined by R6 Executive Board members. This Board is composed of a mayor and commissioner from each of the Six Counties.		Water Infrastructure Improvements	Street/Sidewalk Improvements	Recreation Facility Improvements	Sewer/Storm Infrastructure	Public Facilities, Public Health/Safety	LMI Housing	6	Water Project
		6 points	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
12	National Objective Compliance: When a project is deemed to fall under Limited Clientele Activities, Targeted Activities, ADA Accessibility, Planning-only Activities, as highlighted under the "National Objectives, Eligible Activities and Federal Compliance Requirements" section of the State of Utah's CDBG Application Policies and Procedures, that applicant will recieve 4 points.		Yes	No					0	No
		4 Points	0 Point							
13	Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA): Is the entire project solely focused on ADA compliance?		Yes	No					0	No
		2 points	0 point							
14	Health And Safety: Does the project address serious health and safety threats.		Yes	No					0	No
		3 points	0 point							
15	LMI Housing Stock: Infrastructure for the units, rehabilitation of units, new units and/or accessibility of units for LMI residents. (See Note #15 & #16 for scoring)		>20 units	15 - 20 units	10 - 14 units	5 - 9 units	1 - 4 units		0	Not Housing
		6 points	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points				
16	Affordable Housing Plan Implementation: City/County has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project addresses some element of that plan. (See Note #15 & #16 for scoring)		Yes	No					0	Not Housing
		2 points	0 point							
17	Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #16 for scoring)		4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			4	Yes for all items
18	Civil Rights Compliance: Applicant is in compliance with federal laws and regulations related to civil rights. (See Note #18 for scoring)		2 points	1 point	0 point				2	Checklist Complete, ADA Docs Adopted
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring		1 point	0 point					1	Submitted on time
Notes:								Total Score:	41.5	
#1 - This score will come from the CDBG state staff rating, which can be found under "Capacity to Carry Out the Grant" in the CDBG policies and procedures handbook.										
#9 - One point will be awarded if an architect/engineer is already selected and is actively involved in the application process, or a CDBG compliant procurement process has been followed for equipment purchases. One point will be awarded if architectural/engineering designs/plans are completed for the project or a vendor has been selected for an equipment purchase.										
#15 & #16 - Both of these scoring criteria will only be utilized when scoring a housing project.										
#17 - One point will be awarded if the applicants general plan has been updated in the previous 5 years (ex. For the 2025 cycle: updated during or after 2020). One point will be awarded if the applicant maintains a detailed Capital Improvements List for future projects. One point will be awarded if the applicant keeps a detailed Asset Inventory list. One point will be awarded if the applicant can document an active planning and zoning commission. The Capital Improvements List, Asset Inventory list, and documentation of an active Planning and Zoning Commission must be submitted by the R6 December 15th, 2024 deadline.										
#18 - One point will be awarded if the applicant has completed the "ADA Checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal" form. One point will be awarded if the applicant has adopted all of the following policies prior to the SCAOG December 15th, 2024 deadline: Grievance Procedure under the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 and ADA Effective Communication Policy, Language Access Plan, and Section 504 and ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy. (Forms available from R6)										
#19 - One point will be awarded to applications that contain all correct required documentation under attachments in Webgrants 3 (i.e.: engineers estimate, scope of work, project location map, public hearing notice proof, public hearing minutes, SAM Registration and photographs of the project area) at the time of application submission, by the December 15th, 2024 R6 deadline.										
*All population figures will be sourced from the most recent data available in the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey.										

R6 Regional Council 2025 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet				Total Project Cost:		\$315,152.00		Non-CDBG Funds:		\$79,000.00	
Applicant & Project: Manti - Senior Center Improvements				CDBG Request:		\$236,152.00		Source of Funds:		Manti	
CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description				Data Range/Score (Mark only one for each criteria)						Score:	Notes:
1	Capacity To Carry Out The Grant: Rated by state staff. (See Note #1 for scoring)			5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 points		2.5	Score from state
2	Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by Total Project										
2a	Jurisdictions with a population less than 500			>10%	7.01-10%	4.01-7%	1.01-4%	<1%		4	2020 Population, Manti=3, 429, \$79,000/\$315,152 X100=25.07%
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
				>20%	15.01-20%	10.01-15%	5.01-10%	1-5%			
2 b	Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000			5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
				>30%	25.01-30%	20.01-25%	15.01-20%	1-15%			
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
2 c	Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000			>40%	35.01-40%	30.01-35%	25.01-30%	1-25%			
2 d	Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000			5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
3	Non-CDBG Funds Secured: Non-CDBG funds have been Secured, Partially Secured, or Applied for.			Secured	Partial	Applied				3	COF Confirmed
				3 points	2 points	1 point					
4	CDBG Funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by the number of project beneficiaries.			\$01-100.99	\$101-200.99	\$201-400.99	\$401-800.99	\$801 or >		4	\$236,152/1,542=153.47
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
5	Jurisdictions with a population of less than 5,000 will recieve 1 point.			Yes	No					1	2020 Population, Manti=3, 429
				1 point	0 Point						
6	Project's Geographical Impact: Projects will be rated on their relative impact in the community both in terms of numbers and relative need.			Multiple Counties	County	Portion of County	Community	Portion of Community		3	Portion of County
				5 Points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
7	LMI Population: Percent of the projects beneficiaries considered 80 percent or less LMI. (based on HUD Pre-Approved LMI Communities or an LMI survey)			>80%	75.01-80%	60.01-75%	55.01-60%	51-55%		1	51% because of activity
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 points			
8	Extent Of Poverty: The percentage of Low Income (LI: 50% AMI) and Very Low Income (VLI: 30% AMI) persons directly benefiting from the project.			>20%	15.01-20%	10.01-15%	5.01-10%	1-5%		5	Weighted Average of 34.51
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)			2 Points	1 point					2	RFB Used, Estimate Attached
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:			2020 and Prior	2021	2022	2023			4	Not Funded
				4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
11	Project Priority: Determined by R6 Executive Board members. This Board is composed of a mayor and commissioner from each of the Six Counties.			Water Infrastructure Improvements	Street/Sidewalk Improvements	Recreation Facility Improvements	Sewer/Storm Infrastructure	Public Facilities, Public Health/Safety	LMI Housing	2	Public Facility
				6 points	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point		
12	National Objective Compliance: When a project is deemed to fall under Limited Clientele Activities, Targeted Activities, ADA Accessibility, Planning-only Activities, as highlighted under the "National Objectives, Eligible Activities and Federal Compliance Requirements" section of the State of Utah's CDBG Application Policies and Procedures, that applicant will recieve 4 points.			Yes	No					4	Project falls under this category
				4 Points	0 Point						
13	Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA): Is the entire project solely focused on ADA compliance?			Yes	No					0	No
				2 points	0 point						
14	Health And Safety: Does the project address serious health and safety threats.			Yes	No					0	No
				3 points	0 point						
15	LMI Housing Stock: Infrastructure for the units, rehabilitation of units, new units and/or accessibility of units for LMI residents. (See Note #15 & #16 for scoring)			>20 units	15 - 20 units	10 - 14 units	5 - 9 units	1 - 4 units		0	Not a housing project
				6 points	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points			
16	Affordable Housing Plan Implementation: City/County has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project addresses some element of that plan. (See Note #15 & #16 for scoring)			Yes	No					0	Not a housing project
				2 points	0 point						
17	Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #16 for scoring)			4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			3	All items, except updated General Plan
18	Civil Rights Compliance: Applicant is in compliance with federal laws and regulations related to civil rights. (See Note #18 for scoring)			2 points	1 point	0 point				2	ADA Checklist and Adopted Docs
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring			1 point	0 point					1	Submitted on time
Notes:											
#1 - This score will come from the CDBG state staff rating, which											

R6 Regional Council 2025 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet				Total Project Cost:		\$197,665.00		Non-CDBG Funds:		\$15,001.00	
Applicant & Project: Salina - Park Improvements				CDBG Request:		\$182,664.00		Source of Funds:		Salina	
CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description				Data Range/Score (Mark only one for each criteria)						Score:	Notes:
1	Capacity To Carry Out The Grant: Rated by state staff. (See Note #1 for scoring)			5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 points		5	Score from state
2	Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by Total Project										
2a	Jurisdictions with a population less than 500			>10%	7.01-10%	4.01-7%	1.01-4%	<1%		1	(2020 population=2, 441)\$15,001/\$197,665 X100=7.59%
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
2 b	Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000			>20%	15.01-20%	10.01-15%	5.01-10%	1-5%			
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
2 c	Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000			>30%	25.01-30%	20.01-25%	15.01-20%	1-15%			
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
2 d	Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000			>40%	35.01-40%	30.01-35%	25.01-30%	1-25%			
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
3	Non-CDBG Funds Secured: Non-CDBG funds have been Secured, Partially Secured, or Applied for.			Secured	Partial	Applied				3	Secured
				3 points	2 points	1 point					
4	CDBG Funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by the number of project beneficiaries.			\$01-100.99	\$101-200.99	\$201-400.99	\$401-800.99	\$801 or >		5	\$182,664/2,441=74.83
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
5	Jurisdictions with a population of less than 5,000 will recieve 1 point.			Yes	No					1	2020 population of 2,441
				1 Point	0 Point						
6	Project's Geographical Impact: Projects will be rated on their relative impact in the community both in terms of numbers and relative need.			Multiple Counties	County	Portion of County	Community	Portion of Community		2	Community Project
				5 Points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
7	LMI Population: Percent of the projects beneficiaries considered 80 percent or less LMI. (based on HUD Pre-Approved LMI Communities or an LMI survey)			>80%	75.01-80%	60.01-75%	55.01-60%	51-55%		1	51.10% LMI
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 points			
8	Extent Of Poverty: The percentage of Low Income (LI: 50% AMI) and Very Low Income (VLI: 30% AMI) persons directly benefiting from the project.			>20%	15.01-20%	10.01-15%	5.01-10%	1-5%		5	LOW 595/2,441X100=24.38
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)			2 Points	1 point					2	RFB Process followed
				2020 and Prior	2021	2022	2023				
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:			4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			1	2023
11	Project Priority: Determined by R6 Executive Board members. This Board is composed of a mayor and commissioner from each of the Six Counties.			Water Infrastructure Improvements	Street/Sidewalk Improvements	Recreation Facility Improvements	Sewer/Storm Infrastructure	Public Facilities, Public Health/Safety	LMI Housing	4	Recreation project
				6 points	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point		
12	National Objective Compliance: When a project is deemed to fall under Limited Clientele Activities, Targeted Activities, ADA Accessibility, Planning-only Activities, as highlighted under the "National Objectives, Eligible Activities and Federal Compliance Requirements" section of the State of Utah's CDBG Application Policies and Procedures, that applicant will recieve 4 points.			Yes	No					0	No
				4 Points	0 Point						
13	Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA): Is the entire project solely focused on ADA compliance?			Yes	No					0	No
				2 points	0 point						
14	Health And Safety: Does the project address serious health and safety threats.			Yes	No					0	No
				3 points	0 point						
15	LMI Housing Stock: Infrastructure for the units, rehabilitation of units, new units and/or accessibility of units for LMI residents. (See Note #15 & #16 for scoring)			>20 units	15 - 20 units	10 - 14 units	5 - 9 units	1 - 4 units		0	Not housing project
				6 points	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points			
16	Affordable Housing Plan Implementation: City/County has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project addresses some element of that plan. (See Note #15 & #16 for scoring)			Yes	No					0	Not housing project
				2 points	0 point						
17	Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #16 for scoring)			4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			4	All items complete
18	Civil Rights Compliance: Applicant is in compliance with federal laws and regulations related to civil rights. (See Note #18 for scoring)			2 points	1 point	0 point				2	All items complete
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring			1 point	0 point					0	Submitted late
Notes:											
#1 - This score will come from the CDBG state staff rating, which can be found under "Capacity to Carry Out the Grant" in the CDBG policies and procedures handbook.											
#9 - One point will be awarded if an architect/engineer is already selected and is actively involved in the application process, or a CDBG compliant procurement process has been followed for equipment purchases. One point will be awarded if architectural/engineering designs/plans are completed for the project or a vendor has been selected for an equipment purchase.											
#15 & #16 - Both of these scoring criteria will only be utilized when scoring a housing project.											
#17 - One point will be awarded if the applicants general plan has been updated in the previous 5 years (ex. For the 2025 cycle: updated during or after 2020). One point will be awarded if the applicant maintains a detailed Capital Improvements List for future projects. One point will be awarded if the applicant keeps a detailed Asset Inventory list. One point will be awarded if the applicant can document an active planning and zoning commission. The Capital Improvements List, Asset Inventory list, and documentation of an active Planning and Zoning Commission must be submitted by the R6 December 15th, 2024 deadline.											
#18 - One point will be awarded if the applicant has completed the "ADA Checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal" form. One point will be awarded if the applicant has adopted all of the following policies prior to the SCAOG December 15th, 2024 deadline: Grievance Procedure under the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 and ADA Effective Communication Policy, Language Access Plan, and Section 504 and ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy. (Forms available from R6)											
#19 - One point will be awarded to applications that contain all correct required documentation under attachments in Webgrants 3 (i.e.: engineers estimate, scope of work, project location map, public hearing notice proof, public hearing minutes, SAM Registration and photographs of the project area,) at the time of application submission, by the Decemeber 15th, 2024 R6 deadline.											
*All population figures will be sourced from the most recent data available in the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey.											

R6 Regional Council 2025 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet				Total Project Cost:		\$245,000.00		Non-CDBG Funds:		\$40,000.00	
Applicant & Project: Sevier County - Freezer Building				CDBG Request:		\$205,000.00		Source of Funds:		Central Utah FS	
CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description				Data Range/Score (Mark only one for each criteria)						Score:	
1	Capacity To Carry Out The Grant: Rated by state staff. (See Note #1 for scoring)			5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 points		3	Score from state
2	Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by Total Project										
2a	Jurisdictions with a population less than 500			>10%	7.01-10%	4.01-7%	1.01-4%	<1%		1	2020 Population=21,522, \$40,000/\$245,000X100=16.33%
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
				>20%	15.01-20%	10.01-15%	5.01-10%	1-5%			
2b	Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000			5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
				>30%	25.01-30%	20.01-25%	15.01-20%	1-15%			
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
2c	Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000			>40%	35.01-40%	30.01-35%	25.01-30%	1-25%			
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
2d	Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000										
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
3	Non-CDBG Funds Secured: Non-CDBG funds have been Secured, Partially Secured, or Applied for.			Secured	Partial	Applied				3	Secured in COF
				3 points	2 points	1 point					
4	CDBG Funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by the number of project beneficiaries.			\$0.1-100.99	\$101-200.99	\$201-400.99	\$401-800.99	\$801 or >		1	\$205,000/21,522X100=\$952.51
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
5	Jurisdictions with a population of less than 5,000 will recieve 1 point.			Yes	No					0	2020 Population=21,522
				1 Point	0 Point						
6	Project's Geographical Impact: Projects will be rated on their relative impact in the community both in terms of numbers and relative need.			Multiple Counties	County	Portion of County	Community	Portion of Community		4	County Project
				5 Points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
7	LMI Population: Percent of the projects beneficiaries considered 80 percent or less LMI. (based on HUD Pre-Approved LMI Communities or an LMI survey)			>80%	75.01-80%	60.01-75%	55.01-60%	51-55%		1	51% because of activity
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 points			
8	Extent Of Poverty: The percentage of Low Income (LI: 50% AMI) and Very Low Income (VLI: 30% AMI) persons directly benefiting from the project.			>20%	15.01-20%	10.01-15%	5.01-10%	1-5%		5	LOW 5,180/21,522X100=24.06
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)			2 Points	1 point					2	RFB Used, Estimate uploaded
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:			2020 and Prior	2021	2022	2023			3	Funded in 2021
				4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
11	Project Priority: Determined by R6 Executive Board members. This Board is composed of a mayor and commissioner from each of the Six Counties.			Water Infrastructure Improvements	Street/Sidewalk Improvements	Recreation Facility Improvements	Sewer/Storm Infrastructure	Public Facilities, Public Health/Safety	LMI Housing	2	Public Facility
				6 points	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point		
12	National Objective Compliance: When a project is deemed to fall under Limited Clientele Activities, Targeted Activities, ADA Accessibility, Planning-only Activities, as highlighted under the "National Objectives, Eligible Activities and Federal Compliance Requirements" section of the State of Utah's CDBG Application Policies and Procedures, that applicant will recieve 4 points.			Yes	No					4	Full points because of category
				4 Points	0 Point						
13	Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA): Is the entire project solely focused on ADA compliance?			Yes	No					0	No
				2 points	0 point						
14	Health And Safety: Does the project address serious health and safety threats.			Yes	No					0	No
				3 points	0 point						
15	LMI Housing Stock: Infrastructure for the units, rehabilitation of units, new units and/or accessibility of units for LMI residents. (See Note #15 & #16 for scoring)			>20 units	15 - 20 units	10 - 14 units	5 - 9 units	1 - 4 units		0	Not Housing
				6 points	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points			
16	Affordable Housing Plan Implementation: City/County has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project addresses some element of that plan. (See Note #15 & #16 for scoring)			Yes	No					0	Not Housing
				2 points	0 point						
17	Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #16 for scoring)			4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			4	All items complete
18	Civil Rights Compliance: Applicant is in compliance with federal laws and regulations related to civil rights. (See Note #18 for scoring)			2 points	1 point	0 point				2	All items complete
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring			1 point	0 point					1	Submitted on time
								Total Score:		36	
Notes:											
#1 - This score will come from the CDBG state staff rating, which can be found under "Capacity to Carry Out the Grant" in the CDBG policies and procedures handbook.											
#9 - One point will be awarded if an architect/engineer is already selected and is actively involved in the application process, or a CDBG compliant procurement process has been followed for equipment purchases. One point will be awarded if architectural/engineering designs/plans are completed for the project or a vendor has been selected for an equipment purchase.											
#15 & #16 - Both of these scoring criteria will only be utilized when scoring a housing project.											
#17 - One point will be awarded if the applicants general plan has been updated in the previous 5 years (ex. For the 2025 cycle: updated during or after 2020). One point will be awarded if the applicant maintains a detailed Capital Improvements List for future projects. One point will be awarded if the applicant keeps a detailed Asset Inventory list. One point will be awarded if the applicant can document an active planning and zoning commission. The Capital Improvements List, Asset Inventory list, and documentation of an active Planning and Zoning Commission must be submitted by the R6 December 15th, 2024 deadline.											
#18 - One point will be awarded if the applicant has completed the "ADA Checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal" form. One point will be awarded if the applicant has adopted all of the following policies prior to the SCAOG December 15th, 2024 deadline: Grievance Procedure under the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 and ADA Effective Communication Policy, Language Access Plan, and Section 504 and ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy. (Forms available from R6)											
#19 - One point will be awarded to applications that contain all correct required documentation under attachments in Webgrants 3 (i.e.: engineers estimate, scope of work, project location map, public hearing notice proof, public hearing minutes, SAM Registration and photographs of the project area.) at the time of application submission, by the Decemeber 15th, 2024 R6 deadline.											
*All population figures will be sourced from the most recent data available in the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey.											

R6 Regional Council 2025 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet				Total Project Cost:		\$139,475.00		Non-CDBG Funds:		\$29,000.00	
Applicant & Project: Levan - Pickleball Courts				CDBG Request:		\$110,475.00		Source of Funds:		Levan	
CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description				Data Range/Score (Mark only one for each criteria)						Score:	Notes:
1	Capacity To Carry Out The Grant: Rated by state staff. (See Note #1 for scoring)			5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 points		2.5	Score from state
2	Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by Total Project										
2a	Jurisdictions with a population less than 500			>10%	7.01-10%	4.01-7%	1.01-4%	<1%			
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
				>20%	15.01-20%	10.01-15%	5.01-10%	1-5%			
2 b	Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000			5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
				>30%	25.01-30%	20.01-25%	15.01-20%	1-15%			
2 c	Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000			5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
				>40%	35.01-40%	30.01-35%	25.01-30%	1-25%			
2 d	Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000			5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
				Secured	Partial	Applied					
3	Non-CDBG Funds Secured: Non-CDBG funds have been Secured, Partially Secured, or Applied for.			3 points	2 points	1 point				3	COF Secured
4	CDBG Funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by the number of project beneficiaries.			\$01-100.99	\$101-200.99	\$201-400.99	\$401-800.99	\$801 or >		4	\$110,475/862=128.16
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
5	Jurisdictions with a population of less than 5,000 will recieve 1 point.			Yes	No					1	2020 population of 862
				1 point	0 point						
6	Project's Geographical Impact: Projects will be rated on their relative impact in the community both in terms of numbers and relative need.			Multiple Counties	County	Portion of County	Community	Portion of Community		2	Community Project
				5 Points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
7	LMI Population: Percent of the projects beneficiaries considered 80 percent or less LMI. (based on HUD Pre-Approved LMI Communities or an LMI survey)			>80%	75.01-80%	60.01-75%	55.01-60%	51-55%		2	55.7% LMI
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 points			
8	Extent Of Poverty: The percentage of Low Income (LI: 50% AMI) and Very Low Income (VLI: 30% AMI) persons directly benefiting from the project.			>20%	15.01-20%	10.01-15%	5.01-10%	1-5%		4	LOW 130/862X100=15.10
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)			2 Points	1 point					2	RFB Used, Estimate Attached
				2020 and Prior	2021	2022	2023				
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:			4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			4	Not Funded
11	Project Priority: Determined by R6 Executive Board members. This Board is composed of a mayor and commissioner from each of the Six Counties.			Water Infrastructure Improvements	Street/Sidewalk Improvements	Recreation Facility Improvements	Sewer/Storm Infrastructure	Public Facilities, Public Health/Safety	LMI Housing	4	Recreation
				6 points	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point		
12	National Objective Compliance: When a project is deemed to fall under Limited Clientele Activities, Targeted Activities, ADA Accessibility, Planning-only Activities, as highlighted under the "National Objectives, Eligible Activities and Federal Compliance Requirements" section of the State of Utah's CDBG Application Policies and Procedures, that applicant will recieve 4 points.			Yes	No					0	No
				4 Points	0 Point						
13	Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA): Is the entire project solely focused on ADA compliance?			Yes	No					0	No
				2 points	0 point						
14	Health And Safety: Does the project address serious health and safety threats.			Yes	No					0	No
				3 points	0 point						
15	LMI Housing Stock: Infrastructure for the units, rehabilitation of units, new units and/or accessibility of units for LMI residents. (See Note #15 & #16 for scoring)			>20 units	15 - 20 units	10 - 14 units	5 - 9 units	1 - 4 units		0	Not Housing Project
				6 points	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points			
16	Affordable Housing Plan Implementation: City/County has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project addresses some element of that plan. (See Note #15 & #16 for scoring)			Yes	No					0	Not Housing Project
				2 points	0 point						
17	Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #16 for scoring)			4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			4	All items complete
18	Civil Rights Compliance: Applicant is in compliance with federal laws and regulations related to civil rights. (See Note #18 for scoring)			2 points	1 point	0 point				1	Checklist complete, Docs not adopted
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring			1 point	0 point					1	Submitted on time
Notes:									Total Score:	39.5	
#1 - This score will come from the CDBG state staff rating, which can be found under "Capacity to Carry Out the Grant" in the CDBG policies and procedures handbook.											
#9 - One point will be awarded if an architect/engineer is already selected and is actively involved in the application process, or a CDBG compliant procurement process has been followed for equipment purchases. One point will be awarded if architectural/engineering designs/plans are completed for the project or a vendor has been selected for an equipment purchase.											
#15 & #16 - Both of these scoring criteria will only be utilized when scoring a housing project.											
#17 - One point will be awarded if the applicants general plan has been updated in the previous 5 years (ex. For the 2025 cycle: updated during or after 2020). One point will be awarded if the applicant maintains a detailed Capital Improvements List for future projects. One point will be awarded if the applicant keeps a detailed Asset Inventory list. One point will be awarded if the applicant can document an active planning and zoning commission. The Capital Improvements List, Asset Inventory list, and documentation of an active Planning and Zoning Commission must be submitted by the R6 December 15th, 2024 deadline.											
#18 - One point will be awarded if the applicant has completed the "ADA Checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal" form. One point will be awarded if the applicant has adopted all of the following policies prior to the SCAOG December 15th, 2024 deadline: Grievance Procedure under the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 and ADA Effective Communication Policy, Language Access Plan, and Section 504 and ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy. (Forms available											

R6 Regional Council 2025 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet				Total Project Cost:		\$384,179.00		Non-CDBG Funds:		\$119,000.00		
Applicant & Project: Wayne County - Ambulance Purchase				CDBG Request:		\$265,179.00		Source of Funds:		Wayne County		
CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description				Data Range/Score (Mark only one for each criteria)						Score:	Notes:	
1	Capacity To Carry Out The Grant: Rated by state staff. (See Note #1 for scoring)			5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 points		2.5	Score from state	
2	Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by Total Project											
2a	Jurisdictions with a population less than 500			>10%	7.01-10%	4.01-7%	1.01-4%	<1%				
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
2 b	Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000			>20%	15.01-20%	10.01-15%	5.01-10%	1-5%				
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
2 c	Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000			>30%	25.01-30%	20.01-25%	15.01-20%	1-15%				
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
2 d	Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000			>40%	35.01-40%	30.01-35%	25.01-30%	1-25%				
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
3	Non-CDBG Funds Secured: Non-CDBG funds have been Secured, Partially Secured, or Applied for.			Secured	Partial	Applied					3	Secured
				3 points	2 points	1 point						
4	CDBG Funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by the number of project beneficiaries.			\$01-100.99	\$101-200.99	\$201-400.99	\$401-800.99	\$801 or >		4	\$265,179/2,486 = 106.67	
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
5	Jurisdictions with a population of less than 5,000 will recieve 1 point.			Yes	No					1	2,486 2020 Population	
				1 Point	0 Point							
6	Project's Geographical Impact: Projects will be rated on their relative impact in the community both in terms of numbers and relative need.			Multiple Counties	County	Portion of County	Community	Portion of Community		4	County Wide Project	
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
7	LMI Population: Percent of the projects beneficiaries considered 80 percent or less LMI. (based on HUD Pre-Approved LMI Communities or an LMI survey)			>80%	75.01-80%	60.01-75%	55.01-60%	51-55%		4	74.50% LMI	
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 points				
8	Extent Of Poverty: The percentage of Low Income (LI: 50% AMI) and Very Low Income (VLI: 30% AMI) persons directly benefiting from the project.			>20%	15.01-20%	10.01-15%	5.01-10%	1-5%		5	699/2,486 x 100 = 28.12%	
				5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point				
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)			2 Points	1 point					2	A CDBG compliant procurement process has been followed for equipment purchases	
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:			2020 and Prior	2021	2022	2023			4	Not funded in prior 5 years or more	
				4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point					
11	Project Priority: Determined by R6 Executive Board members. This Board is composed of a mayor and commissioner from each of the Six Counties.			Water Infrastructure Improvements	Street/Sidewalk Improvements	Recreation Facility Improvements	Sewer/Storm Infrastructure	Public Facilities, Public Health/Safety	LMI Housing	2	Ambulance	
				6 points	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
12	National Objective Compliance: When a project is deemed to fall under Limited Clientele Activities, Targeted Activities, ADA Accessibility, Planning-only Activities, as highlighted under the "National Objectives, Eligible Activities and Federal Compliance Requirements" section of the State of Utah's CDBG Application Policies and Procedures, that applicant will recieve 4 points.			Yes	No					0	No	
				4 Points	0 Point							
13	Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA): Is the entire project solely focused on ADA compliance?			Yes	No					0	No	
				2 points	0 point							
14	Health And Safety: Does the project address serious health and safety threats.			Yes	No					3	Yes	
				3 points	0 point							
15	LMI Housing Stock: Infrastructure for the units, rehabilitation of units, new units and/or accessibility of units for LMI residents. (See Note #15 & #16 for scoring)			>20 units	15 - 20 units	10 - 14 units	5 - 9 units	1 - 4 units		0	Not a housing project	
				6 points	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points				
16	Affordable Housing Plan Implementation: City/County has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project addresses some element of that plan. (See Note #15 & #16 for scoring)			Yes	No					0	Not a housing project	
				2 points	0 point							
17	Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #16 for scoring)			4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			4	All items complete	
18	Civil Rights Compliance: Applicant is in compliance with federal laws and regulations related to civil rights. (See Note #18 for scoring)			2 points	1 point	0 point					0	Not complete
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring			1 point	0 point					0	Submitted late	
									Total Score:	43.5		
Notes:												
#1 - This score will come from the CDBG state staff rating, which can be found under "Capacity to Carry Out the Grant" in the CDBG policies and procedures handbook.												
#9 - One point will be awarded if an architect/engineer is already selected and is actively involved in the application process, or a CDBG compliant procurement process has been followed for equipment purchases. One point will be awarded if architectural/engineering designs/plans are completed for the project or a vendor has been selected for an equipment purchase.												
#15 & #16 - Both of these scoring criteria will only be utilized when scoring a housing project.												
#17 - One point will be awarded if the applicants general plan has been updated in the previous 5 years (ex. For the 2025 cycle: updated during or after 2020). One point will be awarded if the applicant maintains a detailed Capital Improvements List for future projects. One point will be awarded if the applicant keeps a detailed Asset Inventory list. One point will be awarded if the applicant can document an active planning and zoning commission. The Capital Improvements List, Asset Inventory list, and documentation of an active Planning and Zoning Commission must be submitted by the R6 December 15th, 2024 deadline.												
#18 - One point will be awarded if the applicant has completed the "ADA Checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal" form. One point will be awarded if the applicant has adopted all of the following policies prior to the SCAOG December 15th, 2024 deadline: Grievance Procedure under the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 and ADA Effective Communication Policy, Language Access Plan, and Section 504 and ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy. (Forms available from R6)												
#19 - One point will be awarded to applications that contain all correct required documentation under attachments in Webgrants 3 (i.e.: engineers estimate, scope of work, project location map, public hearing notice proof, public hearing minutes, SAM Registration and photographs of the project area,) at the time of application submission, by the December 15th, 2024 R6 deadline.												
*All population figures will be sourced from the most recent data available in the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey.												

Permanent Community Impact Fund Board Application
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

APPLICANT Eureka City		PROJECT TITLE Eureka City - Roads Master Plan	
DATE OF REVIEW 03/05/2025	TRIMESTER APPLYING February 2025	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST? YES	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG? YES
AOG R6 Regional Council	APPLICANT COUNTY Juab County	PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING HELD PRIOR TO AOG REVIEW?*	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT? YES
CIB REQUEST \$26,800	GRANT AMT \$26,800	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL YES REGIONAL YES
LOAN AMT N/A	LOAN TERMS N/A	DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS AN IDENTIFIED NEED FROM THE CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY? YES	DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS AN IDENTIFIED TOP PRIORITY FROM THE CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY? YES

PROJECT DESCRIPTION/SCOPE OF WORK Description of what will be purchased with CIB funding.

Eureka City intends to create a transportation master plan and pavement preservation plan.

WHAT IS THIS PROJECT'S INTENDED PURPOSE TO THE COMMUNITY? How does this project help the community?

This document will be an important tool for the city in looking forward to the repair and maintenance of the roads within Eureka City. This will allow for informed decision-making for city staff and provide recommendations to accommodate future growth.

HOW DOES THIS PROJECT FULFILL CIB'S MANDATE TO USE ITS LIMITED FUNDS TO "RESULT IN THE GREATEST USE OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR THE GREATEST NUMBER OF CITIZENS OF THIS STATE"?

This project uses a relatively small amount of funding to place significant positive impact on those who live in Eureka, as well as those who visit from around the state.

AOG RECOMMENDATION

THE ABOVE-NAMED AOG GOVERNING BODY REVIEWED THIS PROJECT ON THE DATE INDICATED AND VOTED TO:

SUPPORT THE PROJECT

Scott Bartholomew

REVIEWED BY

SIGNATURE

R6 Board Chair

TITLE

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENT, PLEASE CONTACT

Shay Morrison

NAME

435-893-0737

PHONE NUMBER

shaym@r6.utah.gov

EMAIL

*Public Hearing: The CIB requires all applicants to have a vigorous public participation effort. All applicants shall hold a formally noticed public hearing to solicit comment concerning the size, scope, and nature of any funding request submitted to the CIB before review by the Board. A complete and detailed scope of work shall be given to the public, and its financing and be documented in the minutes. The information shall include the financial impact to the public as user fees, special assessments, or property taxes. (The Board has adopted a funding matrix tool to assist reasonable consistency regarding grant/loan award.) The CIB may require further public hearings if it determines the applicant did not adequately disclose to the public the possible financial impact of the financial assistance. Projects will not be placed on a CIB agenda until a public hearing has been held.

Permanent Community Impact Fund Board Application
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

APPLICANT Sevier County		PROJECT TITLE Brooklyn SSD Culinary Water Improvements	
DATE OF REVIEW 03/05/2025	TRIMESTER APPLYING February 2025	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST? YES	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG? YES
AOG R6 Regional Council	APPLICANT COUNTY Sevier County	PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING HELD PRIOR TO AOG REVIEW?*	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT? NO
CIB REQUEST \$4,355,000	GRANT AMT \$4,355,000	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL YES REGIONAL YES
LOAN AMT N/A	LOAN TERMS N/A	DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS AN IDENTIFIED NEED FROM THE CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY? YES	DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS AN IDENTIFIED TOP PRIORITY FROM THE CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY? YES

PROJECT DESCRIPTION/SCOPE OF WORK Description of what will be purchased with CIB funding.

Approximately 15,200 feet of new service line will be required to connect the new distribution lines back to the existing home service lines. In the Addition area where meter locations will be moving, service line will be installed to reconnect the existing services as necessary. It's estimated that 29,100 feet of 8-inch pipe and 8,100 feet of 10-inch pipe will be installed throughout the Addition subdivision, along Brooklyn Road, and 1400 S to replace existing 4-inch and 2-inch pipe. The south end of the system will also be looped (Sierra Vista Road and 900 N) to improve available flows and improve water quality. New radio-read meters will be installed to replace the existing aged meters

WHAT IS THIS PROJECT'S INTENDED PURPOSE TO THE COMMUNITY? How does this project help the community?

The proposed improvements will provide an increased level of service (state minimum) to the Brooklyn SSD service area, while increasing the resiliency of the entire Brooklyn SSD by replacing aged infrastructure and connecting the two separate culinary systems. It will also reduce future maintenance and operation costs for Elsinore Town and reduce infrastructure costs between Elsinore Town and Brooklyn SSD.

HOW DOES THIS PROJECT FULFILL CIB'S MANDATE TO USE ITS LIMITED FUNDS TO "RESULT IN THE GREATEST USE OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR THE GREATEST NUMBER OF CITIZENS OF THIS STATE"?

This project fulfills CIB's mandate by maximizing financial resources to benefit the greatest number of citizens through critical water infrastructure improvements for Brooklyn SSD. Sevier County has secured substantial matching funds, reducing the financial burden on CIB and allowing its dollars to stretch further. By leveraging multiple funding sources, this project ensures a reliable water supply, enhances public health, and demonstrates responsible fiscal management, ultimately maximizing the return on investment for Utah residents.

AOG RECOMMENDATION

THE ABOVE-NAMED AOG GOVERNING BODY REVIEWED THIS PROJECT ON THE DATE INDICATED AND VOTED TO:

SUPPORT THE PROJECT

Scott Bartholomew

REVIEWED BY

SIGNATURE

R6 Board Chair

TITLE

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENT, PLEASE CONTACT

Tyler Timmons

NAME

435-893-0738

PHONE NUMBER

ttimmons@r6.utah.gov

EMAIL

*Public Hearing: The CIB requires all applicants to have a vigorous public participation effort. All applicants shall hold a formally noticed public hearing to solicit comment concerning the size, scope, and nature of any funding request submitted to the CIB before review by the Board. A complete and detailed scope of work shall be given to the public, and its financing and be documented in the minutes. The information shall include the financial impact to the public as user fees, special assessments, or property taxes. (The Board has adopted a funding matrix tool to assist reasonable consistency regarding grant/loan award.) The CIB may require further public hearings if it determines the applicant did not adequately disclose to the public the possible financial impact of the financial assistance. Projects will not be placed on a CIB agenda until a public hearing has been held.

Permanent Community Impact Fund Board Application
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

APPLICANT Scipio Town		PROJECT TITLE Scipio Town Water Meter Upgrade	
DATE OF REVIEW 03/05/2025	TRIMESTER APPLYING February 2025	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST? YES	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG? YES
AOG R6 Regional Council	APPLICANT COUNTY Millard County	PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING HELD PRIOR TO AOG REVIEW?*	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT? NO
CIB REQUEST \$111,000	GRANT AMT \$111,000	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL YES REGIONAL YES
LOAN AMT N/A	LOAN TERMS N/A	DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS AN IDENTIFIED NEED FROM THE CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY? YES	DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS AN IDENTIFIED TOP PRIORITY FROM THE CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY? YES

PROJECT DESCRIPTION/SCOPE OF WORK Description of what will be purchased with CIB funding.

The purchase of 296 cellular capable electronic water meters and all the necessary equipment and components for installation.

The equipment to read the meters and training will be purchased as a part of this project from funds provided by Scipio Town.

WHAT IS THIS PROJECT'S INTENDED PURPOSE TO THE COMMUNITY? How does this project help the community?

The manual reading process imposes a significant time burden on Scipio's maintenance personnel, reducing their ability to address other critical tasks. The outdated system hampers their ability to accurately and efficiently bill residents, leading to potential discrepancies, and water loss. The aged equipment, which was installed in the 80's, limits their capability to effectively monitor the water system for leaks or other issues, which reduces the ability to conserve water. Upgrading their water meter infrastructure would alleviate these challenges, enhance operational efficiency, conserve water, and ensure better service to their residents.

HOW DOES THIS PROJECT FULFILL CIB'S MANDATE TO USE ITS LIMITED FUNDS TO "RESULT IN THE GREATEST USE OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR THE GREATEST NUMBER OF CITIZENS OF THIS STATE"?

This project aligns with CIB's mission by optimizing financial resources to maximize benefits for the greatest number of citizens through essential water infrastructure improvements in Scipio Town. With Scipio Town contributing 13% in matching funds, the financial strain on CIB is reduced, enabling its funds to have a greater impact.

AOG RECOMMENDATION

THE ABOVE-NAMED AOG GOVERNING BODY REVIEWED THIS PROJECT ON THE DATE INDICATED AND VOTED TO:

SUPPORT THE PROJECT

Scott Bartholomew

REVIEWED BY

SIGNATURE

R6 Board Chair

TITLE

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENT, PLEASE CONTACT

Jess Peterson

NAME

435-893-0730

PHONE NUMBER

jessrp@r6.utah.gov

EMAIL

*Public Hearing: The CIB requires all applicants to have a vigorous public participation effort. All applicants shall hold a formally noticed public hearing to solicit comment concerning the size, scope, and nature of any funding request submitted to the CIB before review by the Board. A complete and detailed scope of work shall be given to the public, and its financing and be documented in the minutes. The information shall include the financial impact to the public as user fees, special assessments, or property taxes. (The Board has adopted a funding matrix tool to assist reasonable consistency regarding grant/loan award.) The CIB may require further public hearings if it determines the applicant did not adequately disclose to the public the possible financial impact of the financial assistance. Projects will not be placed on a CIB agenda until a public hearing has been held.

Permanent Community Impact Fund Board Application
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

APPLICANT Spring City		PROJECT TITLE Spring City Multipurpose Building/ Fire Dept	
DATE OF REVIEW Mar 5, 2025	TRIMESTER APPLYING Feb 2025	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST? YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG? YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
AOG R6 Regional Council	APPLICANT COUNTY Sanpete	PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING HELD PRIOR TO AOG REVIEW?* YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT? NO
CIB REQUEST \$1,128,323	GRANT AMT 1,128,323	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS? LOCAL YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGIONAL YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
LOAN AMT	LOAN TERMS	DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS AN IDENTIFIED NEED FROM THE CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY? YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS AN IDENTIFIED TOP PRIORITY FROM THE CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY? YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION/SCOPE OF WORK Description of what will be purchased with CIB funding.
This project will rehabilitate the historic 1916 Spring City middle school, a key community center that hosts the town's only gymnasium, youth sports, and various public events. It also serves as the base for the volunteer fire department and local arts organizations. CIB funding will support installing a new roof, adding a garage bay for the fire department's new truck, and creating a restroom, training space, and a small bedroom for overnight firefighters. The project will also raise hallway ceilings, replace outdated heating and electrical systems, and restore the original wood floors. These improvements will ensure the building remains safe and functional for the entire community, supporting youth activities, emergency preparedness, and cultural events. Enhancing the fire department ' s facilities will improve public safety across Spring City and beyond, while preserving the building's historic character for future use.

WHAT IS THIS PROJECT'S INTENDED PURPOSE TO THE COMMUNITY? How does this project help the community?
This project aims to preserve and improve a key community building in Spring City, ensuring it remains a center for youth sports, public events, and cultural activities. By upgrading the volunteer fire department's facilities, it strengthens local and regional emergency response capabilities. The renovations will also make the building safer and more functional, supporting emergency preparedness efforts, community gatherings, and local arts. Overall, the project enhances public safety, encourages community engagement, and preserves the building's historical significance, ensuring it continues to serve Spring City for years to come.

HOW DOES THIS PROJECT FULFILL CIB'S MANDATE TO USE ITS LIMITED FUNDS TO "RESULT IN THE GREATEST USE OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR THE GREATEST NUMBER OF CITIZENS OF THIS STATE"?
This project maximizes CIB's funds by benefiting a wide range of citizens through improved emergency services, youth programs, and community events. It enhances a historic, multi-use facility, serving not only Spring City but neighboring areas, ensuring long-term, broad-based benefits that align with CIB's goal of resource efficiency.

AOG RECOMMENDATION

THE ABOVE-NAMED AOG GOVERNING BODY REVIEWED THIS PROJECT ON THE DATE INDICATED AND VOTED TO:

SUPPORT THE PROJECT ☒

Scott Bartholomew

REVIEWED BY

SIGNATURE

R6 Board Chair

TITLE

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENT, PLEASE CONTACT

Cade Penney

NAME

435-893-0732

PHONE NUMBER

cadepenney@r6.utah.gov

EMAIL

*Public Hearing: The CIB requires all applicants to have a vigorous public participation effort. All applicants shall hold a formally noticed public hearing to solicit comment concerning the size, scope, and nature of any funding request submitted to the CIB before review by the Board. A complete and detailed scope of work shall be given to the public, and its financing and be documented in the minutes. The information shall include the financial impact to the public as user fees, special assessments, or property taxes. (The Board has adopted a funding matrix tool to assist reasonable consistency regarding grant/loan award.) The CIB may require further public hearings if it determines the applicant did not adequately disclose to the public the possible financial impact of the financial assistance. Projects will not be placed on a CIB agenda until a public hearing has been held.

R6 Regional Council
Combined Financial Report
07/01/2024 to 02/28/2025
66.67% of the fiscal year has expired

	Current Year Actual	Original Budget	Revised Budget	Budget Remaining	% Earned/ Used
Change In Net Position					
Revenue:					
Federal	1,911,404.73	4,729,657.00	4,762,332.00	2,850,927.27	40.14%
State	7,849,972.45	8,536,656.00	8,330,268.00	480,295.55	94.23%
Local/Other	7,343,630.28	729,739.00	7,536,480.00	192,849.72	97.44%
Counties	406,032.00	473,826.00	465,589.00	59,557.00	87.21%
Interest	163,925.57	105,900.00	205,900.00	41,974.43	79.61%
Transfers in	83,041.23	0.00	90,041.00	6,999.77	92.23%
Fund balance	0.00	2,719,675.00	2,472,225.00	2,472,225.00	0.00%
Total Revenue:	17,758,006.26	17,295,453.00	23,862,835.00	6,104,828.74	74.42%
Expenditures:					
Wages and benefits					
Personnel					
Salaried	1,443,135.33	2,424,593.00	2,526,278.00	1,083,142.67	57.12%
Hourly	65,116.29	114,701.00	140,552.00	75,435.71	46.33%
Total Personnel	1,508,251.62	2,539,294.00	2,666,830.00	1,158,578.38	56.56%
Fringe benefits					
FICA Match	113,069.02	192,762.00	201,639.00	88,569.98	56.07%
State retirement	204,556.86	354,111.00	367,970.00	163,413.14	55.59%
Group Insurance	594,057.60	1,021,375.00	1,026,404.00	432,346.40	57.88%
Workers Compensation	38,893.08	48,429.00	61,340.00	22,446.92	63.41%
Unemployment Insurance	3,437.64	8,216.00	8,027.00	4,589.36	42.83%
401k Retirement	83,575.69	166,391.00	159,594.00	76,018.31	52.37%
LT Disability	9,403.27	13,589.00	14,904.00	5,500.73	63.09%
Total Fringe benefits	1,046,993.16	1,804,873.00	1,839,878.00	792,884.84	56.91%
Total Wages and benefits	2,555,244.78	4,344,167.00	4,506,708.00	1,951,463.22	56.70%
Travel					
Instate travel	46,006.72	112,259.00	100,671.00	54,664.28	45.70%
Out-of-State travel	6,763.72	13,300.00	11,607.00	4,843.28	58.27%
Meal delivery	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Lodging/Meals	22,397.26	42,623.00	48,762.00	26,364.74	45.93%
Out-f-state per diem	9,938.99	7,934.00	11,397.00	1,458.01	87.21%
Board member travel	5,992.67	11,250.00	11,077.00	5,084.33	54.10%
Vehicle expenses	14,823.18	34,275.00	34,375.00	19,551.82	43.12%
Total Travel	105,922.54	221,641.00	217,889.00	111,966.46	48.61%
Operation					
Office supplies	15,648.68	26,417.00	29,763.00	14,114.32	52.58%
Postage and mailing	3,002.75	7,443.00	8,083.00	5,080.25	37.15%
Printing	1,525.70	5,084.00	8,483.00	6,957.30	17.99%
Telephone	24,823.20	43,141.00	47,206.00	22,382.80	52.58%
Subs, publ and books	306.74	2,050.00	450.00	143.26	68.16%
Assoc/Member dues	14,522.00	14,000.00	36,019.00	21,497.00	40.32%
Rent	67,799.25	116,669.00	120,519.00	52,719.75	56.26%
Utilities	21,040.61	42,000.00	40,094.00	19,053.39	52.48%
Misc. expense	1,872.90	2,360.00	3,635.00	1,762.10	51.52%
Advertising	18,964.07	32,088.00	32,106.00	13,141.93	59.07%
AOG Fiscal Services	214,384.71	352,317.00	384,431.00	170,046.29	55.77%
Audit expense	14,290.00	15,000.00	14,290.00	0.00	100.00%
Bank charges	3,226.21	9,500.00	5,000.00	1,773.79	64.52%
Repairs and services	5,978.45	13,670.00	8,802.00	2,823.55	67.92%
Insurance Gen.	43,323.81	36,607.00	47,115.00	3,791.19	91.95%
Professional supp	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
IT Expense	1,702.33	9,111.00	7,497.00	5,794.67	22.71%
Program expenses	209,414.95	435,542.00	544,286.00	334,871.05	38.48%
IT expense	42,785.36	78,890.00	80,019.00	37,233.64	53.47%
Legal costs	9,114.00	12,000.00	15,000.00	5,886.00	60.76%
Contractual services	421,412.84	1,405,087.00	1,365,544.00	944,131.16	30.86%
Conf./Workshops reg.	5,314.10	18,727.00	16,126.00	10,811.90	32.95%
Training costs	8,758.29	14,402.00	16,922.00	8,163.71	51.76%
C.I.L. Food	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Operating expense	51,920.99	5,469.00	69,888.00	17,967.01	74.29%
Leased equipment	397.08	850.00	850.00	452.92	46.72%
Rx/Medical supplies	15,573.10	50,000.00	33,550.00	17,976.90	46.42%
Health & safety	42,241.35	60,565.00	60,765.00	18,523.65	69.52%

R6 Regional Council
Combined Financial Report
07/01/2024 to 02/28/2025
66.67% of the fiscal year has expired

	Current Year Actual	Original Budget	Revised Budget	Budget Remaining	% Earned/ Used
Food & other	71,394.69	107,017.00	126,551.00	55,156.31	56.42%
Volunteer expense	45,198.70	79,242.00	75,128.00	29,929.30	60.16%
Bldg. materials	41,205.96	71,005.00	72,492.00	31,286.04	56.84%
Revenue returned	278,224.00	0.00	554,376.00	276,152.00	50.19%
County programs	535,716.25	602,426.00	619,296.00	83,579.75	86.50%
Transportation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Emergency assist	68,743.25	127,222.00	134,997.00	66,253.75	50.92%
Other	20,491.78	145,840.00	125,159.00	104,667.22	16.37%
Tools	8,873.29	19,960.00	20,091.00	11,217.71	44.17%
Total Operation	2,329,191.39	3,961,701.00	4,724,533.00	2,395,341.61	49.30%
Capital outlay					
Furniture & fixtures	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Equipment	43,809.08	21,923.00	34,006.00	(9,803.08)	128.83%
Vehicles	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Buildings	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Land	3,128,740.00	8,698,665.00	8,513,194.00	5,384,454.00	36.75%
Total Capital outlay	3,172,549.08	8,720,588.00	8,547,200.00	5,374,650.92	37.12%
Transfers out	83,041.23	0.00	83,041.00	(0.23)	100.00%
Fund To Be Appropriated	0.00	47,356.00	5,783,464.00	5,783,464.00	0.00%
Total Expenditures:	8,245,949.02	17,295,453.00	23,862,835.00	15,616,885.98	34.56%
Total Change In Net Position	9,512,057.24	0.00	0.00	(9,512,057.24)	0.00%

Six County Association of Governments

Combined Financial Report

07/01/2024 to 02/28/2025

66.67% of the fiscal year has expired

	Current Year Actual	Original Budget	Revised Budget	Budget Remaining	% Earned/ Used
Change In Net Position					
Revenue:					
Federal	3,086.58	4,522,588.00	3,196,006.00	3,192,919.42	0.10%
State	23,332.27	8,531,956.00	7,792,626.00	7,769,293.73	0.30%
Local/Other	763.60	729,739.00	241,274.00	240,510.40	0.32%
Counties	0.00	473,826.00	235,250.00	235,250.00	0.00%
Interest	44.11	105,900.00	5,944.00	5,899.89	0.74%
Transfers in	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Fund balance	0.00	2,719,675.00	4,813,767.00	4,813,767.00	0.00%
Total Revenue:	27,226.56	17,083,684.00	16,284,867.00	16,257,640.44	0.17%
Expenditures:					
Wages and benefits					
Personnel					
Salaried	0.00	2,389,503.00	1,607,597.00	1,607,597.00	0.00%
Hourly	0.00	61,043.00	35,730.00	35,730.00	0.00%
Total Personnel	0.00	2,450,546.00	1,643,327.00	1,643,327.00	0.00%
Fringe benefits					
FICA Match	0.00	180,187.00	121,712.00	121,712.00	0.00%
State retirement	0.00	352,831.00	235,231.00	235,231.00	0.00%
Group Insurance	0.00	999,490.00	705,100.00	705,100.00	0.00%
Workers Compensation	0.00	46,954.00	32,997.00	32,997.00	0.00%
Unemployment Insurance	0.00	7,967.00	5,315.00	5,315.00	0.00%
401k Retirement	0.00	163,430.00	107,497.00	107,497.00	0.00%
LT Disability	0.00	13,181.00	8,811.00	8,811.00	0.00%
Total Fringe benefits	0.00	1,764,040.00	1,216,663.00	1,216,663.00	0.00%
Total Wages and benefits	0.00	4,214,586.00	2,859,990.00	2,859,990.00	0.00%
Travel					
Instate travel	0.00	108,604.00	81,808.00	81,808.00	0.00%
Out-of-State travel	0.00	13,300.00	6,800.00	6,800.00	0.00%
Meal delivery	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Lodging/Meals	0.00	42,578.00	29,059.00	29,059.00	0.00%
Out-f-state per diem	0.00	7,934.00	4,134.00	4,134.00	0.00%
Board member travel	0.00	11,250.00	6,400.00	6,400.00	0.00%
Vehicle expenses	0.00	30,281.00	12,231.00	12,231.00	0.00%
Total Travel	0.00	213,947.00	140,432.00	140,432.00	0.00%
Operation					
Office supplies	0.00	24,873.00	12,685.00	12,685.00	0.00%
Postage and mailing	0.00	7,252.00	2,187.00	2,187.00	0.00%
Printing	0.00	4,706.00	2,951.00	2,951.00	0.00%
Telephone	0.00	42,061.00	31,016.00	31,016.00	0.00%
Subs, publ and books	0.00	2,050.00	100.00	100.00	0.00%
Assoc/Member dues	0.00	14,000.00	4,110.00	4,110.00	0.00%
Rent	0.00	114,361.00	93,501.00	93,501.00	0.00%
Utilities	0.00	42,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Misc. expense	0.00	1,362.00	312.00	312.00	0.00%
Advertising	0.00	30,663.00	9,153.00	9,153.00	0.00%
AOG Fiscal Services	0.00	337,256.00	262,606.00	262,606.00	0.00%
Audit expense	0.00	15,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Bank charges	1,884.11	9,500.00	1,837.00	(47.11)	102.56%
Repairs and services	0.00	13,655.00	5,755.00	5,755.00	0.00%
Insurance Gen.	0.00	36,280.00	4,980.00	4,980.00	0.00%
Professional supp	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
IT Expense	0.00	6,257.00	5,957.00	5,957.00	0.00%
Program expenses	0.00	435,542.00	425,542.00	425,542.00	0.00%
IT expense	0.00	73,663.00	43,824.00	43,824.00	0.00%
Legal costs	0.00	12,000.00	6,000.00	6,000.00	0.00%
Contractual services	0.00	1,385,435.00	1,014,551.00	1,014,551.00	0.00%
Conf./Workshops reg.	0.00	18,727.00	6,927.00	6,927.00	0.00%
Training costs	0.00	4,402.00	2,652.00	2,652.00	0.00%
C.I.L. Food	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Access services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Operating expense	0.00	3,939.00	824.00	824.00	0.00%
Leased equipment	0.00	850.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Rx/Medical supplies	0.00	50,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%

Six County Association of Governments

Combined Financial Report

07/01/2024 to 02/28/2025

66.67% of the fiscal year has expired

	Current Year Actual	Original Budget	Revised Budget	Budget Remaining	% Earned/ Used
Health & safety	0.00	57,421.00	47,721.00	47,721.00	0.00%
Food & other	0.00	107,017.00	54,415.00	54,415.00	0.00%
Volunteer expense	0.00	79,242.00	1,097.00	1,097.00	0.00%
Bldg. materials	0.00	65,245.00	65,245.00	65,245.00	0.00%
Revenue returned	0.00	0.00	1,600.00	1,600.00	0.00%
County programs	0.00	602,426.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Transportation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Emergency assist	0.00	127,222.00	127,222.00	127,222.00	0.00%
Other	0.00	142,840.00	17,985.00	17,985.00	0.00%
Tools	0.00	19,960.00	19,960.00	19,960.00	0.00%
Total Operation	1,884.11	3,887,207.00	2,272,715.00	2,270,830.89	0.08%
Capital outlay					
Furniture & fixtures	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Equipment	0.00	21,923.00	13,450.00	13,450.00	0.00%
Vehicles	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Buildings	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Land	6,158,598.61	8,698,665.00	10,975,224.00	4,816,625.39	56.11%
Total Capital outlay	6,158,598.61	8,720,588.00	10,988,674.00	4,830,075.39	56.04%
Transfers out	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Fund To Be Appropriated	0.00	47,356.00	23,056.00	23,056.00	0.00%
Total Expenditures:	6,160,482.72	17,083,684.00	16,284,867.00	10,124,384.28	37.83%
Total Change In Net Position	(6,133,256.16)	0.00	0.00	6,133,256.16	0.00%

2025 Requests for Information (RFI) and Status

