

## R6 Regional Council - Executive Board Meeting

Wednesday, March 5, 2025

82 East 600 North, Richfield UT 84701

\*\*\*\*\*

8:55	<b>Annual Action Plan Hearing</b>	Commissioner Bartholomew	
9:00	<b>Welcome/Meeting Called to Order</b>	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	<b>R6 Programs, Ongoing Projects &amp; Reports</b>		
	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	KerrieLynn Beard	
	8. Other	Commissioner Bartholomew	
9:50	<b>Economic Development District</b>		
	Regional Priorities		
	County Updates		
10:15	<b>Congressional/State Reports</b>		
	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	<b>Adjourn</b>		
	<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	Mayor Chuck Bigelow
Commissioner Roger Brian	Mayor Bill Davis
Commissioner Greg Jensen	Mayor Noreen Johnson
Commissioner Trevor Johnson	Mayor Justin Seely
Commissioner Sam Steed	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](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://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>		<b>\$1,048,261</b>					
Set Aside	SCAOG Admin/Con Plan	<b>\$50,000</b>	<b>\$998,261</b>					
Set Aside	SCAOG SF Rehab	<b>\$100,000</b>	<b>\$898,261</b>					
Set Aside	SCAOG Regional Planning	<b>\$50,000</b>	<b>\$848,261</b>					
1	Wayne County	<b>\$265,179</b>	<b>\$583,082</b>					
2	Bicknell	<b>\$30,501</b>	<b>\$552,581</b>					
3	Lynnndyl	<b>\$40,684</b>	<b>\$511,897</b>					
4	Manti	<b>\$236,152</b>	<b>\$275,745</b>					
5	Levan	<b>\$110,475</b>	<b>\$165,270</b>					
6	Salina	<b>\$182,664</b>	<b>(\$17,394)</b>					
7	Sevier County	<b>\$205,000</b>	<b>(\$222,394)</b>					
8			<b>(\$222,394)</b>					
9			<b>(\$222,394)</b>					

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 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	COF Secured
		3 points	2 points	1 point					
4	CDBG Funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by the number of project beneficiaries.	\$0.01-100.99	\$101-200.99	\$201-400.99	\$401-800.99	\$801 or >		5	\$30,501/328=92.99
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
5	Jurisdictions with a population of less than 5,000 will receive 1 point.	Yes	No					1	2020 population of 328
		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%		5	92.57% 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 115/328 * 100 = 35.1%
		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			2	Funded in 2022
		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	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	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	Done since 2022
19	Application Completion: (See note #19 for Scoring)	1 point	0 point					0	Submitted late
							Total Score:	43	

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.	

**R6 Regional Council 2025 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet**

<b>Applicant &amp; Project: Lynndyl - Water Pump</b>		<b>Total Project Cost:</b>		<b>\$45,234.00</b>		<b>Non-CDBG Funds:</b>		<b>\$4,550.00</b>	
		<b>CDBG Request:</b>		<b>\$40,684.00</b>		<b>Source of Funds:</b>		<b>Lynndyl</b>	
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	>10%	7.01-10%	4.01-7%	1.01-4%	<1%			
2a	Jurisdictions with a population less than 500	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%			
2 c	Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
2 d	Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000	>30%	25.01-30%	20.01-25%	15.01-20%	1-15%			
3	Non-CDBG Funds Secured: Non-CDBG funds have been Secured, Partially Secured, or Applied for.	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
4	CDBG Funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by the number of project beneficiaries.	\$0.01-100.99	\$101-200.99	\$201-400.99	\$401-800.99	\$801 or >		3	\$40,684/111=\$366.52
5	Jurisdictions with a population of less than 5,000 will receive 1 point.	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 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
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	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
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.	>80%	75.01-80%	60.01-75%	55.01-60%	51-55%		3	64.70% LMI
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)	>20%	15.01-20%	10.01-15%	5.01-10%	1-5%			
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:	5 points	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.	2 Points	1 point					2	RFB Used, Estimate Attached
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.	2020 and Prior	2021	2022	2023				
13	Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA): Is the entire project solely focused on ADA compliance?	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			4	Not funded
14	Health And Safety: Does the project address serious health and safety threats.	Water Infrastructure Improvements	Street/Sidewalk Improvements	Recreation Facility Improvements	Sewer/Storm Infrastructure	Public Facilities, Public Health/Safety	LMI Housing	6	Water Project
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)	6 points	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point		
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	No
17	Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #16 for scoring)	2 points	0 point					0	No
18	Civil Rights Compliance: Applicant is in compliance with federal laws and regulations related to civil rights. (See Note #18 for scoring)	3 points	0 point					0	No
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			4	Yes for all items
		2 points	1 point	0 point				2	Checklist Complete, ADA Docs Adopted
		1 point	0 point					1	Submitted on time
									Total Score: <b>41.5</b>

**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.

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	>10% 5 points	7.01-10% 4 points	4.01-7% 3 points	1.01-4% 2 points	<1% 1 point			
2 a	Jurisdictions with a population less than 500	>20% 5 points	15.01-20% 4 points	10.01-15% 3 points	5.01-10% 2 points	1-5% 1 point			
2 b	Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000	>30% 5 points	25.01-30% 4 points	20.01-25% 3 points	15.01-20% 2 points	1-15% 1 point			
2 c	Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000	>40% 5 points	35.01-40% 4 points	30.01-35% 3 points	25.01-30% 2 points	1-25% 1 point			
2 d	Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000	Secured 3 points	Partial 2 points	Applied 1 point				3	COF Confirmed
3	Non-CDBG Funds Secured: Non-CDBG funds have been Secured, Partially Secured, or Applied for.	\$0.01-100.99 5 points	\$101-200.99 4 points	\$201-400.99 3 points	\$401-800.99 2 points	\$801 or > 1 point		4	\$236,152/1,542=153.47
4	CDBG Funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by the number of project beneficiaries.	Yes 1 Point	No 0 Point					1	2020 Population, Manti=3, 429
5	Jurisdictions with a population of less than 5,000 will receive 1 point.	Multiple Counties 5 Points	County 4 points	Portion of County 3 points	Community 2 points	Portion of Community 1 point		3	Portion of County
6	Project's Geographical Impact: Projects will be rated on their relative impact in the community both in terms of numbers and relative need.	>80% 5 points	75.01-80% 4 points	60.01-75% 3 points	55.01-60% 2 points	51-55% 1 points		1	51% because of activity
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)	>20% 5 points	15.01-20% 4 points	10.01-15% 3 points	5.01-10% 2 points	1-5% 1 point		5	Weighted Average of 34.51
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.	2 Points	1 point					2	RFB Used, Estimate Attached
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)	2020 and Prior 4 points	2021 3 points	2022 2 points	2023 1 point			4	Not Funded
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:	Water Infrastructure Improvements 6 points	Street/Sidewalk Improvements 5 points	Recreation Facility Improvements 4 points	Sewer/Storm Infrastructure 3 points	Public Facilities, Public Health/Safety 2 points	LMI Housing 1 point	2	Public Facility
11	Project Priority: Determined by R6 Executive Board members. This Board is composed of a mayor and commissioner from each of the Six Counties.	Yes 4 Points	No 0 Point					4	Project falls under this category
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 2 points	No 0 point					0	No
13	Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA): Is the entire project solely focused on ADA compliance?	Yes 3 points	No 0 point					0	No
14	Health And Safety: Does the project address serious health and safety threats.	Yes 2 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 a 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 a 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			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
							Total Score:	41.5	

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.

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	>10% 5 points	7.01-10% 4 points	4.01-7% 3 points	1.01-4% 2 points	<1% 1 point			
2 a	Jurisdictions with a population less than 500	>20% 5 points	15.01-20% 4 points	10.01-15% 3 points	5.01-10% 2 points	1-5% 1 point			
2 b	Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000	>30% 5 points	25.01-30% 4 points	20.01-25% 3 points	15.01-20% 2 points	1-15% 1 point			
2 c	Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000	>40% 5 points	35.01-40% 4 points	30.01-35% 3 points	25.01-30% 2 points	1-25% 1 point			
2 d	Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000	Secured 3 points	Partial 2 points	Applied 1 point				3	Secured
3	Non-CDBG Funds Secured: Non-CDBG funds have been Secured, Partially Secured, or Applied for.	\$0.01-100.99 5 points	\$101-200.99 4 points	\$201-400.99 3 points	\$401-800.99 2 points	\$801 or > 1 point		5	\$182,664/2,441=74.83
4	CDBG Funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by the number of project beneficiaries.	Yes 1 Point	No 0 Point					1	2020 population of 2,441
5	Jurisdictions with a population of less than 5,000 will receive 1 point.	Multiple Counties 5 Points	County 4 points	Portion of County 3 points	Community 2 points	Portion of Community 1 point		2	Community Project
6	Project's Geographical Impact: Projects will be rated on their relative impact in the community both in terms of numbers and relative need.	>80% 5 points	75.01-80% 4 points	60.01-75% 3 points	55.01-60% 2 points	51-55% 1 points		1	51.10% LMI
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)	>20% 5 points	15.01-20% 4 points	10.01-15% 3 points	5.01-10% 2 points	1-5% 1 point		5	LOW 595/2,441X100=24.38
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.	2 Points	1 point					2	RFB Proccess followed
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:	2020 and Prior 4 points	2021 3 points	2022 2 points	2023 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 6 points	Street/Sidewalk Improvements 5 points	Recreation Facility Improvements 4 points	Sewer/Storm Infrastructure 3 points	Public Facilities, Public Health/Safety 2 points	LMI Housing 1 point	4	Recreation project
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	All items complete
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring	1 point	0 point					0	Submitted late
							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 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:		\$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	>10%	7.01-10%	4.01-7%	1.01-4%	<1%			
2 a	Jurisdictions with a population less than 500	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%			
2 c	Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
2 d	Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000	>30%	25.01-30%	20.01-25%	15.01-20%	1-15%			
3	Non-CDBG Funds Secured: Non-CDBG funds have been Secured, Partially Secured, or Applied for.	Secured	Partial	Applied				3	Secured in COF
3		3 points	2 points	1 point					
4	CDBG Funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by the number of project beneficiaries.	\$0.01-100.99	\$101-200.99	\$201-400.99	\$401-800.99	\$801 or >		1	\$205,000/21,522X100=\$952.51
5	Jurisdictions with a population of less than 5,000 will receive 1 point.	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 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
6		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
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	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point		5	LOW 5,180/21,522X100=24.06
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
10		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
11		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	No					4	Full points because of category
12		4 Points	0 Point						
13	Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA): Is the entire project solely focused on ADA compliance?	Yes	No					0	No
13		2 points	0 point						
14	Health And Safety: Does the project address serious health and safety threats.	Yes	No					0	No
14		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
15		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
16		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
17									
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 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:		\$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	>10% 5 points	7.01-10% 4 points	4.01-7% 3 points	1.01-4% 2 points	<1% 1 point			
2 a	Jurisdictions with a population less than 500	>20% 5 points	15.01-20% 4 points	10.01-15% 3 points	5.01-10% 2 points	1-5% 1 point			
2 b	Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000	>30% 5 points	25.01-30% 4 points	20.01-25% 3 points	15.01-20% 2 points	1-15% 1 point			
2 c	Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000	>40% 5 points	35.01-40% 4 points	30.01-35% 3 points	25.01-30% 2 points	1-25% 1 point			
2 d	Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000	Secured 3 points	Partial 2 points	Applied 1 point				3	COF Secured
3	Non-CDBG Funds Secured: Non-CDBG funds have been Secured, Partially Secured, or Applied for.	\$0.01-100.99 5 points	\$101-200.99 4 points	\$201-400.99 3 points	\$401-800.99 2 points	\$801 or > 1 point		4	\$110,475/862=128.16
4	CDBG Funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by the number of project beneficiaries.	Yes 1 Point	No 0 Point					1	2020 population of 862
5	Jurisdictions with a population of less than 5,000 will receive 1 point.	Multiple Counties 5 Points	County 4 points	Portion of County 3 points	Community 2 points	Portion of Community 1 point		2	Community Project
6	Project's Geographical Impact: Projects will be rated on their relative impact in the community both in terms of numbers and relative need.	>80% 5 points	75.01-80% 4 points	60.01-75% 3 points	55.01-60% 2 points	51-55% 1 points		2	55.7% LMI
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)	>20% 5 points	15.01-20% 4 points	10.01-15% 3 points	5.01-10% 2 points	1-5% 1 point		4	LOW 130/862X100=15.10
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.	2 Points	1 point					2	RFB Used, Estimate Attached
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:	2020 and Prior 4 points	2021 3 points	2022 2 points	2023 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 6 points	Street/Sidewalk Improvements 5 points	Recreation Facility Improvements 4 points	Sewer/Storm Infrastructure 3 points	Public Facilities, Public Health/Safety 2 points	LMI Housing 1 point	4	Recreation
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				1	Checklist complete, Docs not adopted
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring	1 point	0 point					1	Submitted on time
							Total Score:	39.5	

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 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:		\$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.	\$0.01-100.99	\$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 receive 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 receive 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 <b>Eureka City</b>		PROJECT TITLE <b>Eureka City - Roads Master Plan</b>		
DATE OF REVIEW <b>03/05/2025</b>	TRIMESTER APPLYING <b>February 2025</b>	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST? <b>YES</b>	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG? <b>YES</b>	
AOG <b>R6 Regional Council</b>	APPLICANT COUNTY <b>Juab County</b>	PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING HELD PRIOR TO AOG REVIEW?* <b>YES</b>	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT? <b>YES</b>	
CIB REQUEST <b>\$26,800</b>	GRANT AMT <b>\$26,800</b>	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS? <b>YES</b>	LOCAL <b>YES</b>	REGIONAL <b>YES</b>
LOAN AMT <b>N/A</b>	LOAN TERMS <b>N/A</b>	DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS AN IDENTIFIED NEED FROM THE CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY? <b>YES</b>	DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS AN IDENTIFIED TOP PRIORITY FROM THE CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY? <b>YES</b>	

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:

**Scott Bartholomew**

REVIEWED BY

**SUPORT THE PROJECT**

**R6 Board Chair**

SIGNATURE

TITLE

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENT, PLEASE CONTACT

**Shay Morrison**    **435-893-0737**    **shaym@r6.utah.gov**

NAME

PHONE NUMBER

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

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:

**Scott Bartholomew**

REVIEWED BY

**SUPORT THE PROJECT**

**R6 Board Chair**

SIGNATURE

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

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:

**Scott Bartholomew**

REVIEWED BY

**SUPORT THE PROJECT**

**R6 Board Chair**

SIGNATURE

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

**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:

**Scott Bartholomew**

REVIEWED BY

**SUPORT THE PROJECT**

**R6 Board Chair**

SIGNATURE

TITLE

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENT, PLEASE CONTACT

**Cade Penney** **435-893-0732**

NAME

PHONE NUMBER

[cadepenney@r6.utah.gov](mailto: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
<b>Change In Net Position</b>					
<b>Revenue:</b>					
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%
<b>Total Revenue:</b>	<b>17,758,006.26</b>	<b>17,295,453.00</b>	<b>23,862,835.00</b>	<b>6,104,828.74</b>	<b>74.42%</b>
<b>Expenditures:</b>					
<b>Wages and benefits</b>					
<b>Personnel</b>					
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%
<b>Total Personnel</b>	<b>1,508,251.62</b>	<b>2,539,294.00</b>	<b>2,666,830.00</b>	<b>1,158,578.38</b>	<b>56.56%</b>
<b>Fringe benefits</b>					
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%
<b>Total Fringe benefits</b>	<b>1,046,993.16</b>	<b>1,804,873.00</b>	<b>1,839,878.00</b>	<b>792,884.84</b>	<b>56.91%</b>
<b>Total Wages and benefits</b>	<b>2,555,244.78</b>	<b>4,344,167.00</b>	<b>4,506,708.00</b>	<b>1,951,463.22</b>	<b>56.70%</b>
<b>Travel</b>					
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-of-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%
<b>Total Travel</b>	<b>105,922.54</b>	<b>221,641.00</b>	<b>217,889.00</b>	<b>111,966.46</b>	<b>48.61%</b>
<b>Operation</b>					
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**

	<b>Current Year Actual</b>	<b>Original Budget</b>	<b>Revised Budget</b>	<b>Budget Remaining</b>	<b>% Earned/ Used</b>
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%
<b>Total Operation</b>	<b>2,329,191.39</b>	<b>3,961,701.00</b>	<b>4,724,533.00</b>	<b>2,395,341.61</b>	<b>49.30%</b>
<b>Capital outlay</b>					
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%
<b>Total Capital outlay</b>	<b>3,172,549.08</b>	<b>8,720,588.00</b>	<b>8,547,200.00</b>	<b>5,374,650.92</b>	<b>37.12%</b>
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%
<b>Total Expenditures:</b>	<b>8,245,949.02</b>	<b>17,295,453.00</b>	<b>23,862,835.00</b>	<b>15,616,885.98</b>	<b>34.56%</b>
<b>Total Change In Net Position</b>	<b>9,512,057.24</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>(9,512,057.24)</b>	<b>0.00%</b>

**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
<b>Change In Net Position</b>					
<b>Revenue:</b>					
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%
<b>Total Revenue:</b>	<b>27,226.56</b>	<b>17,083,684.00</b>	<b>16,284,867.00</b>	<b>16,257,640.44</b>	<b>0.17%</b>
<b>Expenditures:</b>					
<b>Wages and benefits</b>					
<b>Personnel</b>					
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%
<b>Total Personnel</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>2,450,546.00</b>	<b>1,643,327.00</b>	<b>1,643,327.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>Fringe benefits</b>					
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%
<b>Total Fringe benefits</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1,764,040.00</b>	<b>1,216,663.00</b>	<b>1,216,663.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>Total Wages and benefits</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>4,214,586.00</b>	<b>2,859,990.00</b>	<b>2,859,990.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>Travel</b>					
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%
<b>Total Travel</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>213,947.00</b>	<b>140,432.00</b>	<b>140,432.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>Operation</b>					
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

	<b>Current Year Actual</b>	<b>Original Budget</b>	<b>Revised Budget</b>	<b>Budget Remaining</b>	<b>% Earned/ Used</b>
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%
<b>Total Operation</b>	<b>1,884.11</b>	<b>3,887,207.00</b>	<b>2,272,715.00</b>	<b>2,270,830.89</b>	<b>0.08%</b>
<b>Capital outlay</b>					
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%
<b>Total Capital outlay</b>	<b>6,158,598.61</b>	<b>8,720,588.00</b>	<b>10,988,674.00</b>	<b>4,830,075.39</b>	<b>56.04%</b>
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%
<b>Total Expenditures:</b>	<b>6,160,482.72</b>	<b>17,083,684.00</b>	<b>16,284,867.00</b>	<b>10,124,384.28</b>	<b>37.83%</b>
<b>Total Change In Net Position</b>	<b>(6,133,256.16)</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>6,133,256.16</b>	<b>0.00%</b>

# 2025 Requests for Information (RFI) and Status

