R6 Regional Council - Executive Board Meeting
Wednesday, March 4, 2026
82 East 600 North, Richfield UT 84701

****

9:00 AM	**Welcome/Meeting Called to Order**	Commissioner Greg Jensen	
	1. Opening Prayer		
	2. Pledge of Allegiance		
	3. Minutes Approved		
	-Executive Board Meeting 1.7.26		
	4. Clearinghouse Review		
	5. FYI	Travis Kyhl	
9:10	**R6 Programs, Ongoing Projects & Reports**		
	1. CDBG Annual Action Plan Approval	Shay Morrison	
	2. CDBG Rating & Ranking	Shay Morrison	
	3. LTAP Road Project Update	Brock Jackson	
	4. CIB Application Reviews	Community Advisors	
	5. Agri-Park Board Changes	Shaun Kjar	
	6. Division of Health & Human Services	Tracy Gruber & Tonya Hales	
	7. Nuclear Energy Public Outreach	Shannon King & Patrick Lee	
	8. Finance Update	JaLyne Roundy	
	9. Program Updates	R6 Directors	
	10. Other	Commissioner Jensen	
10:00	**Central Utah Agri-Park**		
	Minutes Approved 11.5.25	Shaun Kjar	
	Agri-Park Update	Shaun Kjar	
10:10	**Economic Development District**		
	County Updates		
	Public Lands Update		
	-USFS - BLM - PLPCO - DWR	Representatives	
10:30	**Congressional/State Reports**		
	Senator Lee	Gary Webster	
	Senator Curtis	Jeff Raisor	
	Rep. Owens	Holly Sweeten	
	Rep. Maloy	Bruce Summers/Evelyn Warnick	
	State Agencies - Time Permitting	Representatives	
11:00	**Adjourn**		

According to the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act, the board may enter a closed session at any time

MINUTES
R6 REGIONAL COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING

DATE: **January 7, 2026**
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 Clinton Painter
Commissioner Sam Steed
Mayor Travis Good
Mayor Noreen Johnson
Mayor Johnny Parsons
Mayor Justin Seely
Councilman Nate Taylor

Staff

Kayla Ballow
Brock Jackson
Doug Kirkham
Travis Kyhl
Shaun Kjar
Pam Morrison
Shay Morrison
Cade Penney
Maradee Peterson
Jess Peterson
Amy Rosquist
JaLyne Roundy
John Syphrett
Michelle Standley
Jeff Tanner
Tyler Timmons

Congressional Staff

Jeff Raisor
Bruce Summers
Holly Sweeten
Gary Webster

Other

Representative Carl Albrecht
Jody Gale
Commissioner Marvin Kenison
Gabe Miller
Commissioner Marty Palmer
Rick Roberts
Representative Troy Shelley
Heidi Stringham
Trent Wilde

Welcome/ Meeting Called to Order

Commissioner Greg Jensen welcomed all and called the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes- Commissioner Scott Bartholomew made a motion to approve the minutes from the November 5, 2025 Executive Board Meeting. Commissioner Clinton Painter seconded the motion. Motion approved.

FYI- Mr. Travis Kyhl introduced the new board members, Mayfield Mayor Travis Good and Delta City Councilman Nate Taylor. Each took a few minutes to introduce themselves. Mr. Kyhl also introduced Mr. Jeff Tanner as the new Economic Development Coordinator and Ms. Maradee Peterson as the new Director of the Aging Department.

DRAFT

R6 Programs, Ongoing Projects & Reports

Legislative Reports- Representative Carl Albrecht updated the group on issues expected to be discussed during the upcoming legislative session. He noted that the state will be operating under a tight budget and that the "Big Beautiful Bill" is projected to reduce Utah's state tax revenue by approximately $500 million. Representative Albrecht highlighted several proposed bills, including legislation related to SITLA and cultural surveys, a drinking water bill, and a nuclear amendments bill. He stated that the nation is experiencing an energy shortage and that Utah is positioned as a critical part of the solution. Representative Troy Shelley advised Board members that if a proposed bill would negatively affect them, they should determine how it could be improved and communicate those concerns with their legislators. Representative Shelley also talked about how carbon credits are generating substantial revenue for Utah.

Action: No action needed

Audit Review- 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 Clinton Painter made a motion to approve the audit report. Councilman Nate Taylor seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Action: No action needed

Agripark Update- Mr. Shaun Kjar reported that the 930-acre land deal has closed. The property is located northwest of Nephi City and is privately owned for the first time. He noted that Nephi City officials met the previous evening to begin the annexation process. Mr. Kjar stated that he is working on geothermal rights and a study focused on infrastructure grants. The master planning process has begun, and Mr. Kjar indicated he is available to answer any questions. Mr. Travis Kyhl advised the Board that the agency's attorney has indicated the R6 Executive Board is liable for decisions made by the Agripark Board. He asked Board members to consider this issue and noted that a future meeting would include discussion on whether those decisions should continue to be delegated.

Action: No action needed

R6 Recognition Banquet- Mr. Travis Kyhl asked the Board for feedback on the Recognition Banquet. Several members shared positive comments, noting that they appreciated holding the banquet at the R6 building.

Action: No action needed

Congressional Briefing Update- Mr. Travis Kyhl reported that he and Mr. Darin Bushman traveled to Washington, D.C. for congressional outreach, which he described as successful. He noted that the Congressional Briefing will take place August 10–12 and that they will return to the original plan of inviting key congressional staffers. During the trip, Mr. Kyhl gathered names, priority topics, and key legislation, and stated that a strong working list has been developed.

Action: No action needed

RLF Board Members- Ms. Amy Rosquist reminded the Executive Board of the composition of the Loan Administration Board (LAB) and noted that there is currently a vacancy due to Mayor Torgerson no

DRAFT

longer serving on the Executive Board. Commissioner Clinton Painter made a motion to appoint Mayor Justin Seely to the LAB. Commissioner Roger Brian seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Action: No action needed

Financial Update- Ms. JaLyne Roundy directed board members to turn their attention to the financial statement provided to them. She gave an update on the agency's financial situation at this point in the fiscal year. Commissioner Scott Bartholomew made a motion to approve the financial report. Councilman Nate Tylor seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Action: No action needed

Program Updates- Ms. Maradee Peterson and Ms. Michelle Standley from the Aging Department provided the Board with information on programs within their department, specifically the Ombudsman Program and the Veteran-Directed Care Program. Ms. Pam Morrison and Ms. Kayla Ballow from the Housing and Community Action Programs Department highlighted the Mutual Self-Help Housing Program. All presenters answered questions from the Board, and members expressed appreciation for the valuable services these programs provide to the region.

Action: No action needed

Other- Mr. Shay Morrison provided a brief update on Project Portal, proposing that it would be beneficial for entities to prioritize their own projects without county oversight. He asked if any Board members had objections to him approaching the Community Impact Board with this request; no objections were raised. Mayor Justin Seely reminded elected officials to keep the Central Utah Leadership Academy in mind as they formulate their budgets.

Action: No action needed

Economic Development Update

County- Mr. Jeff Tanner, Regional Economic Development Coordinator, officially introduced himself to the board and gave a brief overview of economic development activity in each of the counties.

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- Mr. Bruce Summers reported on Representative Maloy's activity. For information on Representative Maloy, please refer to her website at *maloy.house.gov.*

Senator Curtis- Mr. Jeff Raisor reported on Senator Curtis's activity. 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*.

DRAFT

State/Federal Agency Reports

USU- Mr. Jody Gale, representing USU Extension, reported that snowpack levels are very low and that accumulated lake water is below average. He noted that grasshopper populations are increasing and shared information about upcoming agriculture workshops scheduled for January and February.

Snow College- Ms. Heidi Stringham from Snow College provided an update on the Electrical Apprenticeship Program. She noted strong student interest but indicated that the program is currently lacking sufficient industry partners.

Action: No action requested by congressional or state representatives.

Clearinghouse Review- Mayor Justin Seely made a motion to approve the clearinghouse review. Commissioner Sam Steed seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Adjourn 11:02 a.m.

DRAFT

R6 Regional Council 2026 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet		Total Project Cost:		$290,000		Non-CDBG Funds:		$50,000	
Applicant & Project: Ephraim - Park Playground		CDBG Request:		$240,000		Source of Funds:		Ephraim City	
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	N/A
2	Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by Total Project							1	50,000/290,000X100=17.24
2a	Jurisdictions with a population less than 500	>10% 5 points	7.01-10% 4 points	4.01-7% 3 points	1.01-4% 2 points	<1% 1 point			
2 b	Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000	>20% 5 points	15.01-20% 4 points	10.01-15% 3 points	5.01-10% 2 points	1-5% 1 point			
2 c	Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000	>30% 5 points	25.01-30% 4 points	20.01-25% 3 points	15.01-20% 2 points	1-15% 1 point			
2 d	Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000	>40% 5 points	35.01-40% 4 points	30.01-35% 3 points	25.01-30% 2 points	1-25% 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	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	240,000/5,949 (2024 ACS)
5	Jurisdicitions with a population of less than 5,000 will recieve 1 point.	Yes 1 Point	No 0 Point					0	5,949 (2024 ACS)
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 5 Points	County 4 points	Portion of County 3 points	Community 2 points	Portion of Community 1 point		2	Community
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% 5 points	75.01-80% 4 points	60.01-75% 3 points	55.01-60% 2 points	51-55% 1 points		1	52.85%
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% 5 points	15.01-20% 4 points	10.01-15% 3 points	5.01-10% 2 points	1-5% 1 point		5	LOW 2,450/6,598 (2015 ACS)X100=37.13
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)	2 Points	1 point					2	Completed
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:	2021 and Prior 4 points	2022 3 points	2023 2 points	2024 1 point			3	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 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 recieve 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	N/A
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	N/A
17	Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #17 for scoring)	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			3	All but GP
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	Complete
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring	1 point	0 point					1	Complete
						Total Score:		34.5	

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 2026 cycle: updated during or after 2021). 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, 2025 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, 2025 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, 2025 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 2026 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet		Total Project Cost:		$501,690		Non-CDBG Funds:		$255,690	
Applicant & Project: Gunnison City - Sports Court		CDBG Request:		$246,000		Source of Funds:		Various Sources	
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		3.5	N/A
2	Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by Total Project							5	255,690/501,690X100=50.97
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 >		5	246,000/3,562(2024 ACS)=69.1
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
5	Jurisdicitions with a population of less than 5,000 will recieve 1 point.	Yes	No					1	3,562 (2024 ACS)
		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
		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%
		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	15 of 68 on survey=22.1%
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)	2 Points	1 point					2	Complete
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:	2021 and Prior	2022	2023	2024			2	2023
		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	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	No
		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	No
		2 points	0 point						
17	Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #17 for scoring)	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			3	All except GP
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	Complete
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring	1 point	0 point					1	Complete
						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 2026 cycle: updated during or after 2021). 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, 2025 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, 2025 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, 2025 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 2026 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet

		Total Project Cost:		**$256,800**		**Non-CDBG Funds:**		**$0**	
Applicant & Project: Koosharem Town - Water System Improvements		**CDBG Request:**		**$256,800**		**Source of Funds:**		**N/A**	
	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**		3.5	N/A
2	**Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by Total Project**							1	298 (2024 ACS)
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				0	N/A
		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 >		1	256,800/298 (2024 ACS)=861.74
		5 points	**4 points**	**3 points**	**2 points**	**1 point**			
5	**Jurisdicitions with a population of less than 5,000 will recieve 1 point.**	Yes	No					1	298(2024 ACS)
		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
		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	82.10%
		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 35/284 (2015 ACS)=12.32
		5 points	**4 points**	**3 points**	**2 points**	**1 point**			
9	**Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)**	**2 Points**	**1 point**					2	Complete
10	**Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:**	2021 and Prior	2022	2023	2024			4	N/A
		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
		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	No
		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	No
		2 points	**0 point**						
17	**Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #17 for scoring)**	**4 points**	**3 points**	**2 points**	**1 point**			3	All except GP
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	No
19	**Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring**	**1 point**	**0 point**					0	No
						Total Score:		**31.5**	

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 2026 cycle: updated during or after 2021). 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, 2025 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, 2025 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, 2025 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 2026 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet		Total Project Cost:		250,000		Non-CDBG Funds:		$0	
Applicant & Project: Marysvale Town - Concessions Building		CDBG Request:		$250,000		Source of Funds:		N/A	
	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		3.5	N/A
2	Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by Total Project							1	484 (2024 ACS)
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				0	N/A
		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 >		2	250,000/484=516.53
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
5	Jurisdicitions with a population of less than 5,000 will recieve 1 point.	Yes	No					1	484(2024 ACS)
		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
		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	53.30%
		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 205/468(2015 ACS)X100=43.80
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)	2 Points	1 point					2	Complete
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:	2021 and Prior	2022	2023	2024			4	N./A
		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	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	No
		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	No
		2 points	0 point						
17	Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #17 for scoring)	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			4	All 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	No
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring	1 point	0 point					0	No
						Total Score:		29.5	

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 2026 cycle: updated during or after 2021). 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, 2025 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, 2025 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, 2025 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 2026 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet		Total Project Cost:		$260,000		Non-CDBG Funds:		$10,426	
Applicant & Project: Sigurd Town - Park Parking Lot		CDBG Request:		$249,574		Source of Funds:		General Fund	
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		3.5	N/A
2	Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by Total Project							3	10,426/260,000X100=4.01%
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 >		2	249,574/444(2024 ACS)=562.10
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
5	Jurisdicitions with a population of less than 5,000 will recieve 1 point.	Yes	No					1	444(2024 ACS)
		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
		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	62.3
		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 155/561(2015 ACS)X100=27.63
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)	2 Points	1 point					2	Complete
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:	2021 and Prior	2022	2023	2024			4	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	5	Parking Lot
		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	No
		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	No
		2 points	0 point						
17	Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #17 for scoring)	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			4	All 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	No
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring	1 point	0 point					1	Complete
						Total Score:		38.5	

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 2026 cycle: updated during or after 2021). 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, 2025 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, 2025 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, 2025 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 2026 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet		Total Project Cost:		$250,000		Non-CDBG Funds:		$1,000	
Applicant & Project: Spring City - Park Improvements		CDBG Request:		$249,000		Source of Funds:		Spring City	
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		3	N/A
2	Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by Total Project							1	1,000/250, 000X100=.40 (1,057 2024 ACS)
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 >		3	249,000/1,057 (2024 ACS)=235.57
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
5	Jurisdicitions with a population of less than 5,000 will recieve 1 point.	Yes	No					1	1,057
		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
		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	65.70%
		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 230/916 (2015 ACS)X100=25.11
		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)	2 Points	1 point					2	Complete
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:	2021 and Prior	2022	2023	2024			4	N/A
		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	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	No
		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	No
		2 points	0 point						
17	Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #17 for scoring)	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			4	All 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	No
19	Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring	1 point	0 point					1	Complete
						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 2026 cycle: updated during or after 2021). 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, 2025 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, 2025 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, 2025 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 2026 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet

		Total Project Cost:		**$176,688**		**Non-CDBG Funds:**		**$1,500**	
Applicant & Project: Sterling Town - Park Playground		**CDBG Request:**		**$178,688**		**Source of Funds:**		**Rec Fund**	
	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**		3.5	N/A
2	**Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by Total Project**							1	281 (2024 ACS)
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 >		2	175188/281=623.44
		5 points	**4 points**	**3 points**	**2 points**	**1 point**			
5	**Jurisdicitions with a population of less than 5,000 will recieve 1 point.**	Yes	No					1	281
		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
		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	70.70%
		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%		2	LOW 20/226(2015 ACS)X100=8.85
		5 points	**4 points**	**3 points**	**2 points**	**1 point**			
9	**Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)**	**2 Points**	**1 point**					2	Complete
10	**Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:**	2021 and Prior	2022	2023	2024			4	N/A
		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	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	No
		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	No
		2 points	**0 point**						
17	**Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #17 for scoring)**	**4 points**	**3 points**	**2 points**	**1 point**			4	All 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	Complete
19	**Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring**	**1 point**	**0 point**					1	Complete
						Total Score:		34.5	

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 2026 cycle: updated during or after 2021). 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, 2025 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, 2025 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, 2025 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 Community Development Block Grant 2026 Awards								
Rank:	**Applicant:**	**CDBG Ask:**	**Balance:**	**Score:**				
	Projected Funds received:		$1,095,133		**Estimate, May Change*			
Set Aside	R6 Admin/Con Plan	**$50,000**	**$1,045,133**					
Set Aside	R6 SFHR	**$100,000**	**$945,133**					
Set Aside	R6 Regional Planning	**$50,000**	**$895,133**					
1	Gunnison	**$246,000**	**$649,133**	41.5				
2	Sigurd	**$249,574**	**$399,559**	38.5				
3	Spring City	**$249,000**	**$150,559**	36				
4	Sterling	**$178,688**	($28,129)	34.5				
5	Ephraim	**$240,000**	($268,129)	34.5				
6	Koosharem	**$256,800**	($524,929)	31.5				
7	Marysvale	**$250,000**	($774,929)	29.5				
8		**$250,000**	($1,024,929)					
9			($1,024,929)					
10								

Permanent Community Impact Fund Board Application

ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

APPLICANT		PROJECT TITLE	
Juab Special Service Fire District		Fire Truck Acquisition	
DATE OF REVIEW	TRIMESTER APPLYING	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST?	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG?
03/04/2026	February	YES	YES
AOG	APPLICANT COUNTY	PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING HELD PRIOR TO AOG REVIEW?*	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT?
R6 Regional Council	Juab County	YES	NO
CIB REQUEST	GRANT AMT	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL / REGIONAL
$1,512,464.00	$755,464.00		YES / YES
LOAN AMT	LOAN TERMS	DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS AN IDENTIFIED NEED FROM THE CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY?	DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS AN IDENTIFIED TOP PRIORITY FROM THE CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY?
$757,000.00	0.5% for 15 years	YES	YES

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

The project consists of the purchase of a Rosenbauer ladder truck.

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

This truck would enhance fire protection capabilities throughout Juab County.

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"?

While the project cost is significant, the amount of people benefiting from this project is also a large amount. We believe this project helps to fulfill CIB's mandate by investing in a single project that can benefit an entire County.

AOG RECOMMENDATION

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

SUPORT THE PROJECT

Greg Jensen
REVIEWED BY

SIGNATURE

Executive Board Chair
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		PROJECT TITLE	
Eureka City		Eureka Water System Improvements	
DATE OF REVIEW: 03/04/2026	TRIMESTER APPLYING: February	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?* YES	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT? NO
CIB REQUEST: $97,690.00	GRANT AMT: $97,690.00	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL: YES REGIONAL: YES
LOAN AMT	LOAN TERMS	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 has been experiencing large amounts of air in their water pipes. This issue comes from a misplaced piece of equipment that is injecting highly chlorinated water in a bad location. This has caused deterioration and issues with some values and pumps. This project would solve that issue through a new design, as well as replace broken or deteriorating equipment.

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

This project would redesign parts of the Eureka water system to help address current issues with chlorinated water and deteriorating equipment. It would help to keep air out of pipes and allow values and pumps to have a longer lifespan.

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"?

Eureka City is willing to pay $50,000 of the $147,690 project total, which only results in a CIB ask of $97,690. We believe this project can have a large impact on residents, with the community having a significant percentage of 'skin in the game.' This project helps to push for the greatest use of financial resources for the greatest number of citizens.

AOG RECOMMENDATION

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

SUPORT THE PROJECT

Greg Jensen
REVIEWED BY

SIGNATURE

Executive Board Chair
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		PROJECT TITLE	
Mayfield Town		Mayfield Town - Aquifer Storage and Recovery Study	
DATE OF REVIEW	TRIMESTER APPLYING	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST?	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG?
March 4, 2026	February	YES	YES
AOG	APPLICANT COUNTY	PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING HELD PRIOR TO AOG REVIEW?*	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT?
R6 Regional Council	Sanpete	YES	YES
CIB REQUEST	GRANT AMT	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL / REGIONAL
$30,000	$15,000		YES / YES
LOAN AMT	LOAN TERMS	DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS AN IDENTIFIED NEED FROM THE CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY?	DOES THIS PROJECT ADDRESS AN IDENTIFIED TOP PRIORITY FROM THE CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY?
n/a	n/a	YES	YES

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

Mayfield Town is requesting CIB funding to complete an Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) feasibility study for the Park Well aquifer. The funding will be used to hire a qualified engineering and hydrogeologic firm to evaluate whether spring water can be recharged into the aquifer to increase available water supply and improve water quality by reducing nitrate concentrations. The scope of work includes review of existing well and groundwater data, evaluation of aquifer capacity and recharge potential, water quality analysis, preliminary design concepts for recharge options, regulatory coordination with the Utah Division of Drinking Water and Division of Water Rights, and preparation of a final report with cost estimates and implementation recommendations. This request is for professional services only and does not include construction.

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

The intended purpose of this project is to protect and strengthen Mayfield Town's long-term culinary water supply. As the community continues to grow, demand on the water system is increasing, and nitrate levels in one of the Town's wells already exceed state standards without blending. This study will help determine whether storing clean spring water in the aquifer near the Park Well can increase available water during high demand periods and improve overall water quality. By planning ahead, the Town can reduce future risks, protect public health, improve system reliability, and ensure a safe and sustainable water supply for current residents and 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 fulfills CIB's mandate by making a strategic investment in planning that maximizes the use of Mayfield Town's existing water infrastructure for the long term benefit of its residents. Rather than pursuing costly new wells or expanded treatment facilities, the Town is evaluating how to better use its current springs and the Park Well to increase available supply and reduce nitrate concentrations. A $30,000 feasibility study helps prevent significantly higher capital costs in the future, reduces the likelihood of emergency treatment expenses, and protects a critical public health resource. By improving reliability and water quality for the entire culinary system, this project benefits all residents, supports responsible growth, and ensures limited public funds are used efficiently to serve the greatest number of citizens.

AOG RECOMMENDATION

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

SUPORT THE PROJECT

Greg Jensen
REVIEWED BY

SIGNATURE

R6 Board Chair
TITLE

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENT, PLEASE CONTACT

Cade Penney	435-893-0732	cadepenney@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		PROJECT TITLE	
Circleville Town		Circleville Town Spring Redevelopment	
DATE OF REVIEW 3/4/2026	TRIMESTER APPLYING Feb 2026	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST? YES	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG? YES
AOG R6 Regional Council	APPLICANT COUNTY Piute	PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING HELD PRIOR TO AOG REVIEW?* YES	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT? NO
CIB REQUEST $1,200,000	GRANT AMT $1,200,000	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL: YES REGIONAL: YES
LOAN AMT	LOAN TERMS	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 project consists of the redevelopment and modernization of Wade Canyon Springs, a key culinary water source for Circleville Town. Work will focus on improving source reliability, water quality protection, and long-term system sustainability.

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

This project ensures that Circleville Town has reliable culinary water for its 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 fulfills CIB's mandate by protecting and modernizing Wade Canyon Springs, a primary culinary water source that serves all 550 residents, businesses, schools, and public facilities in Circleville Town.

AOG RECOMMENDATION

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

SUPORT THE PROJECT

Greg Jensen
REVIEWED BY

SIGNATURE

R6 Board Chair
TITLE

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENT, PLEASE CONTACT

Tyler Timmons	435-893-0738	ttimmons@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.

R6 Regional Council
Combined Financial Report
02/01/2026 to 02/28/2026
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	2,213,316.31	5,010,242.00	5,025,922.00	2,812,605.69	44.04%
State	1,447,775.93	1,448,360.00	2,302,218.00	854,442.07	62.89%
Local/Other	1,576,262.80	1,377,112.00	1,783,838.00	207,575.20	88.36%
Counties	447,203.00	465,611.00	465,623.00	18,420.00	96.04%
Interest	219,607.56	190,700.00	190,700.00	(28,907.56)	115.16%
Transfers in	172,458.61	0.00	0.00	(172,458.61)	0.00%
Fund balance	0.00	6,958,495.00	6,976,797.00	6,976,797.00	0.00%
Total Revenue:	**6,076,624.21**	**15,450,520.00**	**16,745,098.00**	**10,668,473.79**	**36.29%**
Expenditures:					
Wages and benefits					
Personnel					
Salaried	1,561,839.52	2,409,712.00	2,649,336.00	1,087,496.48	58.95%
Hourly	123,755.38	213,557.00	227,818.00	104,062.62	54.32%
Total Personnel	**1,685,594.90**	**2,623,269.00**	**2,877,154.00**	**1,191,559.10**	**58.59%**
Fringe benefits					
FICA Match	126,454.60	198,324.00	216,670.00	90,215.40	58.36%
State retirement	202,142.66	340,729.00	359,158.00	157,015.34	56.28%
Group Insurance	627,222.58	1,060,969.00	1,161,291.00	534,068.42	54.01%
Workers Compensation	35,444.52	42,831.00	48,729.00	13,284.48	72.74%
Unemployment Insurance	381.21	6,753.00	6,506.00	6,124.79	5.86%
401k Retirement	93,258.42	146,317.00	169,923.00	76,664.58	54.88%
LT Disability	10,034.51	12,628.00	14,241.00	4,206.49	70.46%
Total Fringe benefits	**1,094,938.50**	**1,808,551.00**	**1,976,518.00**	**881,579.50**	**55.40%**
Total Wages and benefits	**2,780,533.40**	**4,431,820.00**	**4,853,672.00**	**2,073,138.60**	**57.29%**
Travel					
Instate travel	42,649.44	95,787.00	122,192.00	79,542.56	34.90%
Out-of-State travel	1,801.75	12,886.00	12,986.00	11,184.25	13.87%
Lodging/Meals	36,173.39	51,943.00	58,386.00	22,212.61	61.96%
Out-f-state perdiem	1,752.38	17,148.00	18,098.00	16,345.62	9.68%
Board member travel	7,553.08	8,421.00	8,536.00	982.92	88.49%
Vehicle expenses	17,950.67	40,293.00	43,293.00	25,342.33	41.46%
Total Travel	**107,880.71**	**226,478.00**	**263,491.00**	**155,610.29**	**40.94%**
Operation					
Office supplies	9,336.37	26,100.00	26,279.00	16,942.63	35.53%
Postage and mailing	5,084.65	9,901.00	12,403.00	7,318.35	41.00%
Printing	2,541.29	11,845.00	10,657.00	8,115.71	23.85%
Telephone	20,348.17	45,081.00	48,975.00	28,626.83	41.55%
Subs, publ and books	523.03	400.00	400.00	(123.03)	130.76%
Assoc/Member dues	12,927.97	27,413.00	27,998.00	15,070.03	46.17%
Rent	81,699.25	145,812.00	145,691.00	63,991.75	56.08%
Utilities	24,950.36	36,660.00	36,640.00	11,689.64	68.10%
Misc. expense	4.32	1,973.00	129,209.00	129,204.68	0.00%
Advertising	9,764.69	33,522.00	31,668.00	21,903.31	30.83%
AOG Fiscal Services	220,891.65	386,553.00	432,660.00	211,768.35	51.05%
Audit expense	17,785.00	16,735.00	16,735.00	(1,050.00)	106.27%
Bank charges	3,420.43	5,000.00	5,000.00	1,579.57	68.41%
Repairs and services	11,417.65	15,676.00	14,774.00	3,356.35	77.28%
Insurance Gen.	51,111.79	46,354.00	46,786.00	(4,325.79)	109.25%
Professional supp	0.00	36,750.00	36,750.00	36,750.00	0.00%
IT Expense	1,617.78	8,913.00	8,913.00	7,295.22	18.15%
Program expenses	56,692.40	409,800.00	409,800.00	353,107.60	13.83%
IT expense	43,529.26	93,166.00	86,821.00	43,291.74	50.14%
Legal costs	4,469.50	21,200.00	21,200.00	16,730.50	21.08%
Contractual services	1,042,533.93	1,503,584.00	1,710,837.00	668,303.07	60.94%
Conf./Workshops reg.	5,190.36	13,885.00	16,698.00	11,507.64	31.08%
Training costs	7,444.60	24,154.00	25,216.00	17,771.40	29.52%
Operating expense	45,465.35	68,843.00	67,825.00	22,359.65	67.03%
Leased equipment	607.62	1,000.00	1,000.00	392.38	60.76%
Rx/Medical supplies	18,610.45	27,780.00	30,733.00	12,122.55	60.56%
Health & safety	53,281.95	105,587.00	98,582.00	45,300.05	54.05%
Food & other	60,665.22	123,258.00	118,967.00	58,301.78	50.99%
Volunteer expense	36,060.74	83,741.00	81,651.00	45,590.26	44.16%

	Current Year Actual	Original Budget	Revised Budget	Budget Remaining	% Earned/ Used
Bldg. materials	24,394.96	82,926.00	78,861.00	54,466.04	30.93%
Revenue returned	27,433.67	0.00	3,938.00	(23,495.67)	696.64%
County programs	565,913.12	610,477.00	675,554.00	109,640.88	83.77%
Emergency assist	36,589.52	53,419.00	53,419.00	16,829.48	68.50%
Other	72,669.42	331,249.00	198,100.00	125,430.58	36.68%
Tools	601.11	10,983.00	9,378.00	8,776.89	6.41%
Total Operation	**2,575,577.58**	**4,419,740.00**	**4,720,118.00**	**2,144,540.42**	**54.57%**
Capital outlay					
Equipment	0.00	12,995.00	12,995.00	12,995.00	0.00%
Vehicles	145,602.00	25,800.00	145,602.00	0.00	100.00%
Land	5,628,409.00	6,179,495.00	6,179,495.00	551,086.00	91.08%
Total Capital outlay	**5,774,011.00**	**6,218,290.00**	**6,338,092.00**	**564,081.00**	**91.10%**
Transfers out	589,318.16	0.00	0.00	(589,318.16)	0.00%
Fund To Be Appropriated	0.00	154,192.00	569,725.00	569,725.00	0.00%
Total Expenditures:	**11,827,320.85**	**15,450,520.00**	**16,745,098.00**	**4,917,777.15**	**70.63%**
Total Change In Net Position	**(5,750,696.64)**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**5,750,696.64**	**0.00%**

MINUTES
CENTRAL UTAH AGRI-PARK
BOARD MEETING

DATE: **November 5, 2025**
PLACE: **82 E 600 N, Richfield, UT**
TIME: **11:00 a.m.**

ATTENDING:

Commissioner Clinton Painter	Travis Kyhl	Brian Barton
Commissioner Scott Bartholomew	Amy Rosquist	Kristi Ferronato
Commissioner Roger Brian	Shaun Kjar	Brett Behling
Commissioner Scott Johnson	JaLyne Roundy	Jordan Whitlock
Commissioner Sam Steed	Forest Turner	Jesse Ralphs
Commissioner Kelly Pehrson, virtual	Danny Stewart, virtual	Glade Nielson
Representative Derrin Owens, virtual	Laura Hansen, virtual	

Welcome/ Meeting Called to Order
Commissioner Clinton Painter welcomed all and called the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes- Commissioner Roger Brian made a motion to approve the minutes from the August 6, 2025 Agri-Park board meeting. Commissioner Scott Johnson seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Master Plan Update- Mr. Glade Nielson introduced key partners from Jones and DeMille, Sunrise Engineering, and WSP. They presented the timeline, schedule, and implementation plan for the Agri-Park Master Plan and explained the benefits of having the three firms collaborate on the project. Mr. Kyhl commended the regional approach outlined in their proposal. All questions were answered.

Action: No action needed

Water Sales Update- Mr. Shaun Kjar updated the group on the water shares currently for sale and noted that additional marketing efforts will be undertaken.

Action: No action needed

SITLA & Annexation- Mr. Shaun Kjar reported that he is reviewing the findings and noted there is a lease with PacifiCorp that will need consideration. He stated that the area has been cleared by Nephi City for annexation and that Nephi has amended a resolution designating the project area as an Inland Port project area. Commissioner Roger Brian made a motion to authorize the executive committee to execute the contract once the geothermal lease has been received and reviewed. Commissioner Sam Steed seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Action: No action needed

Adjourn: 11:42 a.m.

DRAFT