R6 Regional Council - Executive Board Meeting
Wednesday, June 3, 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 5.6.26		
	-First CDBG Public Hearing 11.5.25		
	-Second CDBG Public Hearing 5.6.26		
	4. Clearinghouse Review		
	5. FYI	Travis Kyhl	
9:10 AM	**R6 Programs, Ongoing Projects & Reports**		
	1. FY 27 Budget Approval	JaLyne Roundy	
	2. FY 26 Revised Budget Approval	JaLyne Roundy	
	3. Fraud Risk Assessment Approval	JaLyne Roundy	
	4. Indirect Cost Plan Approval	JaLyne Roundy	
	5. CDBG Policies and Rating and Ranking	Community Advisors	
	6. CIB Application Review	Community Advisors	
	7. Transportation Plan Approval	Jess Peterson	
	8. Other	Commissioner Greg Jensen	
10:00 AM	**Central Utah Agri-Park**		
	Update	Shaun Kjar	
10:10 AM	**Economic Development District**		
	County Updates		
10:30 AM	**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: **May 6, 2026**
PLACE: **82 E 600 N, Richfield**
TIME: **2:00 p.m.**

ATTENDING:

Executive Board

Commissioner Scott Bartholomew
Commissioner Roger Brian
Commissioner Greg Jensen
Commissioner Clinton Painter
Commissioner Sam Steed
Mayor Travis Good
Mayor Clay James
Mayor Noreen Johnson
Mayor Johnny Parsons
Mayor Justin Seely
Councilman Nate Taylor

Staff

Shaun Kjar
Travis Kyhl
Pam Morrison
Cade Penney
Maradee Peterson
Jess Peterson
JaLyne Roundy
Jeff Tanner

Other

Brian Barton
Cindy Bulloch
Glade Nielson
Senator Derrin Owens
Jeff Raisor
Jesse Ralphs
Derrin Sheffer
Heidi Stringham
Trent Wilde

Congressional Staff

Bruce Summers
Holly Sweeten

Welcome/ Meeting Called to Order

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

Approval of Minutes- Councilman Nate Taylor made a motion to approve the minutes from the March 4, 2026 Executive Board Meeting. Commissioner Scott Bartholomew seconded the motion. Motion approved.

R6 Programs, Ongoing Projects & Reports

FY27 Budget Review- All board members had previously been provided with a copy of the proposed budgets for review. Ms. JaLyne Roundy gave a brief explanation of the FY27 budgets for all departments. All questions were addressed.

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

DRAFT

fiscal year. Commissioner Clinton Painter made a motion to approve the financial report. Councilman Nate Taylor seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Action: No action needed

CIB Board Member Appointment- Prior to the meeting, board members anonymously voted to select the R6 representative for the Community Impact Board. Mr. Kyhl informed the group that the votes had been tallied and that Commissioner Sam Steed was selected to serve as the representative. Commissioner Scott Bartholomew made a motion to approve the nomination. Councilman Nate Taylor seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Action: No action needed

Contractor Policy Review- Mr. Travis Kyhl reminded the group that the agency regularly hires contractors for many of its programs and provided several examples. He explained that the agency's current policy has been to avoid hiring family members of employees; however, it has become increasingly difficult to find licensed and insured contractors willing to perform this type of work. Mr. Kyhl noted that there is a family member of an employee who would be a good fit for the program and asked the board to consider whether the policy should be revised. He emphasized that the employee would have no involvement in the contractor selection process or oversight of the contractor's work, and that the contractor would still be selected through a competitive bidding process. Mayor Johnny Parsons made a motion to amend the policy to allow housing programs to accept bids from contractors who are related to agency employees. Councilman Nate Taylor seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Action: No action needed

Congressional Briefing Update- Commissioner Scott Bartholomew reported that plans for the Congressional Briefing are moving forward, with attendees already registered and the presenter list currently being finalized. Mr. Kyhl reminded the group that the event will be held August 10–12 and noted that they would specifically be involved with the UTV ride scheduled for August 11.

Action: No action needed

Aging Annual Plan- Ms. Maradee Peterson presented key points from the Aging Annual Plan. Commissioner Greg Jensen commended the aging department for all the hard work they do in the region. Commissioner Scott Bartholomew made a motion to approve the Aging Annual Plan. Commissioner Sam Steed seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Action: No action needed

Central Utah Agri-Park

Master Plan Update- Mr. Shaun Kjar introduced Glade Nielson and Jesse Ralphs of Sunrise Engineering, along with Brian Barton of Jones & DeMille Engineering. They reviewed the primary focus of the Master Plan and provided an update on the progress made thus far. The team reported that they are currently working on technical summaries, cost estimates, and other project-related tasks. Mr. Kjar also shared examples of some of the data being gathered and analyzed as part of the research process.

DRAFT

Action: No action needed

Financial Advisor- Mr. Shaun Kjar requested approval to move forward with securing a municipal financial advisor. He explained that the agency could either issue its own Request for Proposals or utilize the existing RFP completed through the Utah Inland Port Authority Project Area, which selected Zions Bank based on the bank's experience and expertise. Mr. Kjar recommended using Zions Bank as the municipal financial advisor, and the board members expressed their agreement with the recommendation. Commissioner Clinton Painter made a motion to approve Zions Bank as the municipal financial advisor for the Agri-Park. Mayor Johnny Parsons seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Action: No action needed

Economic Development District

Regional- Mr. Jeff Tanner updated the group on economic development efforts throughout the region. He reviewed the application round dates for the rural county grants and reported that the Economic Opportunity Board initiatives are progressing well. Mr. Tanner shared that Sanpete County is launching a new website in June. In Millard County, grant applications have been scored and awards have been issued. He also noted that the Fillmore Chamber of Commerce is nearly operational. Wayne County has been approved for the GOED Blueprint Program and is currently preparing for implementation. Juab County business grant applications are underway, while Piute County is also participating in the GOED Blueprint Program. One of Piute County's primary focuses is utilizing social media and promotional videos to attract visitors and encourage economic activity. Mr. Tanner added that business grant applications for both Sevier County and Sanpete County are now available online.

Congressional/State Reports

Senator Lee- No representation. 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- No representation. For information on Representative Curtis, please refer to his website at *curtis.house.gov*.

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

State/Federal Agency Reports

Snow College- Ms. Heidi Stringham of Snow College discussed commencement activities and provided details regarding this year's graduating class. She reported on the continued progress of the new Social Science Building in Ephraim, as well as the ongoing building expansion at the Snow College Richfield Campus. Ms. Stringham also highlighted the college's industry partnerships and discussed the success of the ACT program and its role in helping develop the regional workforce.

Senator Derrin Owens- Senator Derrin Owens commended the agency for its important work, specifically highlighting the progress being made on the Agri-Park project. He also discussed several key bills that were passed during the recent state legislative session

DRAFT

Utah Association of Counties- Ms. Cindy Bulloch explained her new role at Utah Association of Counties as the Public Asset Inventory Specialist and outlined the responsibilities associated with the position. She discussed the ongoing housing crisis in Utah and the various efforts underway to address housing challenges across the state. Ms. Bulloch noted that her work includes providing data and resource information that may help municipalities better identify and utilize available assets and resources to support housing and community development efforts.

GOED- Mr. Jeff Raisor of Governor's Office of Economic Opportunity explained his new role as Rural Economic Development Manager. He stated that his primary focus will be working with county economic development directors, city managers, mayors, and Associations of Governments to support business retention, expansion, and recruitment efforts throughout rural communities. Mr. Raisor also discussed the REDI Grant program, including application details and upcoming deadlines. In addition, he reviewed the Rural Community Opportunity Grant, a competitive grant program designed to support economic development projects in rural areas. He offered to meet with any interested communities or organizations to provide additional information and assistance regarding the grant opportunities.

DWS- Mr. Derrin Sheffer, Workforce Development Specialist, discussed his current areas of focus, including the upcoming statewide virtual job fair and ongoing workforce development initiatives. He also reported that the new state building is anticipated to break ground as early as July.

USU Extension- Mr. Trent Wilde, representing Utah State University Extension, discussed the current water conditions and challenges facing the region. He shared information about resources available to agricultural producers and offered contact information for those seeking additional assistance. Mr. Wilde also addressed grazing permit changes resulting from the Monroe Mountain Fire. He explained that approximately 1,200 cattle will be grazing on the mountain this summer wearing tracking collars due to fencing that was destroyed in the fire. In addition, he discussed conservation districts throughout the state and provided information regarding an upcoming conservation district meeting.

Action: No action requested by congressional or state representatives.

Clearinghouse Review- Commissioner Clinton Painter made a motion to approve the clearinghouse review. Commissioner Sam Steed seconded the motion. Motion approved.

Adjourn 3:57 p.m.

DRAFT

FIRST CDBG PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES
R6 REGIONAL COUNCIL FIRST CDBG PUBLIC HEARING HEARING HELD
R6 REGIONAL COUNCIL OFFICE BUILDING, 82 E 600 N, RICHFIELD, UT 84701
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2025 AT 9:00 A.M.

The R6 Regional Council first CDBG public hearing was held on Wednesday, November 5, 2025, in the R6 Regional Council Office Building, 82 E 600 N, Richfield, UT 84701, meeting commenced at 9:00 A.M.

Present:

R6 Executive Board
Commissioner Scott Bartholomew
Commissioner Roger Brian
Commissioner Greg Jensen
Commissioner Trevor Johnson
Commissioner Clinton Painter
Commissioner Sam Steed
Mayor Chuck Bigelow
Mayor Noreen Johnson
Mayor Johnny Parsons
Mayor Justin Seely

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

Congressional Staff
Jeff Raisor
Holly Sweeten
Gary Webster, remote

Other
Brian Barton
Mike Elson
Jody Gale
Ethan Gilliam
Keith Heaton
Sylvia Miller
Forest Turner
Kevin Wright

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) PUBLIC HEARING:

Commissioner Bartholomew opened the public hearing for the CDBG program and stated that the purpose of the public hearing is to provide citizens with pertinent information about the Community Development Block Grant program and to allow for discussion of possible applications for the 2025/2026 funding cycle. It was explained that the grant money must be spent on projects benefiting primarily low and moderate-income persons. The Six County Region, in which R6 Regional Council is a member, is expecting to receive approximately $850,000 in this new program year. All eligible activities that can be accomplished under this program are identified in the CDBG Application Policies and Procedures Manual and interested persons can review it at any time. Commissioner Bartholomew read several of the eligible activities listed including examples, such as Construction of public works and facilities, e.g., water and sewer lines, fire stations, acquisition of real property, provision of public services such as food banks or homeless shelters. Commissioner Bartholomew indicated that in the past R6 Regional Council has received several grants for regional planning, admin and consolidated planning, single family housing rehabilitation, land acquisition, and vehicle acquisition. The AOG has handed out its capital investment plan as part of the regional "Consolidated Plan". This list shows which projects the AOG has identified as being needed in the community. It was asked that anyone with questions, comments or suggestions during the hearing please identify themselves by name, before they speak. The clerk will include your names in the minutes and we would like to specifically respond to your questions and suggestions during the hearing. There were no questions, comments, or suggestions. The hearing was adjourned at 9:05 A.M.

DRAFT

SECOND CDBG PUBLIC HEARING

MINUTES OF R6 REGIONAL COUNCIL SECOND CDBG PUBLIC HEARING PUBLIC HEARING HELD
R6 Regional Council Office Building, 82 E 600 N, Richfield, UT 84701
2:00 P.M. on Wednesday, May 6, 2026

The **R6 Regional Council** second CDBG public hearing was held on **Wednesday, May 6, 2026**, in the **R6 Regional Council Office Building, 82 E 600 N, Richfield, UT 84701**, meeting commenced at **2:00PM**.

Present:
Commissioner Bartholemew, Commissioner Brian, Commissioner Jensen, Commissioner Painter, Commissioner Steed, Mayor Good, Mayor James, Mayor Johnson, Mayor Parsons, Mayor Seely, Mayor Taylor, Shaun Kjar, Travis Kyhl, Pam Morrison, Cade Penney, Jess Peterson, Shay Morrison, Maradee Peterson, Curt Dalley, JaLyne Roundy, Jeff Tanner, Holly Sweeten, Cindy Bulloch, Stan Summers, Jeff Raisor, Heidi Stringham

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) PUBLIC HEARING:

Commissioner Jensen opened the second public hearing for the CDBG program. Commissioner Jensen stated that this hearing was called to allow all citizens to provide input concerning the projects that were awarded under the 2026/2027 Community Development Block Grant Program. The AOG has amended its capital investment plan and decided to apply for funds for Single-family Housing Rehabilitation (SFHR), Planning, and Admin and Consolidated projects. The Commissioner introduced Shay Morrison and Curt Dalley from the R6 Regional Council. The Commissioner explained that the applications were successful in the regional rating and ranking process and the Single-family Housing Rehabilitation (SFHR), Planning, and Admin and Consolidated projects were funded at $100,000, $50,000, and $50,000. The Commissioner explained the project to those in attendance. The Commissioner then asked for any comments, questions and concerns from the audience. The Commissioner stated that copies of the capital investment plan are available if anyone would like a copy. There were no more comments and the hearing was adjourned at 2:05PM.

DRAFT

R6 Regional Council
Combined Financial Report
07/01/2026 to 06/30/2027
100.00% of the fiscal year has expired

	Prior Year Actual	Prior Year Budget	Original Budget	Increase/ (Decrease)
Change In Net Position				
Revenue:				
Federal	3,364,504.45	5,010,242.00	4,481,527.00	(528,715.00)
State	1,530,219.38	1,448,360.00	1,350,090.00	(98,270.00)
Local/Other	2,724,318.92	1,377,112.00	1,291,243.00	(85,869.00)
Counties	482,355.00	465,611.00	485,062.00	19,451.00
Interest	264,301.52	190,700.00	171,000.00	(19,700.00)
Transfers in	172,458.61	0.00	20,000.00	20,000.00
Fund balance	0.00	6,958,495.00	1,380,221.00	(5,578,274.00)
Total Revenue:	**8,538,157.88**	**15,450,520.00**	**9,179,143.00**	**(6,271,377.00)**
Expenditures:				
Wages and benefits				
Personnel				
Salaried	2,063,532.93	2,409,712.00	2,400,415.00	(9,297.00)
Hourly	153,483.18	213,557.00	127,957.00	(85,600.00)
Total Personnel	**2,217,016.11**	**2,623,269.00**	**2,528,372.00**	**(94,897.00)**
Fringe benefits				
FICA Match	166,500.82	198,324.00	201,842.00	3,518.00
State retirement	269,874.00	340,729.00	337,392.00	(3,337.00)
Group Insurance	823,422.64	1,060,969.00	1,025,611.00	(35,358.00)
Workers Compensation	47,245.78	42,831.00	51,646.00	8,815.00
Unemployment Insurance	5,862.52	6,753.00	23,282.00	16,529.00
401k Retirement	120,278.52	146,317.00	149,337.00	3,020.00
LT Disability	13,314.39	12,628.00	16,889.00	4,261.00
Total Fringe benefits	**1,446,498.67**	**1,808,551.00**	**1,805,999.00**	**(2,552.00)**
Total Wages and benefits	**3,663,514.78**	**4,431,820.00**	**4,334,371.00**	**(97,449.00)**
Travel				
Instate travel	65,123.85	95,787.00	132,029.00	36,242.00
Out-of-State travel	3,839.07	12,886.00	15,053.00	2,167.00
Lodging/Meals	55,254.95	51,943.00	71,955.00	20,012.00
Out-f-state perdiem	2,866.38	17,148.00	21,005.00	3,857.00
Board member travel	8,452.00	8,421.00	9,907.00	1,486.00
Vehicle expenses	25,465.20	40,293.00	88,951.00	48,658.00
Total Travel	**161,001.45**	**226,478.00**	**338,900.00**	**112,422.00**
Operation				
Office supplies	13,189.74	26,100.00	23,117.00	(2,983.00)
Postage and mailing	6,152.76	9,901.00	10,062.00	161.00
Printing	3,401.88	11,845.00	8,956.00	(2,889.00)
Telephone	28,995.65	45,081.00	45,400.00	319.00
Subs, publ and books	398.33	400.00	480.00	80.00
Assoc/Member dues	15,546.97	27,413.00	20,147.00	(7,266.00)
Rent	104,378.95	145,812.00	106,837.00	(38,975.00)
Utilities	36,672.69	36,660.00	36,640.00	(20.00)
Misc. expense	9.66	1,973.00	23.00	(1,950.00)
Advertising	10,965.43	33,522.00	25,594.00	(7,928.00)
AOG Fiscal Services	296,758.45	386,553.00	386,887.00	334.00
Audit expense	17,785.00	16,735.00	17,785.00	1,050.00
Bank charges	4,885.28	5,000.00	5,000.00	0.00
Repairs and services	12,660.28	15,676.00	13,851.00	(1,825.00)
Insurance Gen.	51,111.79	46,354.00	46,267.00	(87.00)
Professional supp	0.00	36,750.00	36,750.00	0.00
IT Expense	5,592.84	8,913.00	4,231.00	(4,682.00)
Program expenses	187,633.08	409,800.00	436,225.00	26,425.00
IT expense	57,442.73	93,166.00	55,866.00	(37,300.00)
Legal costs	11,995.50	21,200.00	16,200.00	(5,000.00)
Contractual services	1,536,500.30	1,503,584.00	1,204,099.00	(299,485.00)
Conf./Workshops reg.	11,017.41	13,885.00	14,395.00	510.00
Training costs	13,859.00	24,154.00	21,570.00	(2,584.00)
Operating expense	50,003.98	68,843.00	63,956.00	(4,887.00)
Leased equipment	812.16	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00
RMP Counties	4,548.38	0.00	29,141.00	29,141.00
Rx/Medical supplies	25,194.14	27,780.00	31,717.00	3,937.00
Health & safety	57,829.49	105,587.00	57,778.00	(47,809.00)
Food & other	85,886.17	123,258.00	131,974.00	8,716.00

	Prior Year Actual	Prior Year Budget	Original Budget	Increase/ (Decrease)
Volunteer expense	49,197.75	83,741.00	81,601.00	(2,140.00)
Bldg. materials	25,593.21	82,926.00	101,513.00	18,587.00
Revenue returned	32,186.66	0.00	0.00	0.00
County programs	576,798.63	610,477.00	680,054.00	69,577.00
Emergency assist	59,657.50	53,419.00	63,588.00	10,169.00
Other	91,051.07	331,249.00	256,418.00	(74,831.00)
Tools	4,235.31	10,983.00	8,300.00	(2,683.00)
Total Operation	**3,489,948.17**	**4,419,740.00**	**4,043,422.00**	**(376,318.00)**
Capital outlay				
Equipment	99.99	12,995.00	5,085.00	(7,910.00)
Vehicles	145,602.00	25,800.00	0.00	(25,800.00)
Land	5,628,409.00	6,179,495.00	350,000.00	(5,829,495.00)
Total Capital outlay	**5,774,110.99**	**6,218,290.00**	**355,085.00**	**(5,863,205.00)**
Transfers out	589,318.16	0.00	25,000.00	25,000.00
Fund To Be Appropriated	0.00	154,192.00	82,365.00	(71,827.00)
Total Expenditures:	**13,677,893.55**	**15,450,520.00**	**9,179,143.00**	**(6,271,377.00)**
Total Change In Net Position	**(5,139,735.67)**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**

R6 Regional Council
Combined Financial Report
07/01/2025 to 06/30/2026
100.00% of the fiscal year has expired

	Current Year Actual	Original Budget	Revised Budget	Increase/ (Decrease)	Budget Remaining	% Earned/ Used
Change In Net Position						
Revenue:						
Federal	3,364,504.45	5,010,242.00	5,080,596.00	70,354.00	1,716,091.55	66.22%
State	1,530,219.38	1,448,360.00	1,684,038.00	235,678.00	153,818.62	90.87%
Local/Other	2,724,318.92	1,377,112.00	3,046,251.00	1,669,139.00	321,932.08	89.43%
Counties	482,355.00	465,611.00	472,050.00	6,439.00	(10,305.00)	102.18%
Interest	264,301.52	190,700.00	296,150.00	105,450.00	31,848.48	89.25%
Transfers in	172,458.61	0.00	192,292.00	192,292.00	19,833.39	89.69%
Fund balance	0.00	6,958,495.00	6,428,008.00	(530,487.00)	6,428,008.00	0.00%
Total Revenue:	**8,538,157.88**	**15,450,520.00**	**17,199,385.00**	**1,748,865.00**	**8,661,227.12**	**49.64%**
Expenditures:						
Wages and benefits						
Personnel						
Salaried	2,063,532.93	2,409,712.00	2,334,607.00	(75,105.00)	271,074.07	88.39%
Hourly	153,483.18	213,557.00	169,702.00	(43,855.00)	16,218.82	90.44%
Total Personnel	**2,217,016.11**	**2,623,269.00**	**2,504,309.00**	**(118,960.00)**	**287,292.89**	**88.53%**
Fringe benefits						
FICA Match	166,500.82	198,324.00	190,469.00	(7,855.00)	23,968.18	87.42%
State retirement	269,874.00	340,729.00	312,563.00	(28,166.00)	42,689.00	86.34%
Group Insurance	823,422.64	1,060,969.00	953,794.00	(107,175.00)	130,371.36	86.33%
Workers Compensation	47,245.78	42,831.00	53,800.00	10,969.00	6,554.22	87.82%
Unemployment Insurance	5,862.52	6,753.00	6,906.00	153.00	1,043.48	84.89%
401k Retirement	120,278.52	146,317.00	138,497.00	(7,820.00)	18,218.48	86.85%
LT Disability	13,314.39	12,628.00	15,519.00	2,891.00	2,204.61	85.79%
Total Fringe benefits	**1,446,498.67**	**1,808,551.00**	**1,671,548.00**	**(137,003.00)**	**225,049.33**	**86.54%**
Total Wages and benefits	**3,663,514.78**	**4,431,820.00**	**4,175,857.00**	**(255,963.00)**	**512,342.22**	**87.73%**
Travel						
Instate travel	65,123.85	95,787.00	105,426.00	9,639.00	40,302.15	61.77%
Out-of-State travel	3,839.07	12,886.00	6,657.00	(6,229.00)	2,817.93	57.67%
Lodging/Meals	55,254.95	51,943.00	68,474.00	16,531.00	13,219.05	80.69%
Out-f-state perdiem	2,866.38	17,148.00	11,481.00	(5,667.00)	8,614.62	24.97%
Board member travel	8,452.00	8,421.00	9,653.00	1,232.00	1,201.00	87.56%
Vehicle expenses	25,465.20	40,293.00	38,258.00	(2,035.00)	12,792.80	66.56%
Total Travel	**161,001.45**	**226,478.00**	**239,949.00**	**13,471.00**	**78,947.55**	**67.10%**
Operation						
Office supplies	13,189.74	26,100.00	31,721.00	5,621.00	18,531.26	41.58%
Postage and mailing	6,152.76	9,901.00	11,709.00	1,808.00	5,556.24	52.55%
Printing	3,401.88	11,845.00	9,590.00	(2,255.00)	6,188.12	35.47%
Telephone	28,995.65	45,081.00	42,431.00	(2,650.00)	13,435.35	68.34%
Subs, publ and books	398.33	400.00	399.00	(1.00)	0.67	99.83%
Assoc/Member dues	15,546.97	27,413.00	18,814.00	(8,599.00)	3,267.03	82.64%
Rent	104,378.95	145,812.00	120,243.00	(25,569.00)	15,864.05	86.81%
Utilities	36,672.69	36,660.00	40,877.00	4,217.00	4,204.31	89.71%
Misc. expense	9.66	1,973.00	123.00	(1,850.00)	113.34	7.85%
Advertising	10,965.43	33,522.00	28,583.00	(4,939.00)	17,617.57	38.36%
AOG Fiscal Services	296,758.45	386,553.00	369,148.00	(17,405.00)	72,389.55	80.39%
Audit expense	17,785.00	16,735.00	17,785.00	1,050.00	0.00	100.00%
Bank charges	4,885.28	5,000.00	5,500.00	500.00	614.72	88.82%
Repairs and services	12,660.28	15,676.00	26,359.00	10,683.00	13,698.72	48.03%
Insurance Gen.	51,111.79	46,354.00	52,436.00	6,082.00	1,324.21	97.47%
Professional supp	0.00	36,750.00	36,750.00	0.00	36,750.00	0.00%
IT Expense	5,592.84	8,913.00	6,572.00	(2,341.00)	979.16	85.10%
Program expenses	187,633.08	409,800.00	305,189.00	(104,611.00)	117,555.92	61.48%
IT expense	57,442.73	93,166.00	68,255.00	(24,911.00)	10,812.27	84.16%
Legal costs	11,995.50	21,200.00	20,403.00	(797.00)	8,407.50	58.79%
Contractual services	1,536,500.30	1,503,584.00	2,120,995.00	617,411.00	584,494.70	72.44%
Conf./Workshops reg.	11,017.41	13,885.00	11,071.00	(2,814.00)	53.59	99.52%
Training costs	13,859.00	24,154.00	19,668.00	(4,486.00)	5,809.00	70.46%
Operating expense	50,003.98	68,843.00	69,734.00	891.00	19,730.02	71.71%
Leased equipment	812.16	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	187.84	81.22%
RMP Counties	4,548.38	0.00	4,548.00	4,548.00	(0.38)	100.01%
Rx/Medical supplies	25,194.14	27,780.00	34,943.00	7,163.00	9,748.86	72.10%
Health & safety	57,829.49	105,587.00	78,960.00	(26,627.00)	21,130.51	73.24%
Food & other	85,886.17	123,258.00	109,765.00	(13,493.00)	23,878.83	78.25%

	Current Year Actual	Original Budget	Revised Budget	Increase/ (Decrease)	Budget Remaining	% Earned/ Used
Volunteer expense	49,197.75	83,741.00	82,809.00	(932.00)	33,611.25	59.41%
Bldg. materials	25,593.21	82,926.00	32,746.00	(50,180.00)	7,152.79	78.16%
Revenue returned	32,186.66	0.00	26,621.00	26,621.00	(5,565.66)	120.91%
County programs	576,798.63	610,477.00	609,206.00	(1,271.00)	32,407.37	94.68%
Emergency assist	59,657.50	53,419.00	68,916.00	15,497.00	9,258.50	86.57%
Other	91,051.07	331,249.00	227,016.00	(104,233.00)	135,964.93	40.11%
Tools	4,235.31	10,983.00	7,072.00	(3,911.00)	2,836.69	59.89%
Total Operation	**3,489,948.17**	**4,419,740.00**	**4,717,957.00**	**298,217.00**	**1,228,008.83**	**73.97%**
Capital outlay						
Equipment	99.99	12,995.00	2,500.00	(10,495.00)	2,400.01	4.00%
Vehicles	145,602.00	25,800.00	145,602.00	119,802.00	0.00	100.00%
Land	5,628,409.00	6,179,495.00	5,628,409.00	(551,086.00)	0.00	100.00%
Total Capital outlay	**5,774,110.99**	**6,218,290.00**	**5,776,511.00**	**(441,779.00)**	**2,400.01**	**99.96%**
Transfers out	589,318.16	0.00	598,819.00	598,819.00	9,500.84	98.41%
Fund To Be Appropriated	0.00	154,192.00	1,690,292.00	1,536,100.00	1,690,292.00	0.00%
Total Expenditures:	**13,677,893.55**	**15,450,520.00**	**17,199,385.00**	**1,748,865.00**	**3,521,491.45**	**79.53%**
Total Change In Net Position	**(5,139,735.67)**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**5,139,735.67**	**0.00%**

Fraud Risk Assessment

Continued

*Total Points Earned: 355_/395 *Risk Level:

Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High
> 355	316-355	276-315	200-275	< 200

	Yes	Pts
1. Does the entity have adequate basic separation of duties or mitigating controls as outlined in the attached Basic Separation of Duties Questionnaire?	200	200
2. Does the entity have governing body adopted written policies in the following areas:		
a. Conflict of interest?	5	5
b. Procurement?	5	5
c. Ethical behavior?	5	5
d. Reporting fraud and abuse?	5	5
e. Travel?	5	5
f. Credit/Purchasing cards (where applicable)?	5	5
g. Personal use of entity assets?	5	5
h. IT and computer security?	5	5
i. Cash receipting and deposits?	5	5
3. Does the entity have a licensed or certified (CPA, CGFM, CMA, CIA, CFE, CGAP, CPFO) expert as part of its management team?	0	20
a. Do any members of the management team have at least a bachelor's degree in accounting?	10	10
4. Are employees and elected officials required to annually commit in writing to abide by a statement of ethical behavior?	20	20
5. Have all governing body members completed entity specific (District Board Member Training for local/special service districts & interlocal entities, Introductory Training for Municipal Officials for cities & towns, etc.) online training (training.auditor.utah.gov) within four years of term appointment/election date?	20	20
6. Regardless of license or formal education, does at least one member of the management team receive at least 40 hours of formal training related to accounting, budgeting, or other financial areas each year?	20	20
7. Does the entity have or promote a fraud hotline?	20	20
8. Does the entity have a formal internal audit function?	0	20
9. Does the entity have a formal audit committee?	20	20

*Entity Name: __R6 Regional Council_____

*Completed for Fiscal Year Ending: __2026____ *Completion Date: _6/3/26_____

*CAO Name: __Travis Kyhl_____ *CFO Name: __JaLyne Roundy_____

*CAO Signature: _____ *CFO Signature: _____

*Required

Basic Separation of Duties

See the following page for instructions and definitions.

	Yes	No	MC*	N/A
1. Does the entity have a board chair, clerk, and treasurer who are three separate people?	x			
2. Are all the people who are able to receive cash or check payments different from all of the people who are able to make general ledger entries?	x			
3. Are all the people who are able to collect cash or check payments different from all the people who are able to adjust customer accounts? If no customer accounts, check "N/A".	x			
4. Are all the people who have access to blank checks different from those who are authorized signers?			x	
5. Does someone other than the clerk and treasurer reconcile all bank accounts OR are original bank statements reviewed by a person other than the clerk to detect unauthorized disbursements?			x	
6. Does someone other than the clerk review periodic reports of all general ledger accounts to identify unauthorized payments recorded in those accounts?	x			
7. Are original credit/purchase card statements received directly from the card company by someone other than the card holder? If no credit/purchase cards, check "N/A".	x			
8. Does someone other than the credit/purchase card holder ensure that all card purchases are supported with receipts or other supporting documentation? If no credit/purchase cards, check "N/A".	x			
9. Does someone who is not a subordinate of the credit/purchase card holder review all card purchases for appropriateness (including the chief administrative officer and board members if they have a card)? If no credit/purchase cards, check "N/A".	x			
10. Does the person who authorizes payment for goods or services, who is not the clerk, verify the receipt of goods or services?			x	
11. Does someone authorize payroll payments who is separate from the person who prepares payroll payments? If no W-2 employees, check "N/A".			x	
12. Does someone review all payroll payments who is separate from the person who prepares payroll payments? If no W-2 employees, check "N/A".	x			

* MC = Mitigating Control

Indirect Cost Allocation Plan
R6 Regional Council
82 E 600 N
Richfield, UT 84701
Fiscal Year 7/1/2026-6/30/2027

INTRODUCTION

An indirect cost allocation plan (ICAP) becomes a financial management plan for the organization regarding the treatment of costs. It serves as a mechanism for funding agencies to determine their respective shares of allocated costs based on standards uniformly applied. The ICAP streamlines the budgeting and accounting for shared costs, thus eliminating a host of arbitrary practices.

Cost Allocation plans and indirect cost proposals are prescribed for governmental entities by 2 CFR Part 200 and its appendixes.

The R6 Regional Council (R6) is a multi-funded governmental entity. It operates and administers a variety of programs, and each program participates in the ICAP.

R6 operates as a local governmental entity and operates a variety of programs that provide services to the region's 80,000+ residents.

R6's fiscal year is July 1 to June 30. Funding is received for various periods of time not necessarily coinciding with the organization's fiscal year.

COST ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY

This ICAP will become effective for the 2026-207 fiscal year, which begins July 1, 2026. It is based on the R6's 2025 fiscal year budget. This financial base was considered most representative of a twelve-month level of operation for the purpose of establishing indirect costs, and for sharing central program support and coordination functions which may be required, necessary, or beneficial to R6's programs.

An analysis of annual operating costs, or actual costs experienced in connection with selected item expenditures, was used to develop this proposal, its proposed rates, and allocation methodologies.

This ICAP identifies all costs as direct or indirect. The ICAP will not increase common or shared costs but will provide for their identification and equitable distribution on an organization wide basis rather than through individual negotiations as a part of grants and contract budgeting.

This ICAP will replace current budgeting and accounting procedures and practices effective July I, 2026, the beginning of R6's fiscal year. It sets forth R6 policy that will be applied to all programs.

RATE STRUCTURE PROPOSED

This ICAP establishes the basis of the issuance of "provisional rates". The rate will be used for budgeting of equitable shares. The accounting system will, however, track actual costs and actual rates to programs and activities. The cost difference between actual and provisional rates will be adjusted annually.

The accounting system will accumulate all shared costs, whether direct or indirect, on an annual basis coinciding with the organization's fiscal period. Allocated costs shall be distributed monthly for reporting purposes. At the end of the year, the final distribution shall be recorded to form a part of final costs by activity, and pools will disappear. This mechanism will allow the accounting system to develop actual rates for the twelve-month period and will eliminate the circumstantial results created by the timing of incurred costs and project beginning and termination periods. As a result, all financial activity during the fiscal year serves as the base for the sharing of fiscal year allocated costs.

Through the foregoing practice, the integrity of the system will ensure that reimbursement will be no more or less than actual costs incurred. The absolute best R6 can do is break even. Under this procedure there is no possibility of generating excess revenue using rates or other allocation procedures described herein.

DIRECT COSTS

These costs can be identified with a specific program or project and are budgeted and accounted for as direct charges. The agency's accounting system records actual direct costs to each activity where possible or uses the methodology herein for allocating the costs as direct (i.e. fringe, leave, etc.).

FRINGE BENEFITS

Fringe benefits are established by R6’s executive board and documented in the policies and procedures manual. The accumulated pool costs are distributed to each project or activity through the rate that represents the ratio of fringe benefit costs by individual employee for each pay period. Fringe benefits automatically follow year-to-date salary costs and create an equitable distribution. This procedure simplifies the computations required and results in an equitable distribution of costs.

INDIRECT COSTS

These central organization management and administrative costs are incurred for a common purpose benefiting or supporting all agency programs and activities and are not readily assignable directly. In most cases, attempts to charge these costs directly involve arbitrary decision making or require efforts disproportionate to the benefits derived. This category of costs consists of central organization management and administrative salaries, fringe benefits, and non-salary support costs necessary for carrying out all programs. These categories of cost are developed individually and then are combined to compute a single rate.

Indirect costs represent organizational functions distinct from program administration which are defined by each program and is internal to each program. After equitable shares have been identified in the

accounting system and allocated to projects and activities, they may be reported as administrative costs within the project or may be shared among program activities.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES (INDIRECT SALARIES)

This includes R6's staff that provides agency wide management. These are functions typically related to general management, financial management, personnel management, clerical and administrative support.

TRAVEL

R6 employees may travel for training or meetings which benefit the entire agency and cannot be reasonably attributable to a specific program. Mileage reimbursement may also be provided to employees who use personal vehicles for business related travel.

OFFICE SUPPLIES AND PRINTING

Individual programs will purchase and pay directly for necessary office supplies needed to operate their program. Office supplies for central services, such as the administrative assistant, finance offices and R6 management will be charged to the indirect pool. Office supplies include items such as copy paper, printing costs, and similar type items.

COMMUNICATION (PHONE & POSTAGE)

Long distance fees are charged directly to each individual program through use of program identification numbers. Service charges are allocated and charged directly based on program use. Telephone costs for the administrative assistant, finance office, and R6 management will be charged to the indirect cost pool.

OCCUPANCY COSTS

Each program will pay directly for its program office space based on the floor square-footage. The finance offices and copy room square footage shares will be charged to the indirect pool. Additionally, office space used by staff who perform functions applicable to indirect will have a proportional amount of occupancy costs charged to the indirect pool.

ACCOUNTING

The association contracts with an accounting software vendor to provide ongoing support for the software. This software is used by all programs of the association and will be paid for by the indirect pool.

INSURANCE

R6 has various insurance policies, (liability, theft, etc.) that are not assignable to a specific program, therefore they will be charged to the indirect pool.

AUDITING

The Association is required to conduct a yearly financial audit. The cost of the audit is not readily assignable as a direct cost and will be charged to the indirect pool. In the event, programs require specific audit reviews, the program will pay for those expenses.

GENERAL EQUIPMENT

Expenses for furniture, fixtures, computers, scanners, etc. for the administrative assistant and finance offices needed to perform duties for R6. These costs are not depreciable equipment and will not exceed $5,000.

OTHER COSTS

These expenses may include items such as consumable supplies, bank charges, repairs and services, leased equipment, or other items without a more specific expense classification.

SUMMARY

This ICAP addresses all elements of cost and establishes a consistent methodology for the treatment of indirect costs, and other allocated costs. The rates contained herein will be used for budgeting indirect costs to assure federal and state grantor agencies of equitable cost sharing based on sound accounting principles. The allocations that become a part of direct costs will be budgeted and accounted for accordingly.

The ICAP establishes the method for cost sharing, notwithstanding budgetary constraints, and willingness to pay. The ICAP will indicate appropriate shares for budgeting purposes. Should a funding agency not be willing to bear the full costs of its program (direct plus indirect), the grantee will secure matching funds before execution of the agreement, or the program may not be accepted.

INDIRECT COSTS

Salaries and Fringe

STAFF	PERCENT	TOTAL
Chief Financial Officer	100%	$216,475
Administrative Assistant	20%	$25,735
Executive Director	15%	$45,060
TOTAL SALARIES & FRINGE		**$287,270**

Support Services

Travel	$3,717
Office Supplies and Printing	$3,667
Communication (phone & postage)	$3,874
Space Costs	$2,000
Accounting	$12,536
General Liability Insurance	$15,420
Audit Expense	$14,290
Other Costs	$20,142
TOTAL SUPPORT SERVICES	**$75,646**

SALARIES & FRINGE	**$287,270**
SUPPORT SERVICES	**$75,646**
TOTAL INDIRECT	**$362,916**

CALCULATION OF INDIRECT COST PROPOSAL PERCENTAGE

The three components of indirect costs are summarized, and a composite rate is computed below using the most appropriate base for equitably distributing indirect costs.

Management & Administrative Salary & Fringe	$287,270	
Support Services Indirect Costs	$75,646	
Total Indirect Costs	$362,916	
Indirect Cost Rate Using Salaries and Fringe Base		
Direct R6 Salary and Fringe	$3,588,239	
Indirect Costs	$362,916	
Salaries & Fringe	3,588,239	**10.11%**

CERTIFICATE OF INDIRECT COSTS

(1) All costs included in this ICAP dated July l, 2025 to establish billing of indirect costs for July 1, 2026, to June 30, 2027, are allowable in accordance with the requirements of the Federal award(s) to which they apply.

(2) All costs included in this ICAP are properly allocable to Federal awards based on a beneficial or causal relationship between the expenses incurred and the agreements to which they are allocated in accordance with applicable requirements. Further, the same costs that have been treated as indirect costs have not been claimed as direct costs. Similar types of costs have been accounted for consistently and the Federal Government will be notified of any accounting changes that would affect the predetermined rate.

(3) The indirect cost rate calculated within this ICAP is 10.11%, which was calculated using an indirect cost rate base type of salary and fringe benefits. The calculations were based on actual costs from fiscal year 2025 to obtain a federal indirect cost billing rate for fiscal year 2027. Subject to the provisions of the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986, (31 USC 3801 et seq.), the False Claims Act (18 USC 287 and 31 USC 3729); and the False Statement Act (18 USC 1001), I declare to the best of my knowledge that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ _____

Travis Kyhl
Executive Director

JaLyne Roundy
Chief Financial Officer

_____ _____

Commissioner Greg Jensen
Executive Board Chair

Date

CERTIFICATE OF INDIRECT COSTS

(1) All costs included in this ICAP dated July l, 2025 to establish billing of indirect costs for July 1, 2026, to June 30, 2027, are allowable in accordance with the requirements of the Federal award(s) to which they apply.

(2) All costs included in this ICAP are properly allocable to Federal awards based on a beneficial or causal relationship between the expenses incurred and the agreements to which they are allocated in accordance with applicable requirements. Further, the same costs that have been treated as indirect costs have not been claimed as direct costs. Similar types of costs have been accounted for consistently and the Federal Government will be notified of any accounting changes that would affect the predetermined rate.

(3) The indirect cost rate calculated within this ICAP is 10.11%, which was calculated using an indirect cost rate base type of salary and fringe benefits. The calculations were based on actual costs from fiscal year 2025 to obtain a federal indirect cost billing rate for fiscal year 2027. Subject to the provisions of the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986, (31 USC 3801 et seq.), the False Claims Act (18 USC 287 and 31 USC 3729); and the False Statement Act (18 USC 1001), I declare to the best of my knowledge that the foregoing is true and correct.

Travis Kyhl
Executive Director

JaLyne Roundy
Chief Financial Officer

Commissioner Greg Jensen
Executive Board Chair

2/5/2026
Date

Certificate of Indirect Costs
For State & Local Governments and Indian Tribes

This is to certify that I have reviewed the indirect cost rate proposal submitted herewith and to the best of my knowledge and belief:

(1) All costs included in this proposal, dated February 5, 2026, are to establish billing or final indirect cost rates for July 1, 2026-June 30, 2028 are allowable in accordance with the requirements of the Federal award(s) to which they apply and the provisions of 2 CFR Part 200 Subpart E-Cost Principles. Unallowable costs have been adjusted for in allocating costs as indicated in the indirect cost proposal.

(2) All costs included in this proposal are properly allocable to Federal awards on the basis of a beneficial or causal relationship between the expenses incurred and the agreements to which they are allocated in accordance with applicable requirements. Further, the same costs that have been treated as indirect costs have not been claimed as direct costs. Similar types of costs have been accounted for consistently and the Federal government will be notified of any accounting changes that would affect the predetermined rate.

I declare that the foregoing is true and correct.

Governmental Unit: __R6 Regional Council_____

Signature: _____

Name of Official (printed): ___Travis Kyhl_____

Title: __Exeutive Director_____

Date of Execution: __February 5, 2026_____

This certification:

- Is a requirement per 2 CFR Part 200 Subpart E Subsection 200.415 and Appendix VII Section D.3.;
- Must be submitted as part of the annual indirect cost rate proposal; and
- Must be signed on behalf of the non-Federal entity by an individual at a level no lower than vice president or chief financial officer of the organization.

R6 Regional Council

CDBG Application Policies

~~2026~~ 2027 Program Year

Method of Distribution

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) – To ensure that CDBG projects administered through the ~~Six County~~ R6 Regional Council (R6) Region meet the national objectives; the R6 ~~Regional Council (R6)~~ Regional Review Committee (RRC) has implemented the following: 1.) An application will be rated and ranked against all submitted applications within the Region. 2.) Successful applications will be funded in order of priority as determined by the rating and ranking process until the regional CDBG funding allocation is exhausted.

CDBG POLICIES – ~~2026~~ 2027 Program Year

The following policies have been established to govern the CDBG award process. All eligible project applications submitted by the ~~December 15th~~ "CDBG Application Deadline" (determined by CDBG state staff) will be accepted for rating and ranking.

1. $50,000 of the annual CDBG allocation is set aside for administration of the R6 program, $50,000 is set aside for regional consolidated planning, and $100,000 is set aside for Single Family Housing Rehabilitation. The remaining R6 CDBG funds are distributed based on preapproved R6 Rating and Ranking criteria. ~~R6 approved $50,000 of the total annual CDBG allocation for administration of the R6 CDBG program. $50,000 of the total annual CDBG allocation is also allocated for regional consolidated planning. Lastly, $100,000 of the total annual CDBG allocation is allocated for Single Family Housing Rehabilitation. The remaining amount of annual R6 CDBG funds is allocated on a competitive basis. To encourage multiple projects and local match, no project will receive more than 50% of the net allocation or $250,000, whichever is less. Depending on funding, the R6 Regional Review Committee (RRC) reserves the right to eliminate the 50% rule and $250,000 maximum by a vote of the board.~~

2. In compliance with the policies of the State of Utah CDBG program, and to be eligible for funding consideration, all grantees or sub-grantees must have drawn down 50% of any prior year's CDBG funding prior to the RRC rating and ranking session.

3. Applicants must provide written documentation of the availability and status of all proposed non-CDBG funding at the time their application is submitted. A project is not mature and will not be funded if non-CDBG funding cannot be secured and committed by the CDBG application deadline. ~~December 15th, 2025.~~ If non-CDBG funds from a source other than the applicant aren't secured and committed by CDBG Application Deadline ~~December 15th, 2025~~, the applicant may provide a commitment letter by the CDBG Application Deadline ~~December 15th, 2025~~ that clearly states that they will pay the difference to fully complete their project if a different source of non-CDBG funding isn't secured and committed.

R6 Rating and Ranking Policies

4. State policy has established the minimum amount of funding of $30,000 per project and the maximum amount is limited only by the amount of funds available. ~~annual allocation amount, and the R6 CDBG policies outlined in paragraph 1 (one).~~

5. Projects must align with and be consistent with the goals outlined in the Region's Consolidated Plan. ~~Sponsored projects on behalf of an eligible sub-recipient may not necessarily be listed in the jurisdiction's capital investment plan, but the sub-recipient's project must meet goals identified in the Region's Consolidated Plan.~~

6. Attendance by a representative from all applicants and sub-grantees at one of the annual "How to Apply" workshops is mandatory. ~~for all applicants and sub-grantees. The project manager from the applicant's jurisdiction should be in attendance. Newly elected officials and project managers are especially encouraged to attend, as the administrative requirements and commitments of a CDBG project are considerable.~~

7. ~~Housing projects are encouraged to use the R6 Housing Department's available resources and e~~ Emergency projects may be considered by the RRC at any time. Projects applying for emergency funding must still meet a national objective and regional goals and policies. Projects may be considered as an emergency application if:

    - Funding through the normal application timeframe will create an unreasonable risk to health or property.
    - An appropriate third-party ~~agency~~ has documented a specific risk (or risks) that ~~in their opinion need~~ require immediate remediation.

8. The amount of any emergency funds distributed during the year will be subtracted from the top of the regional allocation during the next funding cycle. Additional information on the emergency fund program is available in the Application Policies and Procedures manual developed annually by the state. ~~in Chapter II, Funding Processes.~~

9. Applications on behalf of sub-recipients (i.e., special service districts, non-profit organizations, etc.) are allowed. ~~The applicant city or county must understand that even if they name the sub-recipient as project manager, t~~ The ~~city~~ municipality/county is ~~still~~ responsible for ~~the~~ project~~'s~~ viability and program compliance, regardless of sub-recipient involvement. A subcontractor~~'s~~ agreement between the applicant entity and the sub-recipient must accompany the application submitted by the CDBG Application Deadline. ~~(after funds have been committed to the project).~~

10. Multi-year projects will be considered. Applications must include detailed cost estimates and clearly defined work elements by year to allow the RRC to establish annual funding allocations during initial Rating and Ranking. Projects exceeding two years in duration will not be considered. ~~Proposals must contain specific cost estimates and work elements by year so that annual allocations by the RRC can be determined at the outset. No projects over 2 years will be considered.~~

11. ~~Project maturity will be considered in determining the awarding of funds for the funding cycle, i.e., project can be completed within eighteen months, leveraged funds are in place, detailed scope of work is developed, engineer's cost estimates in place, etc.~~ A project will only be funded if it is considered mature. A mature project must have completed and provided proof of the following, in compliance with CDBG regulations, by the CDBG Application Deadline: 1.) National Objective Compliance. 2.) Active Unique Entity ID (sam.gov). 3.) First CDBG Public Hearing Notice and Hearing. 4.) Cost Estimates Procured.

12. Applicants that were funded in the year immediately prior to the current program year are not eligible for funding.

13. ~~The~~ An application must be submitted by the CDBG Application Deadline in order to be considered for funding. ~~5:00 PM Mountain Time (MT), December 15, 2025. Any applications received after this date and time will not be considered for funding.~~

14. ~~Applicants with lower populations may receive additional points in the "Percent of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost" category.~~

15. In the event of a tie the following policies will be followed:

    ~~A) The project is in an Economically Distressed Community[1]~~
    B) The project that has the highest percentage of LMI beneficiaries
    C) The project with the most secured and committed non-CDBG funds ~~leveraged~~
    ~~D) The Project with the most points in the Geographical Impact category~~

16. All projects will be fully funded in the order of their rating and ranking prioritization. Once a balance remains insufficient to fully fund the next project in the order of rating and ranking prioritization, that project will be given an opportunity to receive funds, with two conditions: 1.) The project must be able to maintain the same scope of work that was listed in their initial application. 2.) The project must be able to be rated and ranked the same as their initial application. However, if a project chooses to receive the remaining balance and is required to increase their contribution in order to be funded, it will not alter the initial rating and ranking order previously approved. This process will continue until no additional projects can be funded.

17. Once no additional projects can be funded, the remaining balance will be allocated between the region's Single-Family Housing Rehabilitation Program and the Regional Planning Program. The R6 RRC will determine the percentage distributed to each program within the specific program year cycle. Note: Funds allocated to the Regional Planning Program must comply with the 20% funding cap outlined in 24 CFR 570.489(a)(3)(ii).

~~[1] For these purposes, a distressed community is defined as a "local government with an average unemployment rate of 9 percent or more over the past three years using American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates; a poverty rate of 20 percent or more among individuals not enrolled in higher education as of the most recent ACS 5-year estimates, OR a population decline of 5 percent or more between the 2010 Decennial Census and most recent ACS 5-Year estimates."~~

18. The R6 RRC is filled by the members of the R6 Executive Board. This 12-member committee is composed of a commissioner and a mayor from each county of the region. Members of the committee are appointed by their county and fulfill terms until the end of their elected period or reappointment if they still hold office. Due to election cycles, the approximate term of a board member is 4 years. The chair of the RRC is the chair of the R6 Executive Board.

The R6 Regional Review Committee has approved the following set-asides for funding:

Housing - $100,000 if the allocation is over $400,000. If the allocation is under $400,000 then 25% of the allocation for the R6 Housing department to help LMI individuals access available housing resources.

Regional Planning - $50,000 for planning activities to be conducted by R6 staff in HUD pre-approved or income survey approved Low to Moderate Income communities.

Administration & Consolidated Planning - $50,000 for administration of the CDBG program, updating an annual action plan, and meeting with communities to identify planning needs.

R6 Rating and Ranking Policies

R6 Regional Council ~~2026~~ 2027 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet		Total Project Cost:				Non-CDBG Funds:			
Applicant & Project:		CDBG Request:				Source of Funds:			
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			
2	Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost: Non-CDBG Funds Amount, Divided by								
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 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 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 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			
		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 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 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
9	Project Maturity: (See Note #9 for scoring)	2 Points	1 point						
10	Applicant Funded In Previous Program Years:	~~2021~~ 2022 &	~~2022~~ 2023	~~2023~~ 2024	~~2024~~ 2025				
		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	Sewer/Storm Infrastructure	Recreation Facility Improvements	Public Facilities, Public Health/Safety	LMI Housing		
		10 points	8 points	6 points	2 points	2 points	1 point		
12	National Objective Compliance: When a project is deemed to fall under Limited Clientele Activities, Targeted Activities, ADA Accessibility, Planning-only Activities, as highlighted under the "National Objectives, Eligible Activities and Federal Compliance Requirements" section of the State of Utah's CDBG Application Policies and Procedures, that applicant will recieve 4 points.	Yes	No						
		4 Points	0 Point						
~~13~~	~~Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA): Is the entire project solely focused on ADA compliance?~~	~~Yes~~	~~No~~						
		~~2 points~~	~~0 point~~						
~~14~~	~~Health And Safety: Does the project address serious health and safety threats.~~	~~Yes~~	~~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			
		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						
		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				
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					
~~19~~	~~Application Completion: (See note #19) for Scoring~~	~~1 point~~	~~0 point~~						
						Total Score:		0	

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 2027 cycle: updated during or after 2021 2022). 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 Plans, Capital Improvements List, Asset Inventory list, and documentation of an active Planning and Zoning Commission must be submitted by the December~~

~~#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 CDBG Application 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.

Permanent Community Impact Fund Board Application

ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

APPLICANT		PROJECT TITLE	
Glenwood Town		Water System Improvements	
DATE OF REVIEW 06/03/2026	TRIMESTER APPLYING June 2026	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST? YES	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG? YES
AOG R6 Regional Council	APPLICANT COUNTY Sevier County	PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING HELD PRIOR TO AOG REVIEW?* NO	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT? NO
CIB REQUEST $3,430,000	GRANT AMT $2,401,000	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL: YES REGIONAL: YES
LOAN AMT $1,029,000	LOAN TERMS 0.5%, 30 Years	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 scope would include:

- Drilling a new well and constructing a new well house
- Constructing a new concrete water storage tank
- Redeveloping the Glenwood Spring
- Installing radio read meters and software
- Associated piping (approximately 2,320 ft)

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

The Town needs a second source, a storage solution, and other related improvements to their water system to help ensure sufficient long-term water supply.

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 utilizes funding for a critical water project that will benefit a full municipality within the state of Utah. Utilizing funds in this way to benefit residents will help meet the CIB mandate.

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

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	
Levan Town		Aquifer Recharge & Water Rights Acqusition	
DATE OF REVIEW 06/03/2026	TRIMESTER APPLYING June 2026	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?* NO	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT? NO
CIB REQUEST $995,000	GRANT AMT $746,250	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL: YES REGIONAL: YES
LOAN AMT $248,750	LOAN TERMS 0.5%, 30 Years	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 scope would include installing a vault, meter, and associated piping to discharge spring overflow into the Levan Park Well, as well as purchasing water rights.

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

The Town just completed a culinary water improvements project and updated their culinary water master plan in 2024. The Town also just developed a new well in 2020. The master plan showed the peak usage of the system exceeds the Town's water right. It was recommended to complete an Aquifer Storage Recharge permit and discharge surplus flow during low demand times of the year (winter months) into the aquifer through a well that could be used during the high flow times (summer months). This would keep the Town within the current water rights. It was also recommended that the Town purchase additional water rights as they became available. This would provide additional capacity for the system without violating the existing water rights.

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 will help Levan Town residents improve their water system. While the scope is relatively significant, the project is critical for long-term water security in the community. This project meets the CIB mandate, as it utilizes funding for a critical resource, for a full municipality within the state.

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

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	
Nephi City		Public Safety Building	
DATE OF REVIEW 06/03/2026	TRIMESTER APPLYING June 2026	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?* NO	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT? NO
CIB REQUEST $7,500,000	GRANT AMT $0	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL / REGIONAL YES / YES
LOAN AMT $7,500,000	LOAN TERMS 1.0%, 30 Years	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.

This project includes the design and construction of a new public safety building that will house the Nephi City police department, the Utah Highway Patrol, the Utah State Drivers License Division, and Adult Parole and Probation.

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

For over 50 years, Nephi City has practiced careful, conservative fiscal management. The Nephi City Police Department is currently housed in the old Juab High School Seminary building, operating out of a classroom built in 1954. The existing building was not intended to house a police department. The building is old, is too small, lacks specialized security for evidence storage, does not have proper holding areas, does not have private rooms for victim interviews, etc. Since 2006, the police department workload has grown significantly but patrol staffing has remained the same, partly due to the lack of space to house new officers. One of the purposes of this new Public Safety Building is to have a purpose-built Public Safety Building that will serve Nephi's growth for the next 50 years.

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 this project is significant in scope, it provides a valuable resource to a fiscally responsible community that is experiencing rapid growth. This project will fulfill CIB's mandate by utilizing funds towards a public safety project that will surely benefit a large amount of citizens in the state.

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

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	
Richfield City		Fire Truck	
DATE OF REVIEW	TRIMESTER APPLYING	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST?	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG?
06/03/2026	June 2026	YES	YES
AOG	APPLICANT COUNTY	PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING HELD PRIOR TO AOG REVIEW?*	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT?
R6 Regional Council	Sevier County	NO	NO
CIB REQUEST	GRANT AMT	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL / REGIONAL
$600,000	$600,000		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?
$0	N/A	YES	YES

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

Richfield Fire Department is requesting funding to assist with acquiring a new, much needed, truck. As mentioned, in the past, Sevier County has joined forces with the Richfield Fire Department to acquire a new truck to keep our equipment and services at high levels providing fire protection for all. This new truck will provide additional structure protection for the growing communities we serve. The capabilities of this particular truck will provide the support required for semi-truck fires, motel fires and industrial fires. All of these types of fires seem to continue to evolve requiring fire trucks to have more capability and the specific equipment this truck will be outfitted to carry.

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

This new truck will replace a truck that referred to as the FMC. The FMC has been in service since 1987 (39 years old) and has performed well, but it is time to upgrade to meet the needs of the department and the growing community it serves.

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 helps to provide fire protection to the largest community in the R6 region, as well as surrounding areas. Utilizing funding in this way helps to fulfill CIB's mandate by making the money stretch further to help more people.

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

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	
Annabella Town		Annabella Town Culinary Water Improvements	
DATE OF REVIEW June 3 2026	TRIMESTER APPLYING June	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST? YES	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG? YES
AOG R6 Regional Council	APPLICANT COUNTY Sevier	PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING HELD PRIOR TO AOG REVIEW?* YES	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT? NO
CIB REQUEST $3,000,000	GRANT AMT $2,400,000	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL / REGIONAL YES / YES
LOAN AMT $600,000	LOAN TERMS .5% for 30 years	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 scope would include re drilling the 600 S Well, constructing a booster station, installing/replacing approximately 7,800 feet of piping to create the pressure zone boundary along 300 S and replace undersized pipes in the system, improve the power service to the booster station building, and purchasing a backup generator for the booster station.

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

The master plan showed that the existing sources are not sufficient to meet the demands of the system. The 300 S Well has high nitrates, and both the 300 South and 600 South Wells are operating near the emergency shut-off levels. In April of this year, the Town issued a notice to the water users to reduce outdoor watering with culinary water to extend the production of the wells.

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 ensures there is clean and adequate drinking water for the residents of Annabella 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.

Permanent Community Impact Fund Board Application

ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

APPLICANT		PROJECT TITLE	
Central Valley Town		Central Valley Town Culinary Water Improvements	
DATE OF REVIEW June 3 2026	TRIMESTER APPLYING June	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST? YES	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG? YES
AOG R6 Regional Council	APPLICANT COUNTY Sevier	PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING HELD PRIOR TO AOG REVIEW?* YES	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT? NO
CIB REQUEST $4,125,000	GRANT AMT $3,300,000	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL: YES REGIONAL: YES
LOAN AMT $825,000	LOAN TERMS .5% for 30 years	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 scope would include the following:
- Redevelop Tunnel Springs
- Upsize the existing booster station and modify booster building
- Install chlorination equipment at the Downtown Well
- Repair a tank roof (addresses IPS points)
- Install approximately 17,150 ft of water pipe

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

This project addresses several issues with Central Valley's water system by removing dead end lines, redeveloping the spring, and add lines for easier repairs.

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 ensures there is clean and adequate drinking water for the residents of Central Valley 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.

Permanent Community Impact Fund Board Application

ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT REGIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

APPLICANT		PROJECT TITLE	
Centerfield City		Centerfield City - 2026 Drainage Study	
DATE OF REVIEW	TRIMESTER APPLYING	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST?	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG?
June 3, 2026	June	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
50,000	25,000		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?
		YES	YES

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

This project will study and develop a comprehensive drainage plan to help the city identify existing drainage pathways, address current flooding and ponding concerns, and guide future development and infrastructure projects. The work includes collecting existing data and flood information, conducting field inspections and surveying key drainage structures and road elevations, identifying deficiencies and bottlenecks in the drainage system, evaluating downstream discharge routes and pathways to the Sevier River, and developing mitigation recommendations such as capital improvement projects and regional detention basins. The project will conclude with a final engineering report and a citywide drainage pathway plan to support long-term stormwater management and future planning efforts.

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

The purpose of this project is to help the community reduce flooding, drainage problems, and standing water issues. The plan will help the city identify where water flows, locate problem areas, and guide future projects and development so drainage is handled properly. This will help protect roads, property, and public infrastructure while improving safety and long-term planning for the community

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 helps the city plan for future drainage improvements in a cost-effective and organized way. By identifying problem areas and drainage pathways now, the city can prioritize projects, reduce future flood damage, and avoid costly emergency repairs. The plan will benefit residents, businesses, roads, and public infrastructure throughout the community while helping ensure future development is designed with proper drainage solutions in place.

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	435-893-5377	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	
Gunnison City		Gunnison City - Sewer Master Plan	
DATE OF REVIEW	TRIMESTER APPLYING	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST?	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG?
June 3 2026	June	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
$155,100	$77,550		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?
		YES	YES

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

The purpose of this project is to help Gunnison City and Centerfield City evaluate and plan for the future needs of their shared wastewater system. Due to growth in the area and increased demand on the sewer lagoons, the current system is nearing capacity and requires further study to address sludge buildup and treatment limitations. The sewer master plan will help both communities identify needed improvements, plan for future growth, protect public health and water quality, and make informed decisions about infrastructure investments. The project will also include an impact fee analysis to help ensure future growth contributes fairly toward the cost of system improvements.

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

This project will help the community by creating a long-term plan for improving and managing the shared sewer system used by Gunnison City and Centerfield City. The study will identify current capacity issues, future infrastructure needs, and improvements necessary to support continued growth while protecting public health and water quality. The project will also help both cities plan financially for future upgrades and ensure the sewer system can continue to serve residents, businesses, and the correctional facility reliably and efficiently.

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 helps Gunnison City and Centerfield City plan for future sewer system improvements before larger and more expensive problems occur. The master plan will help the cities identify needs, prioritize projects, and prepare for future growth while protecting public health and water quality. By planning ahead, the cities can use funding more efficiently and help ensure the sewer system continues to serve the community reliably for many years.

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	435-893-5377	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	
Moroni City		Moroni City Secondary Water Master Plan	
DATE OF REVIEW	TRIMESTER APPLYING	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST?	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG?
June 3, 2026	June	YES	YES
AOG	APPLICANT COUNTY	PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING HELD PRIOR TO AOG REVIEW?*	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT?
R6 Regional Council	Sanpete	NO	YES
CIB REQUEST	GRANT AMT	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL / REGIONAL
$76,000	$38,000		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?
		YES	YES

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

CIB funding will be used to hire an engineering consultant to prepare a Secondary Irrigation System Master Plan for Moroni City. The project will evaluate the City's existing secondary water system, including water sources, storage facilities, pump stations, pipelines, water rights, and system operations. Future irrigation demands and growth projections will be analyzed, and a hydraulic model will be developed to identify system deficiencies and needed improvements. The project will also include preparation of a Capital Facilities Plan, Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP), and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) to help the City plan for future infrastructure needs and growth. The completed plan will provide a long-term roadmap for maintaining, improving, and funding Moroni City's secondary irrigation system.

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

The purpose of this project is to help Moroni City plan for the future of its secondary irrigation system. The master plan will identify needed improvements, support future growth, improve system reliability, and help ensure residents continue to receive irrigation water service. The plan will also help the City prioritize projects, seek funding opportunities, and make informed decisions about future infrastructure investments.

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 helps ensure that future investments in Moroni City's secondary irrigation system are based on sound planning and accurate information. The master plan will help the City prioritize improvements, avoid costly infrastructure problems, and position the community to secure future funding. By supporting efficient use of existing water resources and planning for future growth, the project benefits current and future residents while maximizing the value of public funds.

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	4358935377	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	
Oak City		Culinary Water Well	
DATE OF REVIEW	TRIMESTER APPLYING	PROJECT ON 1 YEAR CIB APPLICATION LIST?	CAPITAL ASSET INVENTORY ON FILE WITH THE AOG?
5/27/2026	June 2026	YES	YES
AOG	APPLICANT COUNTY	PROJECT PUBLIC HEARING HELD PRIOR TO AOG REVIEW?*	IS THIS A PLANNING PROJECT?
R6 Regional Council	Millard County	NO	NO
CIB REQUEST	GRANT AMT	PROJECT CONSISTENT WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS?	LOCAL / REGIONAL
$1,275,000	$767,000		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.

The proposed project is test drilling, design, and construction of a new municipal groundwater well to be located north of Oak City near the existing power substation. The project will develop a new production well in the basin fill aquifer and connect it to the Town's existing distribution system via a new culinary water service line and booster pump station. The new well is intended to replace the aging existing well as the Town's primary supplemental groundwater source and bring the system into compliance with DDW source capacity requirements.

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

In the event of a wildfire-related loss of spring supply, the existing well would become the Town's sole culinary water source. At its current operational capacity, the well is not capable of meeting Oak City's full culinary water demand. The Town would face an immediate water supply emergency with no adequate backup. This is not a hypothetical risk — it is a realistic and documented vulnerability for a community whose only spring sources are accessed through fire prone canyon terrain. A new, reliable groundwater well north of Town would provide the independent backup source capacity needed to protect the community in exactly this type of emergency.

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"?

The Oak City Culinary Water Well Project aligns with the Community Impact Board's (CIB) mandate by ensuring that these limited financial resources are used to achieve the greatest benefit to the greatest number of citizens. By drilling a new well and connecting it to the existing supply system, the project will ensure a reliable and consistent water supply to all residents, which is a fundamental need. This improvement addresses a critical infrastructure need and enhances service reliability, thereby fulfilling the CIB's objective of maximizing the effectiveness and impact of public funds.

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

Jess Peterson	435-893-0730	jessrp@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.