

Five County Association of Governments

1070 West 1600 South, Building B
St. George, Utah 84770

Fax (435) 673-3540



Post Office Box 1550
St. George, Utah 84771

Office (435) 673-3548

*** * M E M O R A N D U M * ***

TO: ALL STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND INTERESTED PARTIES

FROM: COMMISSIONER PAUL COZZENS, CHAIR

DATE: AUGUST 12, 2020

**SUBJECT: STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 19, 2020
IN PERSON IN PANGUITCH AND AS A TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL**

THE NEXT MEETING OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE WILL BE HELD ON **WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 19, 2020 AT 1:30 P.M.** AS AN IN-PERSON MEETING IN PANGUITCH, UTAH; AS WELL AS WITH AN ELECTRONIC MEETING OPTION, IF DESIRED.

ANY BOARD MEMBER MAY PARTICIPATE IN PERSON OR REMOTELY VIA A TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL. THE IN-PERSON LOCATION IS THE GARFIELD COUNTY COURTHOUSE, COMMISSION CHAMBERS LOCATED AT 55 SOUTH MAIN STREET, PANGUITCH, UTAH.

INFORMATION ON HOW TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING ELECTRONICALLY, IF DESIRED, IS DESCRIBED ON THE ATTACHED AGENDA.

MATERIALS ARE ATTACHED TO ASSIST BOARD MEMBERS IN PREPARING FOR THIS MEETING AND TO INFORM OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES, SUCH AS MAYORS, OTHER COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, CLERKS, AND OTHER OFFICIALS, AND THE PUBLIC OF WHAT WILL BE TAKING PLACE DURING THIS MEETING OF OUR ASSOCIATION'S GOVERNING BODY.

PLEASE REVIEW ALL MATERIALS AND ADDRESS ANY QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS TO THE AOG STAFF, C/O EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BRYAN D. THIRIOT. STAFF WILL THUS BE ABLE TO RESEARCH ANSWERS TO YOUR QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS PRIOR TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING.

WE LOOK FORWARD TO BOARD MEMBER PARTICIPATION IN THIS MEETING, EITHER IN-PERSON IN PANGUITCH OR VIA THE TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL.

Five County Association of Governments

1070 West 1600 South, Building B
St. George, Utah 84770

Fax (435) 673-3540



Post Office Box 1550
St. George, Utah 84771

Office (435) 673-3548

*** A G E N D A ***

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 19, 2020 1:30 P.M.

IN PERSON, ATTEND AT:

THE GARFIELD COUNTY COURTHOUSE, IN THE COMMISSION CHAMBERS,
LOCATED AT 55 SOUTH MAIN STREET; PANGUITCH, UTAH

ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION IN THE MEETING VIA TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL:

DIAL TOLL FREE: **1-800-444-2801**

WHEN PROMPTED FOR A 7-DIGIT CONFERENCE CODE, PLEASE ENTER: **8143271**

NOTE: WHILE THIS IS AN IN-PERSON MEETING, ALL INTERESTED PARTIES AND THE PUBLIC ARE INVITED TO PARTICIPATE VIA TELEPHONE. PLEASE MUTE YOUR PHONE WHEN YOU ARE NOT TALKING.

- I. **WELCOME BY COMMISSIONER PAUL COZZENS, CHAIR**
- II. **DETERMINATION THAT QUORUM IS PRESENT [REQUIRES ROLL CALL - IF ANY MEMBERS ARE ON PHONE]**
- III. **PLEDGE OF ALLIGIANCE**
- IV. **JUNE 10, 2020 MEETING MINUTES – REVIEW AND APPROVE [REQUIRES A MOTION & VOTE]**
- V. **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) PROGRAM** (*Alyssa Gamble, Community Planner, FCAOG and Nate Wiberg, Senior Planner, FCAOG*)
 - A. **PUBLIC HEARING FOR FY 2021 CDBG RATING & RATING (R&R) CRITERIA AND PROGRAM POLICIES DOCUMENT FOR UPCOMING PROGRAM YEAR [CHAIR OPENS AN CLOSSES HEARING]**
 - B. **FORMAL ADOPTION OF THE R&R CRITERIA & POLICIES DOCUMENT [REQUIRES A MOTION & VOTE]**
 - C. **DISCUSSION ON CDBG PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES**
 - D. **CDBG-CV CARES ACT DISCUSSION AND CONCENSUS DECISION ON ACTIVITIES**
- VI. **SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT (SSBG) FY2021 ALLOCATIONS – RATIFICATION OF HUMAN SERVICES COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION** (*Michael Day, Director, Community Action Program, FCAOG*) **[REQUIRES A MOTION & VOTE]**
- VII. **ZION NATIONAL PARK FOREVER PROJECT PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION** (*Kacey Jones, Assistant Director of Development, Zion National Park Forever Project*)
- VIII. **PRESENTATION ON, AND DISCUSSION OF, SCHOOL AND INSTITUTION TRUST LAND ADMINISTRATON (SITLA) ACTIONS** (*Ron Torgerson, Deputy Assistant Director – SW Area, SITLA*)

FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 19, 2020
AGENDA PAGE 2 of 2

- IX. CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING REPORT** (*Garfield County Commissioner Jerry Taylor*)
- X. AGRITOURISM PRESENTATION/GRANT DISCUSSION** (*Norman Hill*)
- XI. DISCUSSION ON COVID-19 IMPACTS ON SCHOOLS AND CHILDCARE SERVICES** (*Steering Committee School Board Members and Carrie Sigler, Director, Care About Childcare, FCAOG*)
- XII. FIVE COUNTY REVOLVING LOAN FUND (RLF) BOARD APPOINTMENTS** (*Gary Zabriskie, Director of Community and Economic Development, FCAOG*) **[REQUIRES A MOTION & VOTE]**
- XIII. NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE 2022 - DISCUSSION ON KICKOFF MEETING** (*Alyssa Gamble, Community Planner, FCAOG*)
- XIV. STATE OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR FRAUD RISK ASSESSMENT UPDATE** (*Bryan Thiriot, Executive Director, FCAOG*)
- XV. CONGRESSIONAL STAFF UPDATES**
- XVI. STATE AGENCY UPDATES**
- XVII. UNIVERSITY UPDATES**
- XVIII. LOCAL AFFAIRS [FOR DISCUSSION ONLY]**
 - A. FIVE COUNTY FOUNDATION** (*Allison McCoy, Chief Financial Officer, FCAOG*)
 - B. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS**
- XIX. ADJOURN [CHAIR CALLS THE MEETING ADJOURNED]**

The next Steering Committee Meeting is scheduled at 1:30 p.m. on October 14, 2020 at the Iron County School District; Upstairs Multi-purpose Room; Cedar City.

Equal Opportunity Employer/Program

Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities by calling Bryan Thiriot, Executive Director, (435)673-3548 ext. 121. Individuals with speech and/or hearing impairments may call Relay Utah by dialing 711. For Spanish Relay Utah call: 1(888)346-3162.

AGENDA ITEM #IV.

MINUTES

FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

WEDNESDAY, June 10, 2020

1:30 P.M.

IN PERSON, ATTEND AT:

BEAVER CITY OFFICES LOCATED AT 30 W. 300 N., CONFERENCE ROOM #3 BEAVER, UTAH

ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION IN THE MEETING VIA TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL:

DIAL TOLL FREE: **1-800-444-2801**

NOTE: ALL INTERESTED PARTIES AND THE PUBLIC WERE INVITED TO PARTICIPATE VIA PHONE.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Commissioner Paul Cozzens
Dale Brinkerhoff
Commissioner Mike Dalton
Carolyn White
Mayor Nolan Davis
Commissioner Jerry Taylor
Frank Houston
Commissioner LaMont Smith
Mayor Robert Houston
Commissioner Gil Almquist
Mayor John Bramall
Mayor Melanie Torgerson
Mayor Todd Robinson

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Heath Hansen
Kelsey Berg
Adam Snow
Celeste Maloy
Henrie Walton
Patrick Mullen
Stuart Clauson
Ginger Chinn
Karina Brown
Garrick Hall
Scott Stubbs
Danny Stewart
Bryan Thiriot
Nathan Wiberg
Gary Zabriskie
Allison McCoy
Courtney Sinagra

MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE

LaRene Cox
Ada Nielson

REPRESENTING

Iron County Commission Representative
Iron County School Board Representative
Beaver County Commission Representative
Beaver County School Board Representative
Beaver County Mayor Representative
Garfield County Commission Representative
Garfield County School Board Representative
Kane County Commission Representative
Kane County Mayoral Representative
Washington County Commission Representative
Washington County Mayoral Representative
Garfield County Mayoral Representative
Iron County Mayoral Representative

REPRESENTING

Senator Mike Lee
Senator Mitt Romney
Congressman Chris Stewart
Congressman Chris Stewart
Dixie State University
Utah Association of Counties
Utah Association of Counties
Utah Inland Port
Democratic Gubernatorial Candidate
Farm Bureau
Member of the Public
Iron County Economic Development
Five County A.O.G. Staff
Five County A.O.G. Staff
Five County A.O.G. Staff
Five County A.O.G. Staff
Five County A.O.G. Staff

REPRESENTING

Washington County School Board Representative
Kane County School Board Representative

I. WELCOME BY COMMISSIONER PAUL COZZENS, CHAIR

Chairman Paul Cozzens opened the meeting at 1:30 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL VOTE TO DETERMINE IF A QUORUM IS PRESENT

A roll call vote determined that a quorum was present. Commissioner Almquist led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. APPROVAL OF APRIL STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Smith moved to approve the April 15th Steering Committee Minutes. Commissioner Taylor seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

IV. FY 2020 FINAL BUDGET REVISIONS PRESENTATION AND PUBLIC HEARING (Allison McCoy, Chief Financial Officer, FCAOG)

Commissioner Cozzens called the public hearing open and invited FCAOG CEO Allison McCoy to present the final budget revisions for Fiscal Year 2020.

FCAOG's expenditures increased by \$311,335. A breakdown of each program's finances was provided to the committee. Administration spent approximately \$12,000 more than what was budgeted. This increase is due to an increase in personnel. Travel budgets were reduced significantly due to COVID-19. Carolyn White asked if the revisions were recommended to be made by the FCAOG Finance Committee. Allison confirmed that the recommendation to approve was made unanimously by the Finance Committee.

VI. APPROVAL OF FY2021 BUDGET (Budget year July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021)

Seeing no further questions or comments, Commissioner Cozzens declared the public hearing closed and called for a motion. This was a slight departure from the agenda, moving ahead to agenda item VI.

Commissioner Dalton moved to approve the FY 2020 Budget Revisions, Carolyn White seconded, and the motion passed without dissent.

V. FY 2021 PROPOSED BUDGET PRESENTATION AND PUBLIC HEARING (Allison McCoy, Chief Financial Officer, FCAOG)

Allison stated this was the most exciting budget year she had been a part of since beginning her employment with the FCAOG six years ago. FCAOG received approximately \$1 million and a half dollars in extra funding because of COVID-19. The budget went from \$9,257,000 to 10,385,000. The funding is one-time funding. Additionally, FCAOG received additional money in the emergency services grant. Because of extra-money, Allison budgeted \$30,000 to update the accounting systems which are on an old database. EDA and CDBG grant will contribute funds to updated it also. The total cost will be about \$50,000. The cost will be offset by the increase in indirect cost allocation. Allison offered to answer any questions from the board.

Carolyn White asked about CSBG funding. Allison explained that she was moving grant funding from the old fiscal year to the new fiscal year. CSBG funding runs on a different cycle than the FCAOG fiscal year. Another big increase was in Community and Economic Development. This department received a significant amount of money from the Economic Development Administration and the Community

Development Block Grant program. This moved their budget from about \$300,000 to over \$1 million dollars.

Dale Brinkerhoff asked if the budget including funds for Cost of Living Adjustments and Pay for Performance increases. Allison replied that Cost of Living was not budgeted for, but there was money being set aside for Pay for Performance. Dale noted that employees are supposed to be performing when they are hired. Allison noted that there is a 5% increase in health insurance premium costs.

VII. APPROVAL OF FY 2021 FINAL BUDGET REVISIONS (Budget year ending June 30, 2020)

Commissioner Cozzens opened the public hearing and asked for comment. Seeing none, he closed the public hearing and called for a vote.

Carolyn White made a motion to approve. Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

VIII. DISCUSSION OF SECOND ROUND SUPPLEMENTAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT-COVID (CDBG-CV) GRANT (Nate Wiberg, Associate Planner, FCAOG)

Nate reported that the FCAOG is preparing to receive its second round of funding from the CARES Act. The Southwest Utah region is going to receive approximately \$825,971 dollars. This money is different than the last round. HUD has two main pots of funding: one is the entitlement program which is for cities with more than 50,000 people. The second is the State Small Cities program. In the first round of funding, entitlement cities received their own funding. In the second round, they have not. Nate specified St. George City as an entitlement city that will now need to be considered in the FCAOG CARES funding.

This funding must follow the same national rules as regular CDBG funding. Nate asked the Steering Committee how they would like to allocate funding and what projects to use the funding on. The Steering Committee discussed various allocation possibilities. Gil asked what other possibilities there were besides simply dividing the money evenly between the counties. Nate explained that some areas are giving the money directly to businesses. He reminded the committee that last time they divided the money evenly and each county got \$86,000. Nate was asked if FCAOG would administer the funds and have applicants work through them. He said yes, FCAOG would administer the funds in accordance with state guidelines.

It was discussed how much whether to give more money to Washington County than last time because of the inclusion of St. George. Commissioner Mike Dalton remarked that since the counties split the money evenly, that this division be population based. Mayor Bramall shared that Washington County and Hurricane City are eligible for a significant amount of funding on their own, and he would rather give the rural counties more opportunity and access to the CARES Act funding coming through FCAOG. Commissioner Gil Almquist agreed.

The consensus was that the money would again be split evenly between the five counties.

Further discussion was had on how exactly to spend the funds. It was noted that Garfield County used some of the funds from the first funding round for a new Meals on Wheels truck. The consensus was that this funding would be used for business assistance.

IX. SECOND PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE SUPPLEMENTAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT- COVID (CDBG-CV) GRANT (*Nate Wiberg, Associate Planner, FCAOG*)

Commissioner Cozzens opened the public hearing.

Nate Wiberg presented the required information on this program. Nate stated:

“This hearing was called to allow all citizens to provide input concerning the project that was awarded under the 2019 CDBG-CV program authorized by the Coronavirus Aid, relief, and economic Security Act known as the CARES Act. These special CDBG-CV funds will be used to prevent, prepare for, and respond to the coronavirus pandemic. The State has amended its Consolidated Plan and Five County Association of Governments has decided to apply for CDBG-CV round 1 funding for business assistance in Beaver County, business assistance in Garfield County, a Meals-on-Wheels truck in Garfield County, business assistance in Iron County, business assistance in Kane County, an ultraviolet light sanitation system in Kane County, and business assistance in Washington County. Five County AOG will receive a portion of the funding to administer the program and the remaining balance will be split evenly between the five counties in the region (\$87,762).”

Commissioner Cozzens asked for public comment. Hearing none he closed the public hearing. Commissioner Cozzens asked Nate to email each county the information on the applications so it can be shared with their respective Chambers of Commerce.

X. AREAWIDE CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW & ACTION (RECOMMENDATION) (*Gary Zabriskie, Community and Economic Development Director, FCAOG*)

A notification was received from the State Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) regarding a fuel loads reduction project in Hamblin Valley in Western Iron County. Gary notified Iron County and received a letter from the Iron County Commission expressing its support for the project. Gary shared that the recommendation from the FCAOG staff support the project.

Commissioner LaMont Smith moved to support. Mayor John Bramall seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner LaMont Smith shared his dismay of SITLA’s recent action in Kane County. Gary recommended the Steering Committee write a letter inviting SITLA’s upper echelon to come to Southern Utah and have a meeting with them regarding this project.

Commissioner Gil Almquist shared his concern that this sets a bad precedent. Carolyn White reminded the group that SITLA’s purpose is to make as much money as possible for the educational trust. LaMont Smith countered with additional information that SITLA’s purpose is two-fold: to sell land, but also generate economic revenue. He feels their actions on this issue denied Kane County economic opportunities.

The group would like to have SITLA represented at the August Steering Committee meeting to be held in Garfield County.

IX. CIB APPLICATIONS REVIEW BY STEERING COMMITTEE (*Gary Zabriskie, CED Director, FCAOG*)

Copies of the Community Impact Board (CIB) applications were sent to Steering Committee members in their agenda packets. Gary Zabriskie briefly described the projects:

Cedar City is seeking \$6.2 million dollars for an expansion to their recreation center, they are putting in \$280,000. Total project cost is \$6,480,000.

East Zion Special Service District is planning to buy a building in the area and retrofitting it into a fire station. They are seeking \$232,000 from CIB and receiving a donation of \$100,000 for the project.

The Town of Hatch is seeking to do a drainage study. They asked CIB for \$25,000 and are prepared to offer a \$25,000 dollar match.

The Town of Hatch is also seeking funds for a road improvement project. They are seeking \$90,000 from CIB to buy the materials, putting \$10,000 cash into it. Garfield County is providing the equipment and manpower to chip-seal the road. Total cost is \$125,000.

Ivins City is requesting CIB funds for a new city hall. They are requesting \$3.5 million dollars. They have \$1,074,000 dollars in cash for the project. The new city hall will have appropriate Americans with Disabilities Act accommodations and will be large enough to accommodate their rapidly growing town. The old city hall will become the Santa Clara-Ivins Police Department offices.

The Local Building Authority of Beaver Fire District #1 is to purchase a new brush/structure fire truck. They have \$77,998 in cash and are asking for \$396,998 from CIB.

The Local Building Authority of Beaver Fire District #1 is requesting funds for a new ambulance. They have \$20,000 in cash and are requesting \$265,242 from CIB.

Commissioner Cozzens and Dale Brinkerhoff expressed their opposition to Cedar City's project with Commissioner Cozzens expressing his feeling that it is irresponsible for Cedar City to spend \$6 million dollars on a gymnasium.

Commissioner Cozzens moved to oppose Cedar City's application. Dale Brinkerhoff seconded. The motion carried unanimously. Frank Houston did not vote due to connectivity issues. Frank had called into the meeting.

Mayor Nolan Davis moved to support the rest of the projects on the CIB list. Mayor John Bramall seconded the motion. The motion passed.

FCAOG Executive Director Bryan Thiriot notified the Chairman that Patrick Mullen of the Utah Association of Counties was on the phone and needed to leave soon for another meeting. Bryan asked the Chair to consider moving to agenda item XIII.

XIII. SATELITE INLAND PORT PROCESS DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION (*Stuart Clauson/Patrick Mullen, Utah Association of Counties*)

Ginger Chinn, Managing Director of Business Development at the Utah Inland Port Authority, joined Stuart and Patrick to discuss satellite inland ports in rural Utah. Much of the information and opportunities with this project are going to be run through the AOG levels. The importance of working these opportunities through the entire Southwest Utah region was discussed.

Mayor John Bramall made a motion to support the Satellite Inland Port Process. Commissioner Mike Dalton seconded. The motion passed without dissent.

The Chairman then returned to agenda item XII.

XII. PUBLIC LANDS ISSUES

A. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING S-3422. THE GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT (*Commissioner Paul Cozzens, Chair*)

Scott Stubbs expressed concern that The Great American Outdoors Act authorizes the federal government to buy property and make it more public land than they already have. He feels the federal government does not need any more public land. He shared his experience with a piece of private land next to his forest allotment. The family grazed it until the forest service bought the land and refused to allow it to be grazed. After several years and a lot of pressure, the forest service is now allowing it to be grazed but no additional AUMs were authorized leading to a loss of tax revenue.

Heath Hansen explained that this bill is currently being debated on the floor of the United States Senate and makes changes to the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). Right now, \$900 million dollars are available to be spent from the LWCF each year, but it can be appropriated by Congress. Meaning, Congress does not have to spend it all and has flexibility in how to spend it. The bill would allow the \$900 million dollars to be spent each year by the federal agencies rather than Congress.

Heath shared that Senator Lee has been adamantly opposed to the LWCF and this new bill. He forced them to delay a vote and he is trying to form a coalition to at least force leadership to allow votes on amendments for the bill. Heath said the sad truth was that the bill was going to pass. Commissioner Taylor expressed that the federal government should have to pay fair property taxes, not Payment in Lieu of Taxes. He said he feels Payment in Lieu of Taxes should mean the same amount, not pittance. He stated his feelings the federal government should live by the laws they write.

Mayor John Bramall expressed his disdain that the federal government takes the taxpayer's money and outbids other entities in land purchases. They then prevent the land from being developed and revenue from being generated. Kelsey Berg mentioned that this bill was being done to help Cory Gardner from Colorado in his re-election battle to the U.S. Senate. She stated that Mitt Romney is opposed to this bill also. Kelsey said that one good thing about the bill is it allocates funding to National Park maintenance backlog, but it does not address the fundamental problems that put the park service in that position in the first place.

Chairman Cozzens asked Scott Stubbs what action he would like to see the FCAOG Steering Committee take. Mr. Stubbs said he simply wanted to make the organizations aware of the issue. He asked the elected officials to do more during the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and to help preserve and increase AUMs. Garrick Hall expressed concern that this land is going to be taken out of grazing and that is what he and the Farm Bureau want to fight against.

Commissioner Cozzens asked Scott and Garrick to prepare a letter to the Steering Committee specifying ways FCAOG and the elected officials involved could help.

B. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING GRAZING ON THE PAVANT (*Scott Stubbs, Farmer/Rancher*)

The previous discussion led into this topic. The point is that grazing is being threatened even further. Commissioners have the right to have correlation meetings with state and federal agencies regarding grazing. Scott stated that people would come to the meetings if they knew about them. He suggested a grazing board be formed. Scott and Garrick will put together a letter for the Steering Committee to consider next morning.

Mayor John Bramall made a motion that the Steering Committee inform the Congressional Delegation that they are adamantly opposed to S-3422. Commissioner Almquist seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

It was noted that the bill was going to pass within a day of the meeting. Therefore, the motion did not include writing a letter. It is simply to go on record as opposed to S-3422.

Technical difficulties occurred with the Steering Committee members on the phone and they were unable to vote on the motion.

XIV. CONGRESSIONAL STAFF UPDATES

Heath Hansen was in attendance representing Senator Mike Lee. He said he had already shared the information he needed to regarding the Great American Outdoors Act and reiterated Senator Lee's opposition to it. He updated the group on the uranium mining issues on the Arizona Strip. The President's Nuclear Fuel Working Group released their report; Senator Lee had been pushing them to include a rescission of the mining ban on the Arizona Strip. Unfortunately, that was not included in the report. They did include some general language supporting further mineral development. Heath feels we need to be working toward getting the Arizona delegation to support a rescission since the land being discussed lies within their state boundaries. He encourages that to be the focus.

Commissioner Smith noted that Rep. Paul Gosar has been supportive.

Heath continued to share updates from Senator Lee's office. The delegation has been working with the National Parks in Utah to get them to re-open amid the pandemic. Specifically, they have been working to re-open the shuttle system at Zion. The Coronavirus Food Assistance program, set up by the United States Department of Agriculture, has been launched. People can apply through the end of August.

Kelsey Berg, Deputy Chief of Staff for Senator Mitt Romney, reported. In-person Wave permits are available once again. Kane County did a great job working with the BLM to get that. She mentioned the CARES Act and that the next round of funding would focus on revenue loss for governments. Mayor John Bramall asked Kelsey to ensure money paid to individuals from the CARES Act is not counted as income for tax purposes.

Kelsey mentioned Hamlin Valley has an upcoming Watershed Restoration Initiative project. She mentioned that there is a large push for additional funding for the Wild Horse and Burro issue.

Adam Snow and Celeste Maloy updated the Steering Committee regarding Congressman Chris Stewart's efforts to re-open Zion National Park and its shuttle system. Adam said he has been fielding phone calls from business owners who are really struggling. Commissioner David Tebbs of Garfield County works as the Chief Financial Officer of Ruby's Inn just outside of Bryce Canyon. He reported to Adam that there have been some nights of zero occupancy at his hotel.

Commissioner Cozzens asked if the Steering Committee is interested in shifting some of the CARES Act money toward tourism promotion. Nate said he would investigate the CDBG rules for that. He is concerned that Ruby's Inn will not qualify as a small business. Commissioner Taylor expressed frustration with Bryce Canyon National Park's process with re-opening. Adam mentioned that Bryce Canyon was the second National Park in the nation to re-open, so the leadership in Garfield County did a good job pushing them. Commissioner Taylor stated that Capitol Reef was the first park to re-open, but it should have been Bryce.

Commissioner Smith brought up Lake Powell and the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. He said the Commission was okay with them shutting down but admonished them to prepare to re-open at a moment's notice.

Adam mentioned timber harvesting on Cedar Mountain. Forest Service leaders do not want to manage fires with large crews because of the virus. Their strategy is full suppression nationwide. They are working with Capitol Reef on sheep grazing. Congressman Stewart is very concerned about China. He said it is easy to get distracted by civil unrest, but we need to remember that the U.S. has a lot of enemies. We need to stay focused on those threats.

Celeste Maloy shared further information on Rep. Stewart's efforts. The three-digit suicide hotline legislation has passed in the Senate. The House is still working on it. Wild Horse and Burro funding is still in process. The first step will be removing excess horses from the range. She mentioned Washington County's Habitat Conservation Plan. Lastly, the Stewart team has been fighting for Utah agriculture, which at times can be tough because Midwest agriculture needs and wants are so dominant.

XV. STATE AGENCY UPDATES

None.

XVI. UNIVERSITY UPDATES

Stephen Lisonbee of Southern Utah University was not present at the meeting. Henrie Walton of Dixie State University had joined by phone but had to be excused for another meeting. He texted FCAOG Human Resources Director Courtney Sinagra and FCAOG Executive Director Bryan Thiriote the updated he wanted shared.

Courtney read the update which stated that DSU is proceeding with the fall semester and will offer a variety of in-person, blended, and online courses. DSU is also working with the governor's office and Utah System of Higher Education to stand-up several new, short-term, online training programs to help unemployed people get back to work. Henrie's message stated that more information would be forthcoming and invited Steering Committee members to email him with questions.

XVII. LOCAL AFFAIRS DISCUSSION

Karina Brown, the democratic candidate for lieutenant governor, had been present in the meeting via telephone. Chairman Cozzens recognized her and invited her to address the other attendees.

Karina introduced herself. She lives in Cache Valley with her family. She is a City of Nimbly planning commissioner and sits on the Cache Valley Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors. Karina was one of the sponsors of Proposition 3 to expand Medicaid. She is also a board member for Logan Regional Hospital.

She stated that she listened to our discussion regarding CDBG grants and mentioned that she is President of the Cache County Friends of the Children's Justice Center Board and the Director of the Children's Justice Center recently received CDBG funds for a new building. Karina expressed her excitement for the project. She also mentioned that she is the co-chair for the Celebration of Women's Suffrage initiative. They are working to celebrate women's suffrage. Karina mentioned that she is excited about the potential of overseeing elections in the role of Lieutenant Governor as she feels elections are one of the most important parts of our democracy.

XVIII. ADJOURN

Commissioner Paul Cozzens adjourned the meeting at 2:01 P.M.

DRAFT

AGENDA ITEMS #V.A. and V.B.

FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT GENERAL POLICIES

1. Weighted Value utilized for Rating and Ranking Criteria: The Rating and Ranking Criteria utilized by the Five County Association of Governments contains a weighted value for each of the criteria. Point values are assessed for each criteria and totaled. In the right hand columns the total points received are then multiplied by a weighted value to obtain the total score. These weighted values may change from year to year based on the region's determination of which criteria have higher priority.
2. Five County AOG staff may require a visit with each applicant for an onsite evaluation/review meeting.
3. All applications will be evaluated by the Five County Association of Governments Community and Economic Development staff using criteria approved by the Steering Committee.
4. Staff will present prioritization recommendations to the RRC (Steering Committee) for consideration and approval. Membership of the Steering Committee includes two elected officials (mayor and commissioner) and a school board representative from each of the five counties. Appointments to the Steering Committee are reviewed and presented annually in February for the two elected officials of each county as well as the county school boards.
5. Maximum amount per year for a single-year project is \$200,000.
6. Maximum years for a multi-year project is 2 years for a total amount of \$300,000 (year 1 @ \$200,000 and year 2 @ \$100,000). Applicants undertaking HUD eligible construction activities cannot apply for multi-year funding. (See eligible activities section of the Policies & Procedures manual for construction activities)
7. All applications must have a complete budget and budget breakdown for each year of funding.
8. Applications on behalf of sub-recipients (i.e., special service districts, non-profit organizations, etc.) are encouraged. However, the applicant city or county must understand that even if they name the sub-recipient as project manager the city/county is still responsible for the project's viability and program compliance. The applying entity must be willing to maintain an active oversight of both the project and the sub-recipient's contract performance. An inter-local agreement between the applicant entity and the sub-recipient must accompany the CDBG final application. The inter-local agreement must detail who will be the project manager and how the sponsoring entity and sub-recipient will coordinate work on the project.
9. Applicant Deadlines to the AOG
 - **Capital Improvements Lists (CIL)**- The project applied for must be included in the prioritized capital improvements list (CIL) that the entity submitted for inclusion in the Consolidated Plan. Your jurisdiction's CIL is due no later than Friday, January 8, 2021 at 5:00 p.m. If your CIL list containing your project is not submitted by the deadline, your project application will not be rated and ranked. You may not amend your list after the deadline.

- **Income Surveys** – Surveys must be conducted and submitted to the AOG for tabulation no less than 30 days prior to the initial State application deadline. If surveys have been conducted incorrectly they can be re-conducted and submitted to the AOG for tabulation no less than 15 days prior to the initial State’s application deadline. Applicants that do not meet this requirement will not be eligible for CDBG funding.
- **Applications Submitted in WebGrants** - In order for Five County CED staff to provide appropriate administrative support to applicants and draft the Annual Action Plan, applicants must have their complete application(s) submitted in WebGrants no less than 15 days prior to the State’s application deadline. Applicants that do not meet this requirement will not be eligible for CDBG funding.

10. Pre-approved funding:

- \$97,000 to Five County AOG (Administration, Consolidated Plan Planning, Rating & Ranking, Planning Assistance, Affordable Housing Planning, and Economic Development TA)

11. Set-aside Funding:

- None.

12. Emergency projects may be considered by the Regional Review Committee (FCAOG Steering Committee) 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 time frame 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; needs immediate remediation.

If an applicant wishes to consider applying for emergency funds, they should contact the Five County Association of Governments CDBG Program Specialist as soon as possible to discuss the state required application procedure as well as regional criteria. Emergency funds (distributed statewide) are limited on an annual basis to \$500,000. The amount of any emergency funds distributed during the year will be subtracted from the top of the appropriate regional allocation during the next funding cycle.

13. Public service providers, traditionally non-profit organizations, may apply for CDBG funds for capital improvement and major equipment purchases. Examples are delivery trucks, furnishings, fixtures, computer equipment, construction, remodeling, and facility expansion. State policy guidelines prohibit the use of CDBG funds for operating and maintenance expenses. This includes paying administrative costs, salaries, etc. No more than 15 percent of the state’s yearly allocation of funds may be expended for public service activities.

14. State policy has established the minimum project size at \$30,000. Projects less than the minimum size will not be considered for rating and ranking.

15. In accordance with state policy, grantees with open grants from previous years who have not spent 50 percent of their previous grant prior to rating and ranking are not eligible to be rated and ranked, with the exception of housing rehabilitation projects.
16. It is the policy of the Five County Association of Governments RRC (Steering Committee) that CDBG funding of housing related projects shall be directed to:
 - The development of infrastructure supporting affordable housing, and/or eligible limited clientele housing.
 - Rehabilitation of rental housing managed by a public housing authority, or another entity showing documentation that they can carry out the project within HUD's allotted timeline.
 - Acquisition of real property for affordable housing that will be managed by a public housing authority.

CDBG funds in this region shall not be utilized for LMI rental assistance or direct housing assistance payments.

17. It is the policy of the RRC (Steering Committee) that lots for single family homes may not be procured with CDBG funding in the Five County region, unless the homes remain available as rental units under the auspices of a public housing authority.
18. In the event of a tie for the last funding position, the following will be awarded one (1) point for each criteria item listed below answered affirmatively:
 - The project that has the Highest percentage of LMI;
 - The project that has the most Local funds leveraged;
 - The project with the most other funds leveraged;
 - The largest Geographical area benefitted;
 - The project with the Largest number of LMI beneficiaries;

If a tie remains unbroken after the above-mentioned tie breaker, the members of the RRC will vote and the project that receives the majority vote will be ranked higher.

19. After all projects have been fully funded in the order of their Rating and Ranking prioritization and a balance remains insufficient for the next project in priority to complete a project in the current year, the funds will be first applied to the highest scoring multi-year project. This will prepay the funding to that multi-year project that would have been allocated out of the upcoming program year's funding. If there are no multi-year projects the balance will be divided proportionately to the cost of each funded construction project, and those grantees will be directed to place that amount in their budget as "construction contingency". After completion of those projects, if the dollars are not needed as contingency, they are to be released back to the state to be reallocated in the statewide pool.
20. Grantees who are contracted to be awarded CDBG funding, and choose to not undertake the project in a timeframe that will allow for redistribution of funds toward another project in the Five County region, during the same program year, will be prohibited from re-applying in the future for the same project. Additionally, grantees who choose not to follow through on their

project within the said timeframe, will not be permitted to apply for CDBG in the CDBG program year immediately following the date they decided not to undertake that project. A request for an exception to this policy may be considered by the Rating & Ranking Committee (R&RC) if a project circumstantially could not be completed (E.g. environmental conditions do not permit). Cost overruns and overbidding are unacceptable circumstances for not undertaking the project and shall not be considered by the R&RC, as grantees should plan for such events.

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
CDBG HOW-TO-APPLY APPLICATION WORKSHOP
ATTENDANCE POLICY**

Attendance at one workshop within the region is mandatory by all prospective applicants or an official representative of said applicant. [State Policy]

Attendance at the workshop by a county commissioner, mayor, city council member, county clerk, city manager, town clerk, or county administrator also satisfies this attendance requirement.

Attendance by prospective eligible “sub-grantees”, which may include non-profit agencies, special service districts, housing authorities, etc. is strongly recommended so that they may become familiar with the application procedures. If a city/town or county elects to sponsor a sub-grantee it is the responsibility of that jurisdiction to ensure the timely and accurate preparation of the CDBG application on behalf of the sub-grantee.

Jurisdictions may formally designate a third-party representative (i.e., other city/county staff, consultant, engineer, or architect) to attend the workshop on their behalf. Said designation by the jurisdiction shall be in writing. The letter of designation shall be provided to the Five County Association no later than the beginning of the workshop.

Extraordinary circumstances relating to this policy shall be presented to the Executive Director of the Five County Association of Governments for consideration by the Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee).

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
CDBG RATING AND RANKING PROGRAM YEAR 2021
DATA SOURCES**

1. **CAPACITY TO CARRY OUT THE GRANT:** The grantee must have a history of successful grant administration to receive full points in this category. First time grantees or grantees who have not applied in more than 5 years are presumed to have the capacity to successfully carry out a project and will receive a default score of 3 points. To adequately evaluate grantee performance, the RRC must consult with the state staff. State staff will rate performance on a scale of 1-5 (Five being best). A grantee whose performance in the past was poor must show improved administration capability through third party administration contracts with AOG's or other capable entities to get partial credit.
2. **GRANT ADMINISTRATION:** Those making a concerted effort to minimize grant administration costs taken from CDBG funds will be awarded extra points.
3. **UNEMPLOYMENT:** "Utah Economic and Demographic Profiles" (most current issue available prior to rating and ranking), provided by Utah Office of Planning and Budget or The Kem Gardner Policy Institute; or "Utah Labor Market Report" (most current issue with annual averages), provided by Department of Workforce Services.
4. **FINANCIAL COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (Self-Help Financing):** Figures provided by applicant in grant application. Documentation of the source(s) and status (whether already secured or not) of any and all proposed "matching" funds must be provided prior to the rating and ranking of the application by the RRC. Any changes made in the dollar amount of proposed funding, after rating and ranking has taken place, shall require reevaluation of the rating received on this criteria. A determination will then be made as to whether the project's overall ranking and funding prioritization is affected by the score change.

Use of an applicant's local funds and/or leveraging of other matching funds is strongly encouraged in CDBG funded projects. This allows for a greater number of projects to be accomplished in a given year. Acceptable matches include property, materials available and specifically committed to this project, and cash. Due to federal restrictions unacceptable matches include donated labor, use of equipment, etc. All match proposed must be quantified as cash equivalent through an acceptable process before the match can be used. Documentation on how and by whom the match is quantified is required. "Secured" means that a letter or applications of intent exist to show that other funding sources have been requested as match to the proposed project. If leveraged funds are not received, then the points given for that match will be deducted and the project's rating reevaluated.

A jurisdiction's population (most current estimate provided by the Census, ACS or Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute.) will determine whether they are Category A, B, C or D for the purposes of this criteria. A jurisdiction is defined as an incorporated city, town, county, or a defined special service district area. All public housing authorities or similar non-profits shall be considered a 4B jurisdiction for this criteria.

5. **CDBG DOLLARS REQUESTED PER CAPITA:** Determined by dividing the dollar amount requested in the CDBG application by the beneficiary population.

6. LOCAL JURISDICTIONS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES: THRESHOLD CRITERIA:

Every applicant is required to document that the project for which they are applying is consistent with that community's and the Five County District Consolidated Plan. The project, or project type, must be a high priority in the investment component (Capital Investment Plan (CIP) One-Year Action Plan). The applicant must include evidence that the community was and continues to be a willing partner in the development of the regional (five-county) consolidated planning process. (See CDBG Application Guide.)

7. COUNTY'S COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND POLICIES: Prioritization will be determined by the three (3) appointed Steering Committee members representing the county in which the proposed project is located. The three (3) members of the Steering Committee include: one County Commission Representative, one Mayor's Representative, and one School Board Representative. (Note: for AOG applications, determination is made by the Steering Committee Chair, in consultation with the AOG Executive Committee.)

8. REGIONAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND POLICIES: Determined by the Executive Director with consultation of the AOG Finance Committee members. The Finance Committee is comprised of one County Commissioner from each of the five counties.

#1 priority	6 points X 2.0 (weighting) =	12.0 points
#2 priority	5 points X 2.0 (weighting) =	10.0 points
#3 priority	4 points X 2.0 (weighting) =	8.0 points
#4 priority	3 points X 2.0 (weighting) =	6.0 points
#5 priority	2 points X 2.0 (weighting) =	4.0 points
#6 priority	1 points X 2.0 (weighting) =	2.0 points

Regional Prioritization

Justification

#1 **Public Utility Infrastructure**

Projects designed to increase the capacity of water and other utility systems to better serve the customers and/or improve fire flow capacity. Adjusting water rates are a usual funding source. Other agencies also fund this category. Includes wastewater disposal projects.

#2 **Public Safety Activities**

Projects related to the protection of property, would include activities such as flood control projects or fire protection improvements in a community. Typically, general fund items that most communities cannot fund without additional assistance. Grants help lower indebted costs to jurisdiction. Fire Protection is eligible for other funding i.e., PCIFB and entities are encouraged to leverage those with CDBG funds.

#3 **Community Facilities**

Projects that traditionally have no available revenue source to fund them or have been turned down traditionally by other funding sources, i.e., Permanent Community Impact Fund Board (PCIFB). May also include projects that are categorically

eligible for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding, i.e., senior citizens centers, health clinics, food banks, and/or public service activities. Includes community centers that are not primarily recreational in nature.

#4 LMI Housing Activities

Projects designed to provide for the housing needs of very low and low-moderate income families. May include the development of infrastructure for LMI housing projects, home buyer's assistance programs, or the actual construction of housing units (including transitional, supportive, and/or homeless shelters), and housing rehabilitation. Meets a primary objective of the program: Housing. Traditionally CDBG funds leverage very large matching dollars from other sources.

#5 Projects to remove Architectural Barriers

Accessibility of public facilities by disabled persons is mandated by federal law but this is an unfunded mandate upon the local government. A liability exists for the jurisdiction because of potential suits brought to enforce requirements.

#6 Parks and Recreation

Projects designed to enhance the recreational qualities of a community i.e., new picnic facilities, playgrounds, aquatic centers, etc.

Note: The Executive Director, in consultation with the Finance Committee members, reviewed and obtained approval of this regional prioritization for the CDBG program FY2021.

9. IMPROVEMENTS TO, OR EXPANSION OF, LMI HOUSING STOCK, OR PROVIDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACCESSIBILITY TO LMI RESIDENTS: Information provided by the applicant. Applicant must be able to adequately explain reasoning which supports proposed figures, for the number of LMI housing units to be constructed or substantially rehabilitated with the assistance of this grant. Or the number of units this grant will make accessible to LMI residents through loan closing or down payment assistance.

10. AFFORDABLE HOUSING PLAN IMPLEMENTATION: The CDBG State Policy Committee adopted the following rating and ranking criteria to be used by each regional rating and ranking system: *"Applications received from cities and counties which have complied with Utah code regarding the preparation and adoption of an affordable housing plan, and who are applying for a project that is intended to address element(s) of that plan will be given additional points."* Projects which actually demonstrate implementation of a jurisdiction's Affordable Housing Plan policies will be given points. Applicants must provide sufficient documentation to justify that their project complies with this criteria. Towns applying for credit under this criteria may either meet a goal in its adopted Affordable Housing Plan or the project meets a regional affordable housing goal in the Consolidated Plan.

11. **GEOGRAPHIC EXTENT OF PROJECT'S IMPACT:** The actual area to be benefitted by the project applied for.
12. **PROPERTY TAX RATE FOR JURISDICTION:** Base tax rate for community or county, as applicable, will be taken from the "Statistical Review of Government in Utah", or most current source using the most current edition available prior to rating and ranking. Basis for determining percent are the maximum tax rates allowed in the Utah Code: 0.70% for municipalities, and 0.32% for counties.
13. **PERCENTAGE OF APPLICANT'S JURISDICTION WHO ARE LOW TO MODERATE INCOME:** The figures will be provided from the results of a Housing and Community Development Division (HCDD) approved income survey conducted by the applicant of the project benefit area households, or pre-approved LMI communities list in the Policies and Procedures book, or the HUD LMI Map Application Tool.
14. **EXTENT OF POVERTY:** The percentage of the total population of the jurisdiction or project area who are Low Income (LI: 50% of AMI) or below directly benefitting from the project. The AOG staff will use the income surveys (for those who conducted a survey) and HUD income list (for those who were on the HUD pre-approved list) provided by the state to find these numbers.
15. **LIMITED CLIENTELE GROUP:** Applicant will provide information as to what percent of the proposed project will assist a presumed LMI group as defined in the current program year CDBG Application Guide handbook.
16. **Civil Rights Compliance:** Applicants (City/County) will receive points for compliance with federal laws, executive orders and regulations related to civil rights. (Checklist and templates available from State CDBG staff.) An entity can be awarded a maximum of two points for this criteria
1 Point – Complete "ADA Checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal" for city/county office.
1 Point – City/County has adopted the following policies – 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.
17. **PRO-ACTIVE PLANNING:** The State of Utah emphasizes the importance of incorporating planning into the operation of city government. Communities that demonstrate their desire to improve through planning will receive additional points in the rating and ranking process.

In the rating and ranking of CDBG applications, the region will recognize an applicant's accomplishments consistent with these principles by adding additional points when evaluating the following:

- ** Demonstration proactive land use planning in the community;**
- ** Development of efficient infrastructure including water and energy conservation;**
- ** Incorporation of housing opportunity and affordability into community planning; and**
- ** Protection and conservation plan for water, air, critical lands, important agricultural lands and historic resources.**
- **Removal of barriers to accessibility of programs and facilities for all persons**

Worksheet #17 will be used in the rating and ranking process for applicants who have taken the opportunity to provide additional information and documentation in order to receive these additional points.

- 18. Application Quality:** Quality of the Pre-Application is evaluated in terms of project problem identification, justification, well-defined scope of work likely to address identified problems, and a detailed architectural/engineering report.

- 19. Project Maturity:** Funding should be prioritized to those projects which are the most "mature". For the purposes of this process, maturity is defined as those situations where: 1) the applicant has assigned a qualified project manager; 2) has selected an engineer and/or architect; 3) proposed a solution to the problem identified in the Scope of Work and is ready to proceed immediately; and 4) identifies all funding sources and funding maturity status. Projects that are determined to not be sufficiently mature so as to be ready to proceed in a timely manner, may not be rated and ranked.

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
FY 2021 CDBG RATING AND RANKING CRITERIA and APPLICANT'S PROJECT SCORE SHEET**

The Five County Association of Governments Steering Committee (RRC) has established these criteria for the purpose of rating and ranking fairly and equitably all Community Development Block Grant applications received for funding during FY 2021. Only projects which are determined to be threshold eligible will be rated and ranked. Eligibility will be determined following review of the submitted CDBG application with all supporting documentation provided prior to rating and ranking. **Please review the attached Data Sources Sheet for a more detailed explanation of each criteria.**

Applicant:		Requested CDBG \$'s		Ranking:		of		Total Score:	
-------------------	--	----------------------------	--	-----------------	--	-----------	--	---------------------	--

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description Five County Association of Governments		Data	Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)					Score	X Weight	Total Score
1	Capacity to Carry Out The Grant: Performance history of capacity to administer grant. Scores comes from State CDBG Staff. (First-time & <5-yr grantees: default is 2.5 points)		Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Fair 3 points	Deficient 2 point	Poor 1 point		0.4	
2	Grant Administration: Concerted effort made by grantee to minimize grant administration costs.		0% CDBG Funds 3 points	1 - 5% 2 points	5.1 - 10% 1 point				1.0	
3	Unemployment: What percentage is applicant County's unemployment percentage rate above State average percentage rate?	%	4.1% or greater above state average 3.0 points	3.1% - 4.0% above state average 2.5 points	2.1% - 3.0% above state average 2.0 points	1.1% - 2.0% above state average 1.5 points	0.1% - 1.0% above state average 1.0 point	Up to state average 0 points	1.5	
4 A	Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (Jurisdiction Population <500) Percent of non-CDBG funds invested in total project cost.	%	> 10% 5 points	7.1 % - 10% 4 points	4.1% - 7% 3 points	1% - 4% 2 points	< 1% 1 point		2.0	
4 B	Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (Jurisdiction Population 501 - 1,000) Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in total project cost.	%	> 20% 5 points	15.1 - 20% 4 points	10.1 - 15% 3 points	5.1 - 10% 2 points	1 - 5.0% 1 point		2.0	
4 C	Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (Jurisdiction Population 1,001 - 5,000) Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in total project cost.	%	> 30% 5 points	25.1 - 30% 4 points	20.1 - 25% 3 points	15.1 - 20% 2 points	1 - 15% 1 point		2.0	
4 D	Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (Jurisdiction Population >5,000) Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in total project cost.	%	> 40% 5 points	35.1 - 40% 4 points	30.1 - 35% 3 points	25.1 - 30% 2 points	1 - 25% 1 point		2.0	

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description Five County Association of Governments		Data	Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)					Score	X Weight	Total Score
5	CDBG funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by # of beneficiaries.		\$1 - 100 5 points	\$101-200 4 points	\$201- 400 3 points	\$401 - 800 2 points	\$801 or > 1 point		1.0	
6 T*	Jurisdiction's Project Priority: Project priority rating in Regional Consolidated Plan, (<u>Capital Investment Plan - One-Year Action Plan</u>)		High # 1 6 points	High # 2 5 points	High # 3 4 points	High # 4 3 points	High # 5 2 points	High # >5 1 point	2.0	
7	County's Project Priority: Prioritization will be determined by the three (3) appointed Steering Committee members representing the county in which the proposed project is located. The three (3) members of the Steering Committee include: one County Commission Representative, one Mayor's Representative, and one School Board Representative. (Note: for AOG application, determination is made by the Steering Committee Chair, in consultation with the AOG Finance Committee.)		# 1 6 points	# 2 5 points	# 3 4 points	# 4 3 points	# 5 2 points	#6 or > 1 point	2.0	
8	Regional Project Priority: Determined by the Executive Director with consultation of the AOG Finance Committee members. The Finance Committee is comprised of one (1) County Commissioner from each of the five counties.		# 1 Public Safety Activities 6 points	# 2 Community Facilities 5 points	# 3 LMI Housing Activities 4 points	# 4 Public Utility Infrastructure 3 points	# 5 Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA) 2 points	#6 or > Parks and Recreation 1 point	2.0	
9	LMI Housing Stock: Infrastructure for the units, rehabilitation of units, and/or accessibility of units for LMI residents.		> 20 Units 8.5 points	15 - 20 Units 7 points	10 - 14 Units 5.5 points	5-9 Units 4 points	3-4 Units 2.5 points	1-2 Units 1 point	1.0	
10	Affordable Housing Plan Implementation: City has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project demonstrates implementation of specific policies in the Plan. Towns applying for credit under this criteria may <u>either</u> meet a goal in their adopted Affordable Housing Plan or the project meets a regional affordable housing goal in the Consolidated Plan.		YES 3 points	No 0 points					1.0	
11	Project's Geographical Impact: Area benefitting from project.		Regional 3.5 points	Multi-county 3.0 points	County-wide 2.5 points	Multi-community 2.0 points	Community 1.5 points	Portion of Community 1 point	1.5	

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description Five County Association of Governments		Data	Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)					Score	X Weight	Total Score	
12	Jurisdiction's Property Tax Rate: In response to higher demand for services, many communities have already raised tax rates to fund citizen needs. The communities that maintain an already high tax burden (as compared to the tax ceiling set by state law) will be given higher points for this category. Property tax rate as a percent of the maximum allowed by law (3 point default for non-taxing jurisdiction).	%	> 50% 5 points	40.1 - 50% 4 points	30.1 - 40% 3 points	20.1 - 30% 2 points	10.1 - 20% 1 point	< 10% 0 points		1.0	
13	Jurisdiction's LMI Population: Percent of residents considered 80 percent or less LMI.	%	91 - 100% 5 points	81 - 90% 4 points	71 - 80% 3 points	61 - 70% 2 points	51 - 60% 1 point			1.0	
14	Extent of Low-Income Population: The percentage of the total population of the jurisdiction or project area who are Low Income (LI: 50% of AMI) or below, directly benefitting from the project.	%	20% or More 5 points	15 - 19% 4 points	10 - 14% 3 points	5 - 9% 2 points	1 - 4% 1 point			0.5	
15	Limited Clientele Groups: Project specifically serves CDBG identified LMI groups, i.e. elderly, disabled, homeless, etc., as stipulated in the state of Utah Small Cities CDBG Application Policies and Procedures.	%	100% 4 points	51% 2 points						1.0	
16	Civil Rights Compliance: Applicants (City/County) will receive points for compliance with federal laws, executive orders and regulations related to civil rights. 1 Point – Complete “ADA Checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal” for city/county office. 1 Point – City/County has adopted the following policies – 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.		Complete both parts 2 points	Adopt grievance procedure with ADA 1 point	Complete ADA Checklist 1 point					1.0	
17	Pro-active Planning: Reflects on communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities; coordination and cooperation with other governments; development of efficient infrastructure; incorporation of housing opportunity and affordability in community planning; and protection and conservation plan for water, air, critical lands, important agricultural lands and historic resources. Score comes from Worksheet #17.		Very High 4 points	High 3 points	Fair 2 points	Low 1 point				0.5	

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description Five County Association of Governments		Data	Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)					Score	X Weight	Total Score	
18	Application Quality: Application identifies the problem, contains a well-defined scope of work and is cost effective, demonstrates that it will be completed in a timely manner, demonstrates that it does not duplicate existing services, and provides an architectural/engineering report. Score comes from Worksheet #18.		Excellent 5 points	Very Good 4 points	Good 3 points	Fair 2 points	Acceptable 1 point	Poor 0 points		1.5	
19	Project Maturity: Project demonstrates capacity to be implemented and/or completed in the allotted contract period and is clearly documented. Score comes from Worksheet #19.		Excellent 5 points	Very Good 4 points	Good 3 points	Fair 2 points	Acceptable 1 point	Poor 0 points		2.0	

PLEASE NOTE:

**Criteria marked with a T* is a THRESHOLD eligibility requirement for the CDBG Program. < = Less Than > = More Than
Previously Allocated Pre-Approved Funding: \$90,000 to Five County AOG for Administration, Consolidated Plan, Rating & Ranking, RLF Program
Delivery, Economic Development Technical Assistance and Affordable Housing Plan Development and Updates**

CRITERIA 17 WORKSHEET

PRO-ACTIVE PLANNING		
Criteria	Support Documentation Provided	Score (4 Points Total)
1. Has the applicant provided information about the local jurisdiction which demonstrates pro-active planning and land use in their community in coordination and cooperation with other governments ?	Yes ___ 0.5 point No ___ 0 points	
2. Has the applicant documented that the project is in accordance with an applicable <u>adopted</u> plan (E.g., water facilities master plan, etc.)	Yes ___ 1.5 point No ___ 0 points	
3. Has the applicant documented incorporation of housing opportunity and affordability into community planning (E.g. General Plan housing policies , development fee deferral policies , etc.)	Yes ___ 0.5 point No ___ 0 points	
4. Has the applicant documented adopted plans or general plan elements addressing protection and conservation of water, air, critical lands, important agricultural lands and historic resources?	Yes ___ 0.5 point No ___ 0 points	
5. Has the applicant documented information about the local jurisdiction which demonstrates pro-active planning for the removal of barriers to accessibility of programs and facilities for all persons?	Yes ___ 0.5 point No ___ 0 points	
6. Has the applicant provided information about the local jurisdiction which demonstrates the development of efficient infrastructure including water and energy conservation.	Yes ___ 0.5 point No ___ 0 points	
Very High = 3.5 - 4 Points High = 2.5 - 3 Points Fair = 1.5 - 2 Points Low = 0.5 - 1 Point		Total Points: Rating: (Very High, High, Fair, Low)

CRITERIA 18 WORKSHEET

Application Quality			
Criteria	Support Documentation Provided		Score (7 Points Total)
1. Problem Identification	Yes___ 1 point	No___ 0 points	
2. Is proposed solution well defined in the Scope of Work? In other words, is the solution likely to solve the problem?	Yes___ 1 point	No___ 0 points	
3. Does the application give a concise description of how the project will be completed in a timely manner?	Yes___ 1 point	No___ 0 points	
4. Does the proposed project duplicate any existing services, programs, or activities already available to the beneficiaries in the jurisdiction? I.e. those locally or regionally based. Applicant must provide documentation.	Yes___ 0 point	No___ 1 points	
5. Detailed Architectural/Engineering Report, design/plans prepared? Projects that do not require an Architect/Engineer will receive full points if build specification documents are provided when applicable. (E.g. Fire trucks have build specification documents, while acquisition of real property will not have pertinent documents.)	Yes___ 3 point	No___ 0 points	
Excellent = 7 Points Acceptable = 3 Points Very Good = 6 Points Poor = ≤ 2 Points Good = 5 Points Fair = 4 Point			Total Points _____ Rating _____

CRITERIA 19 WORKSHEET

PROJECT MATURITY		
Criteria	Status	Score (7 Points Total)
1. Architect/Engineer already selected and is actively involved in the application process	Yes___ 1 point No___ 0 points	
2. Has the applicant provided evidence that the project manager has the capacity to carry out the project in a timely manner?	Yes___ 1 point No___ 0 points	
3. Is the proposed solution to the problem identified in the Scope of Work ready to proceed immediately ?	(Well Defined) Yes___ 2 points No___ 0 points	
4. Funding Status (Maturity)	Is CDBG the only funding source for the project? Yes___ 1 point No___ 0 points (or) Other project funding was applied for but not committed. Yes___ 2 points No___ 0 points (or) All other project funding is in place for immediate use. Yes___ 3 points No___ 0 points	
Excellent = 7 Points Fair = 4 Points Very Good = 6 Points Acceptable = 3 Points Good = 5 Points Poor = ≤ 2 Points		Total Points: _____ Rating: _____ (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Acceptable, Poor)

AGENDA ITEM #V. D.

Quick Guide to CDBG Eligible Activities to Support Infectious Disease Response

March 19, 2020

Grantees should coordinate with local health authorities before undertaking any activity to support state or local pandemic response. Grantees may use Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds for a range of eligible activities that prevent and respond to the spread of infectious diseases such as the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19).

Examples of Eligible Activities to Support Infectious Disease Response

<i>For more information, refer to applicable sections of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (for State CDBG Grantees) and CDBG regulations (for Entitlement CDBG grantees).</i>	
Buildings and Improvements, Including Public Facilities	
Acquisition, construction, reconstruction, or installation of public works, facilities, and site or other improvements. <i>See section 105(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(2)); 24 CFR 570.201(c).</i>	Construct a facility for testing, diagnosis, or treatment.
	Rehabilitate a community facility to establish an infectious disease treatment clinic.
	Acquire and rehabilitate, or construct, a group living facility that may be used to centralize patients undergoing treatment.
Rehabilitation of buildings and improvements (including interim assistance). <i>See section 105(a)(4) (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(4)); 24 CFR 570.201(f); 570.202(b).</i>	Rehabilitate a commercial building or closed school building to establish an infectious disease treatment clinic, e.g., by replacing the HVAC system.
	Acquire, and quickly rehabilitate (if necessary) a motel or hotel building to expand capacity of hospitals to accommodate isolation of patients during recovery.
	Make interim improvements to private properties to enable an individual patient to remain quarantined on a temporary basis.
Assistance to Businesses, including Special Economic Development Assistance	
Provision of assistance to private, for-profit entities, when appropriate to carry out an economic development project. <i>See section 105(a)(17) (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(17)); 24 CFR 570.203(b).</i>	Provide grants or loans to support new businesses or business expansion to create jobs and manufacture medical supplies necessary to respond to infectious disease.
	Avoid job loss caused by business closures related to social distancing by providing short-term working capital assistance to small businesses to enable retention of jobs held by low- and moderate-income persons.
Provision of assistance to microenterprises. <i>See section 105(a)(22) (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(22)); 24 CFR 570.201(o).</i>	Provide technical assistance, grants, loans, and other financial assistance to establish, stabilize, and expand microenterprises that provide medical, food delivery, cleaning, and other services to support home health and quarantine.

Public Services (Capped at 15 Percent of the Grant, With Some Exceptions)¹	
Provision of new or quantifiably increased public services. <i>See section 105(a)(8) (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(8)); 24 CFR 570.201(e).</i>	Carry out job training to expand the pool of health care workers and technicians that are available to treat disease within a community.
	Provide testing, diagnosis or other services at a fixed or mobile location.
	Increase the capacity and availability of targeted health services for infectious disease response within existing health facilities.
	Provide equipment, supplies, and materials necessary to carry-out a public service.
	Deliver meals on wheels to quarantined individuals or individuals that need to maintain social distancing due to medical vulnerabilities.
Planning, Capacity Building, and Technical Assistance	
States only: Planning grants and planning only grants. <i>See section 105(a)(12).</i>	Grant funds to units of general local government may be used for planning activities in conjunction with an activity, they may also be used for planning only as an activity. These activities must meet or demonstrate that they would meet a national objective. These activities are subject to the State’s 20 percent administration, planning and technical assistance cap.
States only: use a part of to support TA and capacity building. <i>See section 106(d)(5) (42 U.S.C. 5306(d)(5)).</i>	Grant funds to units of general local government to hire technical assistance providers to deliver CDBG training to new subrecipients and local government departments that are administering CDBG funds for the first time to assist with infectious disease response. This activity is subject to the State’s 3 percent administration, planning and technical assistance cap.
Entitlement only. data gathering, studies, analysis, and preparation of plans and the identification of actions that will implement such plans. <i>See 24 CFR 570.205.</i>	Gather data and develop non-project specific emergency infectious disease response plans.

Planning Considerations

Infectious disease response conditions rapidly evolve and may require changes to the planned use of funds:

- CDBG grantees must amend their Consolidated Annual Action Plan when there is a change to the allocation priorities or method of distribution of funds; an addition of an activity not described in the plan; or a change to the purpose, scope, location, or beneficiaries of an activity (24 CFR 91.505).
- If the changes meet the criteria for a “substantial amendment” in the grantee’s citizen participation plan, the grantee must follow its citizen participation process for amendments (24 CFR 91.105 and 91.115).

Resources

The Department has technical assistance providers that may be available to assist grantees in their implementation of CDBG Funds for activities to prevent or respond to the spread of infectious disease. Please contact your local CPD Field Office Director to request technical assistance from HUD staff or a TA provider.

- Submit your questions to: CPDQuestionsAnswered@hud.gov
- COVID-19 (“Coronavirus”) Information and Resources: <https://www.hud.gov/coronavirus>
- CPD Program Guidance and Training: <https://www.hudexchange.info/program-support/>

¹ Section 105(a)(8) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, provides a different percentage cap for some grantees.

AGENDA ITEM # VI.

**Five County SSBG FY 21
Subawards**

Agency	Suggested Award	Ask	Difference
Red Rock Center for Independence	\$7,500.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ (1,500.00)
Kane County	\$8,500.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ (1,500.00)
Neighborhood Housing Services of Provo, Inc.	\$9,000.00	\$ 7,500.00	\$ (1,500.00)
The Learning Center for Families	\$8,500.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ (1,500.00)
Beaver County COA	\$6,500.00	\$ 5,000.00	\$ (1,500.00)
Iron County Council on Aging	\$10,000.00	\$ 9,000.00	\$ (1,000.00)
Washington County Council on Aging	\$8,500.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ (1,500.00)
Garfield County Council On Aging	\$8,000.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ (1,000.00)
TOTAL	\$ 66,500.00	\$ 55,500.00	\$ (11,000.00)

Five County SSBG Admin and Direct Client	\$ 9,813.00
Total SSBG Award	\$ 76,313.00

AGENDA ITEM # IX.

From: Travis Kyhl

Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 7:31 PM

Cc:

Subject: Group Pictures

All,

Thanks again for attending our event today and making it great. Attached are the two group pictures that several have requested. If you see I've missed someone on the email list please forward it to them. I didn't have the emails for all the legislative folks.

Thanks again!

--

Travis Kyhl
Executive Director
435.893.0713



SIX COUNTY
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

From: Redge Johnson
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 5:24 AM
To: Travis Kyhl
Cc:

Subject: Re: Group Pictures

Thank you Travis,

Another successful and well executed event! Thanks to all those who helped with the planning and worked so hard to make this happen. I would especially like to thank all of the elected officials who took time to attend, discuss and plan a strategy to address the many challenges and opportunities we have regarding our Natural Resources and Public Lands! I am excited to see the progress we will make as we all work towards common goals.

Best Regards,

Redge Johnson
Consultant
Governors Public Lands Policy Office, State of Utah
801-870-3638





AGENDA ITEM # XII.

**FIVE COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
REVOLVING LOAN FUND
LOAN ADMINISTRATION BOARD**

Kris Braunberger, CPA
HintonBurdick
St. George, Utah
2 Year Term - Renewed 3/2019
Expires 3/2021

Mark Tilby
Department of Workforce Services
St. George, UT
2 Year Term - **Expired 3/2020** **Proposed**
Reappointment 08/2020 **Expire 03/2022**

Commissioner Gil Almquist
Five County AOG Steering Committee
St. George, Utah
Steering Committee Appointment 3/2019
Expires 03/2021

Chris McCormick, Pres. & CEO
Cedar City Chamber of Commerce
Cedar City, UT
2 Tear Term - Renewed 3/2019
Expires 3/2021

West Martin
Former Banker
St. George, Utah
2 Year Term - **Expired 3/2020** **Proposed**
Reappointment 08/2020 **Expire 03/2022**

Darrin Duncan
State Bank of Southern Utah
Cedar City, Utah
2 Year Term - Renewed 3/2019
Expires 3/2021

Shaun Warby, CPA
Warby & Johnson CPAs, PLLC
Cedar City, Utah
2 Year Term - Renewed 3/2019
Expires 3/2021

Eric Clarke
Washington County Attorney's Office
St. George, UT
2 Year Term - **Expired 3/2020** **Proposed**
Reappointment 08/2020 **Expire 03/2022**

Jack Lancaster
Local Business Owner
St. George, Utah
2 Year Term - **Was Vacant** **Proposed**
Appointment 08/2020 **Expire 03/2022**