

# Five County Association of Governments

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

Fax (435) 673-3540



**SOUTHWEST UTAH**

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 JAMES MATSON, CHAIR**

**DATE: AUGUST 7, 2013**

**SUBJECT: STEERING COMMITTEE, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14, 2013**

THE NEXT MEETING OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE WILL BE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14, 2013, AT THE GARFIELD COUNTY COURTHOUSE, UPSTAIRS CONFERENCE ROOM, LOCATED AT 55 SOUTH MAIN STREET, PANGUITCH, UTAH.

MATERIALS ARE ATTACHED TO ASSIST YOU IN PREPARING FOR THIS MEETING. PLEASE REVIEW ALL MATERIALS AND ADDRESS ANY QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS TO THE AOG STAFF, C/O BRYAN D. THIRIOT. THIS WOULD ALLOW TIME TO RESEARCH YOUR QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS PRIOR TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING.

WE LOOK FORWARD TO MEETING WITH YOU AT 1:00 P.M. IN PANGUITCH ON WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14, 2013.

BDT:DL  
ATTACHMENTS

# Five County Association of Governments

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

Fax (435) 673-3540



**SOUTHWEST UTAH**

Post Office Box 1550  
St. George, Utah 84771

Office (435) 673-3548

## **\*\* A G E N D A \*\***

**STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING, AUGUST 14, 2013  
GARFIELD COUNTY COURTHOUSE, UPSTAIRS CONFERENCE ROOM  
55 SOUTH MAIN STREET; PANGUITCH, UT - 1:00 P.M.**

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

- I. MINUTES JUNE 12, 2013 - REVIEW AND APPROVE**
- II. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTIONS - AUGUST 14, 2013**
- III. COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT (CSBG) - HUMAN SERVICES COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY 2014 FUND ALLOCATION**
- IV. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) - FY 2014 RATING AND RANKING CRITERIA DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL**
- V. STATE AGENCY UPDATES**
  - A. GOVERNOR'S OFFICE**
  - B. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**
  - C. DEPARTMENT OF WORKFORCE SERVICES**
- VI. UNIVERSITIES**
  - A. SOUTHERN UTAH UNIVERSITY UPDATE**
  - B. DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY UPDATE**
- VII. CONGRESSIONAL STAFF UPDATES**
- VIII. LOCAL AFFAIRS**
  - A. CORRESPONDENCE**
  - B. OUT-OF-STATE TRAVEL**
  - C. PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT BOARD APPLICATIONS**
  - D. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM FUNDING UPDATE**
  - E. PLANNING ASSISTANCE**
  - F. OTHER BUSINESS**
- IX. AREAWIDE CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEWS**

**Notice of Special Accommodations:** In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations, including auxiliary communicative aids and services, during this meeting should notify Bryan Thiriot, Executive Director, Five County Association of Governments: 1070 West 1600 South, Building B, St. George, Utah; Work # 1.435.673.3548, extension 121; Fax # 1.435.673.3540; or e-mail [bthiriot@fivecounty.utah.gov](mailto:bthiriot@fivecounty.utah.gov) at least three working days prior to the meeting.

**Notice of Electronic or Telephone Participation:** While board members are encouraged to attend in person, any Board member that is unable to attend in person may participate via a telephone conference call. To participate via telephone, Board members may dial in toll free: 1.800.444.2801. When prompted please enter session ID code: 3858200.

**BEAVER**

**GARFIELD**

**IRON**

**KANE**

**WASHINGTON**

# MINUTES

## STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

June 12, 2013

Kanab, Utah

### MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Commissioner Jim Matson, Chair  
Mayor Nina Laycook, Vice-Chair  
Wendy Allan  
Commissioner Mike Dalton  
Carolyn White, via electronic participation  
Commissioner Clare Ramsay  
Ken Platt  
Commissioner Dale Brinkerhoff  
Mayor Dutch Deutschlander for  
Mayor Connie Robinson  
Shane Adams  
Commissioner Denny Drake

### OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Ellen Schunk  
William Swadley  
Gary Webster  
Teresa Banks  
Dirk Clayson  
Duane Hufman  
Dave Conine  
Janice Kocher  
Warren Barlow  
Doug Carriger  
Bryan Thiriot  
Gary Zabriskie  
Carol Hollowell  
Scott Leavitt  
Diane Lamoreaux

### MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE

Mayor Bryan Sherwood, Excused  
Mayor Jerry Taylor, Excused  
Mayor Dan McGuire, Excused  
LuAnne Forrest  
Wes Curtis, Excused  
Frank Lojko

### REPRESENTING

Kane County Commissioner Representative  
Kane County Mayor Representative  
Kane County Schools Representative  
Beaver County Commissioner Representative  
Beaver County Schools Representative  
Garfield County Commissioner Representative  
Garfield County Schools Representative  
Iron County Commissioner Representative  
Iron County Mayor Representative

Iron County Schools Representative  
Washington Co. Commissioner Representative

Senator Lee's Office  
Senator Hatch's Office  
Congressman Chris Stewart's Office  
Department of Workforce Services  
Kane County Commissioner  
Kanab City  
USDA Rural Development  
USDA Rural Development  
Hildale City  
Sunrise Engineering  
Five County Association of Governments  
Five County Association of Governments

Beaver County Mayor Representative  
Garfield County Mayor Representative  
Washington County Mayor Representative  
Washington County Schools Representative  
Southern Utah University  
Dixie State University

Commissioner Jim Matson, Chair, welcomed everyone in attendance and introductions were provided. Those asking to be excused include: Mayor Bryan Sherwood, Beaver County Mayor Representative; Mayor Jerry Taylor, Garfield County Mayor Representative; Mayor Dan McGuire, Washington County Mayor Representative; and Mr. Wes Curtis, Southern Utah University

Representative. Mayor Dutch Deutschlander was in attendance representing Mayor Connie Robinson, Iron County Mayor Representative. Ms. Carolyn White joined the meeting via electronic participation.

**I. MINUTES APRIL 17, 2013 AND MAY 8, 2013 - REVIEW AND APPROVE**

Chairman Matson indicated that a quorum was present for conduct of business. Minutes of the April 17, 2013 and May 8, 2013 meetings were presented for discussion and consideration of approval.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER DENNY DRAKE, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DALE BRINKERHOFF, TO APPROVE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 17, 2013 AND MAY 8, 2013 MEETINGS AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED.**

**II. PREVIOUS STEERING COMMITTEE ACTION APPROVAL**

Chairman Matson reviewed previous Steering Committee actions that require approval because electronic participation was not advertised for that particular meeting. Future meeting notices will include the opportunity for participation electronically. Actions were reviewed as follows:

Approval of Human Services Council funding recommendation for FY 2014 Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) fund allocation.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER DENNY DRAKE, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CLARE RAMSAY, TO APPROVE HUMAN SERVICES COUNCIL RECOMMENDED FY 2014 FUNDING ALLOCATION FOR THE SSBG PROGRAM. MOTION CARRIED.**

Executive Committee recommendation to provide a 2% cost of living adjustment for FY 2014, to be determined from the total salaries divided by the number of employees, to provide an equal amount to each employee. Approval of the Indirect Cost Allocation Plan for FY 2014 at a rate of 12.0%.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER MIKE DALTON, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DENNY DRAKE TO APPROVE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTIONS AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED.**

Out-of-state travel authorization for Carol Hollowell, Lynnsi Hayes and Janna Roberts to attend the Senior Corps Conference in Washington, D.C. on June 18-22, 2013.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER CLARE RAMSAY, SECONDED BY MR. KEN PLATT, TO APPROVE OUT-OF-STATE TRAVEL AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THREE STAFF TO ATTEND THE SENIOR CORPS CONFERENCE IN WASHINGTON, D.C. MOTION CARRIED.**

Support for applications submitted to the Permanent Community Impact Fund Board (PCIFB) for the Brian Head Town park restoration reservoir and Cannonville Town culinary water master plan.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MAYOR NINA LAYCOOK, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DENNY DRAKE, TO SUPPORT THE TWO APPLICATIONS TO PCIFB. MOTION CARRIED.**

Areawide clearinghouse review supporting a range improvement project in western Kane County.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MAYOR NINA LAYCOOK, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CLARE RAMSAY, TO APPROVE THE A-95 REVIEW. MOTION CARRIED.**

**III. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTIONS - MAY 31, 2013 WORK SESSION & JUNE 12, 2013 MEETING**

Chairman Matson reviewed Executive Committee actions and discussion as follows: **1) FY 2013 Budget Revisions--** The committee reviewed, accepted and recommends approval of FY 2013 budget revisions; **2) FY 2014 Budget--** The budget was discussed and recommended for Steering Committee consideration; **3) USDA Rural Development, Mutual Self Help Program--** A presentation was made by USDA asking Five County to consider administering the Mutual Self-Help Program. A representative, Ms. Janice Kocher, is here today to provide a brief summary of the program for Board consideration; **5) Options Counseling Program--** It is the recommendation of Executive Committee members that additional information be presented for their review prior to a decision on acceptance of this program; and **6) Natural Resources Coordination and Cooperating Agency Training Course--** Discussion considering a training course that would be provided to Five County elected officials collectively. Commission representatives will discuss this proposal with their respective commissions for consideration as a future agenda item.

Ms. Janice Kocher, USDA Rural Development, reported that Color Country Community Housing, Inc. has been serving as the organization that provides Mutual Self Help Program technical assistance in the Five County region. Due to recent issues that have surfaced with CCCHI, USDA staff has approached the AOG to consider contracting for this work. She explained that there is approximately \$270,000 available for contract to complete 11 homes. The Five County AOG would not assume any liabilities of CCCHI. This program allows low and very-low income families to build their own homes by providing sweat equity work on the homes. The program has been very successful in the Five County region with projects in Ivins, Kanab, LaVerkin, and Enoch. Chairman Matson indicated that this agenda item will be considered later on the agenda.

**IV. FINANCIAL**

**A. FY 2014 BUDGET PUBLIC HEARING, REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Chairman Matson entertained a motion to enter into the budget public hearing.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY MR. KEN PLATT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MIKE DALTON, TO ENTER INTO THE FY 2014 BUDGET PUBLIC HEARING. MOTION CARRIED.**

Chairman Matson called for comments from committee members and others in attendance. Noting no comments, he entertained a motion to close the public hearing.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER DENNY DRAKE, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CLARE RAMSAY, TO CLOSE THE BUDGET PUBLIC HEARING. MOTION CARRIED.**

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER CLARE RAMSAY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DALE BRINKERHOFF, TO ACCEPT THE FY 2014 BUDGET AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED.**

**B. FY 2013 BUDGET REVISIONS APPROVAL**

Scott Leavitt reported that the Executive Committee reviewed and approved budget revisions for FY 2013. Budget revisions are presented for discussion and consideration four times during each budget year. Mid-year revisions were approved previously in February. Final budget revisions include shifting minor amounts of funding amounting to approximately \$50,000.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER MIKE DALTON, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DALE BRINKERHOFF, TO RATIFY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTION APPROVING FY 2013 BUDGET REVISIONS. MOTION CARRIED.**

**V. USDA RURAL DEVELOPMENT - MUTUAL SELF HELP PROGRAM DISCUSSION**

Chairman Matson requested that Commissioner Mike Dalton review Executive Committee discussion regarding this program. Commissioner Dalton explained that committee members reviewed the profit and loss statements of this program over the past five years to make sure that no debt or damage to the budget would occur. In essence, Five County would contract with USDA Rural Development to provide technical assistance for this program. Payment of \$25,000 for each home would be available to cover associated costs. Five County would be required to build 11 homes through a contract that would end September 30, 2014. Some of the employees from CCCHI would be hired on contract to provide construction supervision. Under this program, an on-site supervisor teaches the clients how to build their own homes. Clients are required to provide 30-35 hours of work each week on their home. The construction loan and long-term financing is provided to clients through USDA. The use of sweat equity brings down the price of the home and allows payment of the technical assistance for the program. As a general rule, the homes are constructed in close proximity for ease of supervision as well as developing a closeness between home owners. None of the home owners can move into their home until all of the homes are completed. The program provides an excellent service to low income individuals and will be available throughout the Five County region. It was noted that eight lots are available in Ivins and some are also available in LaVerkin to use for this program. Four applications are currently in process for clients that are interested in building on lots located in Ivins.

Bryan Thiriot reported that administration of this program would be the responsibility of the Five County Community and Economic Development Division, under the direction of Gary

Zabriskie, Deputy Director and Director of this Division. Scott Leavitt, CFO, would provide fiscal management and intake activities associated with the program. The intent is to contract with former CCHI employees to provide construction supervision.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER MIKE DALTON, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CLARE RAMSAY, TO APPROVE ENTERING INTO A \$270,000 CONTRACT WITH USDA RURAL DEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO BUILD 11 HOMES UNDER THE MUTUAL SELF HELP PROGRAM, AS PER DISCUSSION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. THE CONTRACT WILL EXTEND THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2014. MOTION CARRIED.**

**VI. STATE AGENCY UPDATES**

**A. GOVERNOR'S OFFICE**

No representative in attendance.

**B. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

No representative in attendance.

**C. DEPARTMENT OF WORKFORCE SERVICES**

Ms. Teresa Banks, DWS, reported that the economy is moving forward, but at a slower pace. Copies of the economic snapshot for each county were made available. Unemployment rates for the Five County area are as follows: **1) Beaver-- 5.3; 2) Garfield-- 10.2; 3) Iron-- 6.7; 4) Kane-- 6.4; and 5) Washington-- 6.2.** Building permit activity has increased, particularly in Washington County. Iron County has been successful in attracting the cyberjet company as the location for their plant expansion. It is anticipated that this employment opportunity will impact Iron County for the next 20 years and beyond as the company invests in the community and facilities. This particular company will pay employees above normal wages and intends on hiring from 1,200 to 1,400 positions. DWS is partnering with the Southwest ATC, universities and Mortan Metal Craft to make certain that training is available to support positions with the local workforce. Jobs associated with this business will include fabrication, wiring, jobs for other technical aspects, and people on the ground. It was noted that there will also be an instructor to provide training to pilots on how to fly these aircraft. Additional information will be made available as the project moves forward.

Dave Conine, State Director of USDA, commented that funding for the cyberjet project was provided through a USDA Rural Development loan guarantee working with a local bank. This company will support many other business offerings such as interior fabrication, aviation, and other upgrades by companies that are located in other areas of the state. He noted that this is an impressive aircraft that is very competitive and is certified for a single pilot. It is touted as the best long distance airplane in the world.

**VII. SOUTHERN UTAH UNIVERSITY**

Mr. Bryan Thiriot reported that Mr. Wes Curtis was unable to attend but provided copies of a handout titled "Rural Vistas". Individuals interested in receiving copies via e-mail can sign up on a sheet that is being passed around.

**VIII. DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY**

No representative in attendance.

**IX. CONGRESSIONAL STAFF UPDATES**

Ms. Ellen Schunk, Senator Lee's Office, provided copies of an article published in the Deseret News last week. The article presents Senator Lee's view of the immigration bill. Ms. Schunk read portions of the Senator's testimony on the House floor which included the need for additional border security prior to granting a path for citizenship. The bill contains a number of things that are of issue, including the fact that there is no Congressional oversight included in the reform. The Secretary of Homeland Security would be provided with broad discretion to waive standards and benchmarks provided in the bill. Senator Lee encourages true immigration reform that is pursued step by step in a proper sequence.

Mr. Bill Swadley, Senator Hatch's Office, reported that the immigration reform bill will be debated over the next few weeks, and more amendments will likely be introduced to address specific aspects of the bill. The Farm Bill passed in the Senate, but Senator Hatch voted against the bill because of the high level of spending on subsidies. Associated costs over the next ten years total approximately \$100 billion. The House of Representatives has their own version of the Farm Bill that contains some spending cuts. The legislation will go into conference to work out differences between the Senate and House. Commissioner Jim Matson commented that the Farm Bill has a dramatic impact on counties because it includes Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT). It is very important that this funding continues to counties.

**X. LOCAL AFFAIRS**

**A. CORRESPONDENCE**

None.

**B. OUT-OF-STATE TRAVEL**

Mr. Bryan Thiriot referenced out-of-state travel requests on pages 39-46 of the packet for Child Care employees as follows: **1) Kim Kitteridge**-- Authorization to travel to Washington, D.C. to attend the 2013 QRIS National Meeting to be held on July 31<sup>st</sup> through August 2<sup>nd</sup>. The state of Utah is covering the cost of lodging and registration for this conference; and **2) Kristen Clark and Carrie Sigler**-- Travel authorization to attend the NAFCC conference in Scottsdale, Arizona on July 18-20, 2013. Funds are included in the budget to cover associated costs.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER DENNY DRAKE, SECONDED BY MAYOR NINA LAYCOOK, TO APPROVE OUT-OF-STATE TRAVEL REQUESTS FOR CHILD CARE EMPLOYEES AS OUTLINED. MOTION CARRIED.**

**C. PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD (PCIFB) APPLICATIONS**

Mr. Gary Zabriskie referenced summaries for applications that were submitted to PCIFB in June. He described the process of application submission, meetings to hear applications and the funding meeting. The Steering Committee is asked to review all applications submitted to PCIFB. The interest rate has dropped to 1.5% for all loans. Commissioner Denny Drake explained how mineral lease monies are received and allocated. He explained that the Five County area does not generate a lot of mineral lease production. However, a large amount of money has been approved as loans and grants in the Five County area. He noted that as a member of the PCIFB Board, it is very difficult to be supportive of applications unless they are for public safety or infrastructure. Those intending on making application for PCIFB grants or loans should contact Gary Zabriskie to obtain help through the process. It was also noted that PCIFB board members question various project costs, particularly engineering costs. The Board has the option to support, not support, or remain neutral.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER CLARE RAMSAY, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DALE BRINKERHOFF, TO SUPPORT ALL OF THE APPLICATIONS TO THE PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD AS PRESENTED IN THE PACKET. MOTION CARRIED.**

**D. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM FUNDING UPDATE**

Ms. Diane Lamoreaux provided a handout containing the final numbers provided by state CDBG staff for FY 2013 Community Development Block Grant allocation. The table provided in the Steering Committee packet does not reflect the final allocation to the region. Approximately \$3,900 of additional money was received that has been included in the Cedar City Housing Authority project. Rating and Ranking of CDBG projects was previously approved in April to fund the highest ranked applications until funds are exhausted. Five County AOG will receive \$704,332 for FY 2013. The Cedar City Housing Authority will receive \$164,332 in the first year funding and \$135,668 will be committed from the FY 2014 CDBG allocation. This is the only multi-year project that was funded.

**E. PLANNING ASSISTANCE**

None.

**F. OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**XI. AREAWIDE CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEWS**

None.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 14, 2013 in Panguitch at the Garfield County Courthouse.

**MOTION TO ADJOURN WAS MADE BY MAYOR NINA LAYCOOK, SECONDED BY MS. WENDY ALLAN.**

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

**AGENDA ITEM # IV.**

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
FY 2014 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 2014. 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:				
Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)								
	Excellent (9-10 score) 4 points	Very Good (7-8 score) 3 points	Good (5-6 score) 2 points	Fair (3-4 score) 1 point	Poor (1-2 score) 0 points	Score	X Weight	Total Score
1	Capacity to Carry Out The Grant: Performance history of capacity to administer grant. Score comes from Worksheet #1. (First-time & <5-y/ grantees: default = Good)	1 - 5% 2 points	5.1 - 10% 1 point				.5	
2	Grant Administration: Concerted effort made by grantee to minimize grant administration costs.	0% CDBG Funds 3 points						
3	Job Creation: Estimated number of new permanent jobs completed project will create or number of jobs retained that would be lost without this project.	> 4 Jobs 4 points	3-4 Jobs 3 points	2 Jobs 2 points	1 Job 1 point			
4	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	.1% - 1.0% above state average 1.0 point		Up to state average 0 points
5 A	Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - <u>Jurisdiction Population &lt;500</u> 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		
5 B	Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - <u>Jurisdiction Population 501 - 1,000</u> 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		
5 C	Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - <u>Jurisdiction Population 1,001 - 5,000</u> 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		
5 D	Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - <u>Jurisdiction Population &gt;5,000</u> 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		

**AGENDA ITEM # IV. (Continued)**

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 - 100 5 points	\$101-200 4 points	\$201-400 3 points	\$401 - 800 2 points	\$801 or > 1 point	#6 or >			
6 CDBG funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by # of beneficiaries.		High # 1 6 points	High # 2 5 points	High # 3 4 points	High # 4 3 points	High # 5 2 points	High # >5 1 point	1.0		
7 T* Jurisdiction's Project Priority: Project priority rating in Regional Consolidated Plan. (Capital Investment Plan - One-Year Action Plan)		# 1 6 points	# 2 5 points	# 3 4 points	# 4 3 points	# 5 2 points	#6 or > 1 point	2.0		
8 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 Executive Committee.)		# 1 6 points	# 2 5 points	# 3 4 points	# 4 3 points	# 5 2 points	#6 or > 1 point	2.0		
9 Regional Project Priority: Determined by the Executive Director with consultation of the AOG Executive Committee members. The Executive Committee is comprised of one (1) County Commissioner from each of the five counties.		# 1 LMI Housing Activities 6 points	# 2 Community Facilities 5 points	# 3 Public Utility Infrastructure 4 points	# 4 Public Safety Activities 3 points	# 5 Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA) 2 points	#6 or > Parks and Recreation 1 point	2.0		
10 LMI Housing Stock: Number of units constructed, rehabilitated, or made accessible to 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	2 Units 1 point	1.0		
11 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 either 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		
12 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		
13 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		

**AGENDA ITEM # IV. (Continued)**

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
		91 - 100% 5 points	81 - 90% 4 points	71 - 80% 3 points	61 - 70% 2 points	51 - 60% 1 point				
14 Jurisdiction's LMI Population: Percent of residents considered 80 percent or less LMI (based on LMI Survey).	%	91 - 100% 5 points	81 - 90% 4 points	71 - 80% 3 points	61 - 70% 2 points	51 - 60% 1 point		1.0		
15 Extent of Poverty: If an applicant satisfactorily documents the percentage of Low Income (LI - 50%) and Very Low Income (VLI - 30%) persons directly benefiting from a project; or can show the percentage of Low Income/Very Low Income of the community as a whole; additional points shall be given in accordance with the following. Percentage of total population of jurisdiction or project area who are low income and very low income.	%	20% or More 5 points	15 - 19% 4 points	10 - 14% 3 points	5 - 9% 2 points	1 - 4% 1 point		1.0		
16 Presumed LMI Group: 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% 5 points	80 - 99% 4 points	60 - 79% 3 points	51 - 59% 2 points			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 #18.		Very High 4 points	High 3 points	Fair 2 points	Low 1 point			0.5		
18 Application Quality: Application identifies problem, contains a well-defined scope of work and is cost-effective. Score comes from Worksheet #19.		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 18 month contract period and is clearly documented. Score comes from Worksheet #20.		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, Five County AOG Grant - Administration, Consolidated Plan, Rating & Ranking, Program Delivery for Housing Programs and Economic Development Technical Assistance and Planning  
 \$135,668, Cedar City on behalf of the Cedar City Housing Authority - 2<sup>nd</sup> year funding of multi-year project for LMI Housing Property Acquisition

**AGENDA ITEM # IV. (Continued)**

**CRITERIA 1 WORKSHEET**

STATE OF UTAH DIVISION OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - GRANTEE PERFORMANCE RATING										
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Score (10 Points Total)
Excellent ⇐ _____ (Circle One) _____ ⇒ Poor										
Person Providing Evaluation: (Circle)      Keith      Cheryl      Glenna										
Excellent	=	9 to 10								
Very Good	=	7 to 8								
Good	=	5 to 6								
Fair	=	3 to 4								
Poor	=	1 to 2								
Total Points: _____ Rating: _____ (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor)										

**AGENDA ITEM # IV. (Continued)**

**CRITERIA 17 WORKSHEET**

PRO-ACTIVE PLANNING			Score (4 Points Total)
Criteria	Support Documentation Provided		
1. Has the local jurisdiction provided information demonstrating pro-active planning and land use in their community in coordination and cooperation with other governments?	Yes ___ 1 point	No ___ 0 points	1 point
2. Has the applicant documented that the project is in accordance with an adopted master plan (i.e., water facilities master plan, etc.)	Yes ___ 1 point	No ___ 0 points	1 point
3. Has the applicant documented incorporation of housing opportunity and affordability into community planning (i.e. General Plan housing policies, development fee deferral policies, etc.)	Yes ___ 1 point	No ___ 0 points	1 point
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 ___ 1 point	No ___ 0 points	1 point
Very High = 4 Points High = 3 Points Fair = 2 Points Low = 1 Point			Total Points: _____ Rating: _____ (Very High, High, Fair, Low)

**AGENDA ITEM # IV. (Continued)**

**CRITERIA 18 WORKSHEET**

APPLICATION QUALITY			
Criteria	Support Documentation	Other Documentation	Score (7 Points Total)
1. Problem Identification	Additional written text provided? Yes ___ 1 point No ___ 0 points	Detailed Architectural/Engineering Report prepared? Yes ___ 2 points No ___ 0 points	
2. Is proposed solution well defined in Scope of Work? In other words, is solution likely to solve problem?	Yes ___ 1 point No ___ 0 points	1 point	2 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	1 point	
4. Does proposed project duplicate any existing services or activities already available and provided to beneficiaries in that jurisdiction through other programs, i.e. those locally or regionally based.	No ___ 2 points (Does not Duplicate) Yes ___ 0 points (Duplicates Services)	2 points	
Excellent = 7 Points Very Good = 6 Points Good = 5 Points Fair = 4 Points Acceptable = 3 Points Poor = 2 Points			Total Points: _____ Rating: _____ (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Acceptable, Poor)

**AGENDA ITEM # IV. (Continued)**

**CRITERIA 19 WORKSHEET**

PROJECT MATURITY			Score (9 Points Total)
Criteria	Status		
1. Architect/Engineer already selected and is actively involved in the application process	Yes ___ 1 point      No ___ 0 points	1 point	
2. Is there evidence that the project manager has the capacity to carry out the project in a timely manner?	Yes ___ 1 point      No ___ 0 points	1 point	
3. Is the proposed solution to problem identified in the Scope of Work <u>ready to proceed immediately</u> ?	(Well Defined) Yes ___ 2 points      No ___ 0 points	2 points	
4. Are architectural or engineering design/plans (i.e. blueprints) already completed for the project?	Yes ___ 2 points      No ___ 0 points	2 points	
5. Funding Status (Maturity)	Is CDBG the only funding source for the project? Yes ___ 1 point      No ___ 0 points (or) All other project funding is 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	1 point  2 points  3 points	
Excellent = 9 Points Very Good = 8 Points Good = 7 Points Fair = 6 Points Acceptable = 5 Points Poor = 4 Points or Less			Total Points: _____ Rating: _____ (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Acceptable, Poor)

**AGENDA ITEM # IV. (Continued)**

**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. Points 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 will visit each applicant on site for an 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 recommendation to the RRC (Steering Committee) for consideration and approval.
5. Maximum amount per year to a jurisdiction is \$150,000.00.
6. Maximum years for a multi-year project is 2 years at \$150,000 per year.
7. All applications for multi-year funding must contain a complete budget and budget breakdown for each specific year of funding. Depending on available funding, all or part of the second year funding of a multi-year project may be made available in year one.
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 pre-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. A letter from the governing board of the sub-recipient requesting the sponsorship of the project must accompany the pre-application. This letter must be signed by the board chairperson.
9. Projects must be consistent with the District's Consolidated Plan. The project applied for must be included in the prioritized capital improvements list (CIP) that the entity submitted for inclusion in the Consolidated Plan. Your jurisdiction's CIP is due no later than January 9, 2014 at 5:00 p.m. If your CIP 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.
10. Previously allocated pre-approved funding:
  - \$90,000 Five County AOG (Consolidated Plan Planning, Administration, Rating & Ranking, Housing Program Delivery and Economic Dev. Technical Assistance and Planning)
  - \$135,668 Cedar City on behalf of the Cedar City Housing Authority for balance of year two multi-year funded project.

#### **AGENDA ITEM # IV. (Continued)**

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, are encouraged to 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. Policy regarding funding of housing related projects: It is the policy of the Five County Association of Governments RRC (Steering Committee) that CDBG funds in this region be directed to the development of brick and mortar LMI housing projects, or utilized for necessary infrastructure for that housing. CDBG funds in this region shall not be utilized for LMI rental assistance.
17. 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.

Adopted by the Five County Association of Governments Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee) August 14, 2002, as amended August 14, 2013.

**AGENDA ITEM # IV. (Continued)**

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
HOW-TO-APPLY CDBG 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, or county clerk satisfies the above referenced attendance requirement of the prospective applicant's jurisdiction. In addition, attendance by a city manager, town clerk, or county administrator also satisfies this requirement.

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 at the beginning of the workshop.

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.

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).

## AGENDA ITEM # IV. (Continued)

### FY 2014 Regional Prioritization Criteria and Justification

**Criteria #9: Regional Project Priority** Project priority rating with regional goals and policies. Regional prioritization is determined by the Executive Director with consultation of the AOG Executive Committee members.

#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 point	X 2.0 (weighting)	=	2.0 points

#### Regional Prioritization

#### Justification

#1	<b>LMI Housing Activities</b>	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 buyers 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.
#2	<b>Community Facilities</b>	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.
#3	<b>Public Utility Infrastructure</b>	Projects designed to increase the capacity of water and other utility systems to better serve the customers and/or improve fire flow capacity. Other funding sources usually available. Adjusting water rates are a usual funding source. Other agencies also fund this category. Includes wastewater disposal projects.
#4	<b>Public Safety Activities</b>	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 but 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 can form Special Service Districts (SSD's) to generate revenue stream.
#5	<b>Projects to remove architectural barriers</b>	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. Only CDBG and sometimes PCIFB have stepped up to fund this mandate.
#6	<b>Parks and Recreation</b>	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 Executive Committee members, reviewed and obtained consensus of the regional prioritization for the CDBG program.

**Five County Association of Governments  
CDBG Rating and Ranking Program Year 2014  
Data Sources**

1. **CAPACITY TO CARRY OUT THE GRANT:** The grantee must have a history of successful grant administration in order 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 2.5 points. To adequately evaluate grantee performance, the RRC must consult with the state staff. State staff will rate performance on a scale of 1-10 (Ten 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. Worksheet #1 used to determine score.
2. **GRANT ADMINISTRATION:** Grant administration costs will be taken from the CDBG pre-application. Those making a concerted effort to minimize grant administration costs taken from CDBG funds will be awarded extra points.
3. **JOB CREATION:** Information provided by applicant prior to rating and ranking. Applicant must be able to adequately support proposed figures for job creation or retention potential. This pertains to permanent jobs created as a result of the project, not jobs utilized in the construction of a project. Two part-time employees = 1 full-time.
4. **UNEMPLOYMENT:** "Utah Economic and Demographic Profiles" (most current issue available prior to rating and ranking), provided by Utah Office of Planning and Budget; or "Utah Labor Market Report" (most current issue with annual averages), provided by Department of Workforce Services.
5. **FINANCIAL COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (Self-Help Financing):** From 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 in the Five County Region. 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 Utah Office of Planning and Budget) will determine whether they are Category A, B, C or D for the purposes of this criteria.

**AGENDA ITEM # IV. (Continued)**

6. **CDBG DOLLARS REQUESTED PER CAPITA:** Determined by dividing the dollar amount requested in the CDBG application by the beneficiary population.
7. **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.)
8. **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 application, determination is made by the Steering Committee Chair, in consultation with the AOG Executive Committee.)
9. **REGIONAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND POLICIES:** Determined by the Executive Director with consultation of the AOG Executive Committee members. The Executive Committee is comprised of one County Commissioner from each of the five counties.
10. **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.
11. **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 it's adopted Affordable Housing Plan or the project meets a regional affordable housing goal in the Consolidated Plan.
12. **GEOGRAPHIC EXTENT OF PROJECT'S IMPACT:** The actual area to be benefitted by the project applied for.
13. **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: .70% for municipalities, and .32% for counties.

**AGENDA ITEM # IV. (Continued)**

- 14. 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.
- 15. EXTENT OF POVERTY:** Based on information provided by applicant prior to rating and ranking that satisfactorily documents the percentage of Low Income (LI - 50%) and Very Low Income (VLI - 30%) persons directly benefitting from a project.
- 16. PRESUMED LMI 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.
- 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

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 identification, justification, and well-defined scope of work likely to address identified problems.
- 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 solution to problem is identified in the Scope of Work and ready to proceed immediately; 4) has completed architectural/engineering design (blueprints); and 5) 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.

**AGENDA ITEM # IX.**

**STEERING COMMITTEE**

**REVIEWS**

**AREAWIDE CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEWS  
FOR PLANNING DISTRICT V**

**NOTIFICATIONS - Supportive**

**August 14, 2013**

**1. Title: SPECIAL USE LEASE APPLICATION # 1778 (SULA 1778)**

**Applicant: Trust Lands Administration**

**Description: The State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration received a lease application for 2.69 acres of Trust Lands east of Beaver City on the Beaver Mountain in Beaver County. It was noted that the actual surface disturbance will be 0.69 acres even though the lease will be for 2.69 acres.**

<b>Funding:</b>	<b><u>Amount</u></b>	<b><u>Agency</u></b>	<b><u>SAI #</u></b>
	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>39480</b>
			<b>Received 7/22/2013</b>

**Comments: The Utah State School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) proposes to lease 2.69 acres of land located east of Beaver City on the Beaver Mountain in Beaver County. It is noted that only 0.69 acre will have surface disturbance. SITLA has indicated that this commercial lease is currently subject to a non-disclosure agreement. Regional policies support SITLA development proposals as long as appropriate local land use approvals, when required, are pursued and obtained. According to SITLA, Beaver County has also been separately notified of this proposed lease. (Gary Zabriskie)**

AGENDA ITEM # IX.

STEERING COMMITTEE

REVIEWS

AREAWIDE CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEWS  
FOR PLANNING DISTRICT V

NOTIFICATIONS - Supportive

August 14, 2013

2. Title: SPIKE HOLLOW VEGETATION TREATMENT - RANGE  
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (RIP) # 530

Applicant: Trust Lands Administration

Description: SITLA, in cooperation with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR), propose to remove pinyon and juniper trees followed by seeding on approximately 1,000 acres of trust lands. The P/J tree removal would be accomplished with a two-way chaining. The treated area would be aerial seeded. It is anticipated that without treatment the encroachment of the pinyon/juniper will continue until the sagebrush steppe community is lost completely. Encroachment that has already occurred has decreased the quantity and quality of habitat for Mule Deer, Elk, and other sagebrush obligate species. There has also been a decrease in vegetative diversity. The purpose of the project is to improve watershed health, wildlife habitat, and increase forage for livestock.

Funding: Amount                      Agency                      SAI #

N/A                                      N/A                                      39544

Received 7/26/2013

Comments: The State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA), in cooperation with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR), proposes a project to chain and seed approximately 1,000 acres in western Beaver County which is expected to improve watershed health, wildlife habitat, and increased forage for livestock. Regional policies support efforts to improve rangeland health. Beaver County has also been separately notified of this proposed joint project. (Gary Zabriskie)

AGENDA ITEM # IX.

STEERING COMMITTEE

REVIEWS

AREAWIDE CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEWS  
FOR PLANNING DISTRICT V

NOTIFICATIONS - Conditional

August 14, 2013

3. Title: EAST CIRCLEVILLE VEGETATION ENHANCEMENT  
RANGE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (RIP) # 531

Applicant: Trust Lands Administration

Description: SITLA, in cooperation with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR), propose to remove pinyon and juniper trees followed by seeding on approximately 460 acres of trust lands. The pinyon/juniper removal would be accomplished with a two-way chaining. The treated area would be aerial seeded. It is anticipated that without treatment the encroachment of the pinyon/juniper will continue into historic shrub steppe habitat and is at risk for a catastrophic wildfire. Wildlife habitat has also degraded with a loss of vegetative diversity. The purpose of the project is to increase vegetative diversity, seeing an increase in grasses, forbes, and shrubs in both occurrence and vigor. The project is also intended to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire through a decrease in the continuous pinyon/juniper canopy.

Funding:	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>SAI #</u>
	N/A	N/A	39545

Received 7/26/2013

Comments: The State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA), in cooperation with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR), proposes a project to chain and seed approximately 460 acres in along the southern boundary of Piute County adjacent to Garfield County. The project is expected to increase vegetative diversity, seeing an increase in grasses, forbs, and shrubs in both occurrence and vigor. The project also is intended to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire through a decrease in the continuous pinyon/juniper canopy. Garfield County is generally supportive of this action with one provision. Garfield County places great priority on grazing. The description of the action states that grazing will be "rested from grazing for at least two season." If the intent of the action is to reduce grazing over a period longer than two or three years, Garfield County would oppose the action. (Gary Zabriskie)