



SIX COUNTY
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Annual Action Plan

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019

PREPARED BY: TRAVIS KYHL – CDBG PROGRAM MANAGER

SIX COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS – 250 N MAIN ST, RICHFIELD, UT 84701

PHONE: (435) 893-0713 – TKYHL@SIXCOUNTY.COM

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Index of Figures..... | 1 |
| Executive Summary..... | 2 |
| Outreach | 3 |
| Consultation | 3 |
| Citizen Participation | 4 |
| Goals & Objectives | 5 |
| Allocation priorities..... | 7 |
| Expected Resources | 8 |
| Geographic Distribution..... | 8 |
| Method of Distribution | 9 |
| Barriers to Affordable Housing | 11 |
| Other | 12 |
| Home Management..... | 12 |
| Lead Based Paint..... | 12 |
| Coordination | 12 |
| Appendix I: Newspaper Articles for Citizen Outreach | 13 |
| Appendix II: Citizen Participation Survey..... | 14 |
| Appendix III: CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria for the SCAOG Region..... | 15 |
| Appendix IV: PY 18 CDBG Applicant Scoring & Funded Projects | 17 |
| Appendix V: Citizen Consultation Form | 19 |
| Appendix VI: Agency Consultation Forms..... | 22 |
| Appendix VII: CDBG Application Policies & Procedures..... | 26 |

Index of Figures

| | |
|--|---|
| Table 1: Consultation of Agencies and Jurisdictions..... | 3 |
| Table 2: Jurisdictions of the SCAOG Region..... | 4 |
| Table 3: Numbers of those Served in PY 2017 | 6 |
| Table 4: Goals for PY 2018 | 6 |
| Table 5: CDBG funding break-down by jurisdiction | 7 |
| Table 6: Importance of Funding Criteria | 9 |

Executive Summary

This plan, prepared by Six County Association of Governments (SCAOG) Office of Economic and Community Development, is meant to provide a regional overview of housing and community development priorities with descriptions of resources available to achieve these priorities for program year 2018 (July 1, 2018 - June 30, 2019).

SCAOG is the lead agency in charge of the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) for Central Utah. The region covers Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, and Wayne Counties in the State of Utah and 49 communities within these counties.

The objectives of this plan are to:

- Provide a forum of collaboration between community leaders, service providers, and citizens;
- Create a set of one-year goals for Six County AOG to move forward with.
- Provide an annual extension/update of strategies to fit in with the Five-Year Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan.

The expected outcomes of this plan are to:

- Create a usable and relevant document for community leaders, service providers, and citizens to have a reference when considering local needs for the next year;
- Provide assistance to communities when applying for community and housing grant funding, particularly for the CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) program;
- Implement projects and goals in order to better allocate CDBG money to the communities in terms of need;
- Aid planning and community assistance projects in allocating funding to individuals and communities in terms of need.
- Aid local leaders and the AOG in determining priorities for the future

Personal interviews are conducted with the elected officials and staff of every jurisdiction on an annual basis. In the past this approach of community visits has allowed officials to speak openly about their concerns and set real goals and priorities for housing and community development.

Citizens and service providers are also invited to share their knowledge of needed infrastructure. This year an article about the planning process was published in several local papers of the region. The article discussed the importance of the plan and provided a link to a survey about local needs. A copy of this article and survey may be found in Appendix I and II.

Even with this method it was difficult to reach out to citizens. Zero citizens participated in the anonymous survey.

This plan will be available for public comment from January 25 to February 24, 2018 and a public meeting will be held on February 7, 2018 to gather public input on this plan. Comments from this period will be included in this plan.

The objectives and outcomes identified in this plan are derived by input from local government, SCAOG agencies, and citizens. They are listed below.

- Provide safe and healthy affordable housing for low-income individuals, especially those who are disabled;

- Prevent homelessness by offering overnight shelter and rental assistance;
- Improve the quality of life for elderly and disabled individuals;
- Improve infrastructure of jurisdictions with citizens that primarily make a low-moderate income.

Outreach

Consultation

SCAOG takes three approaches to involve organizations in the creation of the Annual Action Plan:

- Visit elected officials and staff in their own locale every January. Collect a list of Capital Improvements and other projects. This is during the planning process.
- Survey Service Providers about local needs during the planning process
- Meet with the SCAOG Housing and Community Action Programs (HCAP) department during the planning process.
- Mail and e-mail the draft of the annual action plan to the above mentioned organizations for comment and revisions during the public comment period.
- Hold a public hearing for the plan.

Table 1: Consultation of Agencies and Jurisdictions

| Organization Consulted | Result of Consultation |
|--|--|
| Service Provider’s Council | Maintain knowledge of area needs; learn potential ways to solve these needs. |
| SCAOG Housing | Understand Housing Programs, and collected data and goals on rehabilitation Programs |
| SCAOG Community Action Programs | Understand Community Assistant programs, collect data and goals regarding rental assistance and homeless prevention. |
| SCAOG Elected Officials | Improves relationship with constituents, collect data and goals for the capital improvement list. |

This plan was created by the coordination and cooperation of every jurisdiction (cities, counties, and towns) in the region. The communities were presented with their one year, and two to five year capital improvement goals. The elected officials guided SCAOG in updating this plan and the Capital Improvement List. They provided community project goals, including funding, and grant or loan sources (especially CDBG and CIB). Please see Appendix IV for more details about consultation.

Table 2: Jurisdictions of the SCAOG Region

| Juab | Millard | Piute | Sanpete | Sevier | Wayne |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eureka • Levan • Mona • Nephi • Rocky Ridge | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delta • Fillmore • Hinckley • Holden • Kanosh • Leamington • Lynndyl • Meadow • Oak City • Scipio | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Circleville • Junction • Kingston • Marysvale | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centerfield • Ephraim • Fairview • Fayette • Fountain Green • Gunnison • Manti • Mayfield • Moroni • Mount Pleasant • Spring City • Sterling • Wales | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annabella • Aurora • Central Valley • Elsinore • Glenwood • Joseph • Koosharem • Monroe • Redmond • Richfield • Salina • Sigurd | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bicknell • Hanksville • Loa • Lyman • Torrey |

Citizen Participation

Six County AOG takes three approaches to involve citizens in the creation of the Annual Action Plan:

- Publish feature article in the local papers about the Annual Action Plan. Invite public input in-person, online, e-mail, mail, or by telephone (See Appendix I)
- Provide online survey about community needs (See Appendix II)
- Discuss the Plan on the front page of the AOG website, www.sixcounty.com.
- Post public notice in local papers to inform public that the Plan is open to comment for a 30 day comment period. Invite service providers to participate.
- Hold public hearing for the plan during the comment period.

It is difficult to collect citizen input. No public comments were received during the 30 day comment period.

During the creation of the draft plan, SCAOG staff invited the local papers to publish a feature article about the Annual Action Plan process.

The draft plan was open for public comment from January 25 to February 24, 2018. A notice was published to open the comment period. It was published in every local paper of the region (Sanpete Messenger, Millard County Chronicle Progress, Gunnison Gazette, Nephi Times News, The Pyramid, The Richfield Reaper, the Wayne & Garfield County Insider. The text of the notice is as follows:

REGIONAL ANNUAL ACTION PLAN ON HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
30-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

Public comments will be accepted from January 25 to February 24, 2018 on the Annual Action Plan of Housing and Community Development for the Six County Region Program Year 2018. The DRAFT plan may be reviewed at www.sixcounty.com or 250 North Main Suite B12, Richfield, UT. To comment please print and fill out a form at www.sixcounty.com or contact Travis Kyhl at phone: (435)-893-0713, mail: PO Box 820, Richfield, UT 84701 or email: tkyhl@sixcounty.com.

There will be a Public Hearing on February 7, 2018 at 10:00 AM located at 250 N Main Street Suite B20, Richfield, Utah. The purpose of the hearing will be to take public comment concerning the DRAFT plan.

In compliance with the Disability Act, individuals wishing to attend this meeting and who require special accommodations should contact Travis Kyhl at least three (3) working days prior to the meeting.

Goals & Objectives

SCAOG operates HUD contracts to assist the region with community action, housing, and community development (including capital improvements).

The SCAOG HCAP department works with individuals needing immediate financial assistance. The department anticipates assisting 87 households/246 individuals with rent payments during PY 17. The department's goal for PY 18 will be to assist 28 households with rent. This number is lower than those served last year due to a decrease in funding. A total of 20 households or 30 individuals that were homeless were provided a total of 39 nights of shelter. There are no shelters other than New Horizon's Crisis Center, in the region, so they were offered vouchers for short hotel stays.

Homeowner housing and housing rehabilitation are also offered through the SCAOG HCAP department. Funds through a CDBG set-aside are used for housing rehabilitation for those earning a low-moderate income. There is a spending maximum of \$10,000 on each home. Last year 20 homes were assisted by this program and it is planned to assist the same number next year. Disabled individuals are a priority for the program, and it is a goal to assist six next year.

Table3: Estimated Numbers of those Served in PY 2017

| Goal Outcome Indicator | Quantity |
|---|---|
| Homeowner housing rehabilitated | 19 Household Housing Unit |
| Tenant-based rental assistance/Rapid rehousing | 37 households 96 individuals |
| Homeless person overnight shelter | 36 households 54 individuals, 35 nights |

Table 4: Goals for PY 2018

| One year goals for the number of households supported through: | | One year goals for the number of households to be supported : | |
|---|----|--|----|
| Rental assistance | 30 | Homeless | 30 |
| The production of new units | 0 | Non-homeless | 0 |
| Rehab of existing units | 20 | Total | 30 |
| Acquisition of existing units | 0 | | |
| Total | 50 | | |

The SCAOG Community and Economic Development department manages the HUD funded Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program for the region. Infrastructure is a high priority for the CDBG program in Central Utah. The Regional Review Committee (RRC), which comprises the SCAOG Executive Board, has chosen to prioritize infrastructure, especially those dealing with water and sewer. See the Allocation Priorities and Method of Distribution section for a list of funding priorities for CDBG funding.

Allocation priorities

SCAOG has developed a ranking system that aims to prioritize the distribution of CDBG funds. This ranking system is updated annually by the RRC, based off the recommendations of SCAOG staff and the needs determined through this plan. Appendix III lists the region’s 2018 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria.

As noted in the 2017 Annual Action Plan, infrastructure projects, especially those to do with water and sewer, are top priorities for CDBG allocations. Promoting projects with improvements following the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is also considered a regional priority. This is a recent addition to the rating and ranking criteria, and was added as an expressed need by several of the communities or counties of the region needing to update their public buildings.

Communities with higher rates of citizens who make a low-moderate Income (according to HUD income limits) also receive ranking status as CDBG funding candidates, as do those projects with wider geographical impact. Applicants that have more than one funding source for a project are also more likely to receive CDBG funding allocations.

Allocation priorities are meant to encourage new applicants to apply in order to assist all jurisdictions in the region as much as possible. Those that have not been funded in the past four years are ranked as a higher priority for CDBG funds. Table 6 lists these communities.

The jurisdictions have designated the projects they plan to apply for CDBG funding in the next few years. This list is part of the Regional Capital Improvements List and is forthcoming.

The SCAOG Community and Economic Development department receives a set-aside for administration of the CDBG program in the Six County region. These funds are prioritized because of administrative requirements necessary to obtain CDBG funding. These include but are not limited to: 1) Developing and publishing the Six County Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan Updates; 2) Providing technical assistance to counties, communities, and other project applicants in qualifying for CDBG funding through application preparation, submission, and other support.

The Housing Rehabilitation Program will remain a priority, receiving a \$100,000 set-aside from the annual CDBG allocation. If an individual or family earns a low income and their home has an issue that poses a health or safety threat, the program will provide a repair costing under \$10,000. Preference is

Table 5: CDBG funding break-down by jurisdiction

| Not funded within past 5-years | Never Funded |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annabella • Centerfield • Elsinore • Eureka • Fairview • Gunnison • Hanksville • Joseph • Kanosh • Koosharem • Manti • Monroe • Piute County • Scipio • Wales | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aurora • Bicknell • Central Valley • Fillmore • Glenwood • Holden • Junction • Kingston • Leamington • Lyman • Lynndyl • Mayfield • Meadow • Moroni • Oak City • Redmond* • Rocky Ridge • Salina • Sevier County • Sigurd • Spring City* • Sterling • Torrey |
| <p>* Funded in PY 18</p> | |

given to individuals with a disability. This project is being prioritized because of its provision for providing safe and healthy living environments for the region's citizens who earn a low-income.

Expected Resources

Annual allocation of resources to support programs administered by the SCAOG total nearly four million dollars. These include federal, state, and local dollars. These funds are utilized to enhance the quality of life among the citizens of the Six County region. However, for purposes related to the Consolidated Plan, approximately \$1.4 million is directly associated with support services for the low income.

Funding from state and federal sources is very specific in purpose. As it relates to the goals and objectives of the CDBG program, the following provide services that benefit the low and moderate income as it relates to affordable housing, community development and other services. These include programs for HEAT assistance, rental assistance, home weatherization and rehabilitation, and CDBG.

Historically approximately \$550,000 is allocated to the Six County region for CDBG. Administration of the grant program is allocated \$50,000, and about \$100,000 is allocated towards housing rehabilitation through SCAOG HCAP. This leaves \$400,000 on average for other projects. This amount has increased to approximately \$657,000 for PY 18 with continuing discussing concerning the allocation formula. There are no plans to leverage the CDBG funds with private, other state, or local funds at SCAOG, but applicants are encouraged to leverage CDBG funds. There are no matching requirements for CDBG funding recipients through SCAOG. Applicants are encouraged to leverage their projects with outside or local funds.

Geographic Distribution

The Six County Region has an arguably similar population and income trends throughout. Every jurisdiction in the region is considered rural, and there is not much geographic variation concerning funding need. For this reason, SCAOG will not target any specific areas or jurisdictions in the upcoming year and funds will not be distributed based on location. Even so, this year, the AOG has especially promoted the program to communities that do not generally participate.

Jurisdictions that have not applied or received CDBG funding at all or recently, as noted, are specifically contacted and asked about the reasons for not applying. The jurisdictions are encouraged to participate in upcoming funding cycles. This approach has improved applicant numbers.

Method of Distribution

As mentioned above, the Six County Regional Review Committee reviews applicants and approves projects for funding. The applicant projects are judged by a set criteria and assigned points depending on how they measure. Table 8 demonstrates which criteria offer the highest points if met. Please see Appendix III for all of the rating and ranking criteria and points available.

Table 6: Importance of Funding Criteria

| Criteria | Importance |
|---|----------------|
| Capacity to carry out the grant | Up to 5 points |
| LMI Housing Stock | Up to 6 points |
| Affordable Housing Plan | Up to 2 points |
| Extent of Poverty | Up to 5 points |
| Leveraged Funds | Up to 5 points |
| Project Maturity | Up to 4 points |
| Overall Geographical Impact | Up to 5 points |
| Applicant has not had any projects in previous years | Up to 4 points |
| Project Priority | Up to 6 points |
| Proactive Planning | Up to 4 points |
| ADA Components | Up to 2 points |

For a full list of policies and procedure that outline specific criteria and method of distribution for selecting applications please see Appendix VI.

Potential applicants may access the application manuals or other materials describing the application criteria by visiting the Six County Association of Governments offices located at 250 North Main, Richfield, Utah, Suite B-12. They may also visit the Utah CDBG website at: <http://www.jobs.utah.gov/housing/cdbg/applications.html>. For general information about the CDBG Program and application criteria applicants may contact CDBG Manager, Travis Kyhl.

A formal email outlining the CDBG process is sent to each county commission and mayor 2-4 weeks before the How-to-Apply Workshop. Regional service provider agencies are also contacted. The notification explains CDBG eligibility criteria and encourages participation in the How-to-Apply Workshops.

The process that an applicant must go through to be successful in receiving CDBG funding is explained in detail at the mandatory How-to-Apply Workshop. This is a mandated training with two sessions offered at different times. If there are scheduling conflicts potential applicants may attend this workshop in another region. In addition SCAOG staff is available to discuss in detail the CDBG program, criteria, and application requirements.

Applicants must select a qualified project (explained in the workshop), make sure project benefits 51 percent low and moderate income (requires a survey in most cases), complete the application, have a public hearing, and submit the application utilizing Web-Grants. The project is then rated and ranked by the Executive Committee. Projects are prioritized for funding and awarded based on available resources. Both successful and unsuccessful applicants are notified as to the results. Successful applicants then work with a State CDBG representative through project logistics and funding.

At a minimum \$50,000 is allocated for administration of the Six County AOG CDBG program. This amount must also not be more than 15 percent of the total allocation. This amount is subtracted from the total amount of funding given to the region. Six County HCAP also receives \$100,000 of the funding for housing rehab projects.

The remaining amount is allocated on a competitive basis. No more than 50 percent of the net allocation will be awarded to any one applicant in order to encourage multiple projects and local match. There is a state minimum funding requirement of \$30,000 per project. Although this policy may be eliminated by a vote of the Regional Review Committee. More detail about the allocation process may be found in the Six County AOG CDBG Policies and Procedures in Appendix VI.

This method of distribution is meant to assist primarily jurisdictions in infrastructure projects (See table 8), especially those who have not received funding recently from CDBG. Many of the communities do not have full time staff or have only volunteer staff. The expected outcome of these methods is to be simple and streamlined for individuals who are not experts with the federal grant system. SCAOG offers as much administration assistance as needed by any community.

For PY 18, the SCAOG received eight applications. The rating and ranking of these projects and the funding awarded can be found in Appendix IV.

Barriers to Affordable Housing

In the 2015 Consolidated Plan there was noted several barriers to affordable housing as described from interviews with various regional housing agencies.

SCAOG does not set affordable housing criteria as a high priority in the region, but there is a \$100,000 set-aside specifically for home rehabilitation.

SCAOG is working with the elected officials and local planning commissions to educate them about the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment.

SCAOG is also working with the State Rural Planning Group to provide training to the local planning commissions. This training will explain zoning and policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing.

Other

Home Management

SCAOG does not fund Public Housing Agencies and does not take any actions to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership.

There are several agencies in the region that provide this assistance without direct help from the SCAOG. They are also noted in the 2015 Consolidated Plan.

The Main Street Committee of Mount Pleasant has a sub-committee dedicated to examining housing needs. Along with operating public housing in the town, they also find ways to help fund individuals to update their dilapidated trailers to a manufactured home standard. This is not specifically reaching out to the people in their public housing units, but it is helpful to other low-moderate income groups.

Consumer Education classes explaining finance, mortgages, and ownership of a home are provided to any individual who is a member of a Native Tribe by the Paiute Housing Authority.

Lead Based Paint

SCAOG Housing technicians are trained and certified to identify and eliminate the hazards of lead based paint. SCAOG does not provide a fee for service in this area but does test each home serviced through weatherization and home rehab.

Staff of the SCAOG will test client homes for lead that was constructed prior to 1978. If lead-based paint is found in a home or on a surface that will be disturbed, then lead safe work practices must be used by anyone certified to do the work. A pamphlet titled "Protect Your Family From Lead in Your Home" is handed out to any pre- 1978 home no matter if lead is found or not. The certified staff from the SCAOG does not make these services available to the public due to time constraints in doing complete inspections.

Until more resources are made available along with addressing liability issues of those providing the service, the opportunity for the Region to actively participate is limited. The current practice of testing SCAOG housing clients will be continued.

Coordination

SCAOG Community and Economic Development, Housing and Community Action Programs, and Aging Services Departments will continue to work with the regional Service Provider's Council by attending monthly meetings. The SCAOG HCAP department will work with public and private entities to coordinate critical needs of citizens within the Six County area. They will also coordinate and outreach to the public and provide affordable housing opportunities to qualified individuals. The SCAOG Community and Economic Development department will discuss housing needs with communities during their annual visit and assessment.

Appendix I: Newspaper Articles for Citizen Outreach

Public participation welcome for Regional Annual Action Plan

Every year the Six County Association of Governments produces an Annual Action Plan as required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The Plan details the community development, housing needs and priorities of Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, and Wayne Counties. There is special emphasis on serving the needs of the low and moderate income and special needs populations.

The purpose of the plan is to identify implementation of HUD funded projects and activities that should take place in the immediate or near future. The planning process is undertaken with the assistance of towns, cities, counties and the public to identify, prioritize and quantify the cost of capital improvement needs in each jurisdiction. In January communities are interviewed individually about their needs.

Six County also works with the regional public housing agencies and other service providers to identify gaps in affordable housing and for appropriate means to address those gaps. Public hearings are in conjunction with the regional governing body, or executive board, to solicit public involvement in the plan development process.

The following questions are considered in the development of the Annual Action Plan:

1. What are the key priorities for housing and community development for each jurisdiction in the region, and the region as a whole?
2. What opportunities exist for integration and coordination of federal, state and/or local programs?
3. How can SCAOG and the Utah Small Cities Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, which is administered through the Utah Division of Housing and Community Development (HCD) help foster better coordination?
4. What data or other information would help us in developing and improving the housing and community development decision making process as it relates to rating and ranking of projects proposed for HUD funding?

Public participation in the planning process is encouraged for the upcoming 2018-2019 plan. The final plan will be published in March.

A short survey form is available to anyone interested in providing input on housing and community development needs in their community at www.sixcounty.com. You may also provide input or ask for a paper survey with the SCAOG Regional Planner, Travis Kyhl, at (435) 893-0713, via e-mail: tkyhl@sixcounty.com, or mail: 250 North Main St, P.O. Box 820, Richfield, UT 84701.

Appendix II: Citizen Participation Survey

Annual Action Plan Public Participation

This form is for citizen participation in the 2018 Annual Action Plan for the Six County Region covering Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Sevier and Wayne Counties in Utah. All answers are anonymous, but will be mentioned in the final report. For questions please contact Travis Kyhl, SCAOG Regional Planner: (435) 893-0713 or tkyhl@sixcounty.com, 250 N Main St. P.O. Box 820, Richfield, UT 84701. We want your input to be able to identify, prioritize and quantify the cost of infrastructure or facility needs in each jurisdiction. The purpose of the annual action plan is to identify possible HUD funded projects and activities that should take place in the immediate or near future.

Which county and city/town do you reside? _____

Please mark a check next to the **three** most important needs for your community based on your opinion.

- Low-moderate income housing availability
- Water infrastructure improvements
- Sewer/storm infrastructure improvements
- Public health/safety projects (EMS facility, ambulance, health clinic improvements)
- Other public facilities
- Street/sidewalk improvements
- Recreation facility improvements or additions (parks)
- Planning efforts (general plan etc.)
- Accessibility for persons with a disability in public areas
- Other: _____

Is there any specific infrastructure, facility or other needs for your community? If so, please explain:

Do you have any other comments?

Appendix III: CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria for the SCAOG Region

Six County Association of Governments 2018 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet

Applicant:

Requested CDBG Amount:

Total Score: **0**

| CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria | | Data Range/Score (Mark only one for each criteria) | | | | | SCORE |
|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 1 | Capacity To Carry Out The Grant: Rated by state staff. (See Note #1 for scoring) | 5 points | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 points | |
| 2 | Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost. | | | | | | |
| 2a | Jurisdictions with a population less than 500 | >10% 5 points | 7.1-10% 4 points | 4.1-7% 3 points | 1-4% 2 points | <1% 1 point | |
| 2 b | Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000 | >20% 5 points | 15.1-20% 4 points | 10.1-15% 3 points | 5.1-10% 2 points | 1-5% 1 point | |
| 2 c | Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000 | >30% 5 points | 25.1-30% 4 points | 20.1-25% 3 points | 15.1-20% 2 points | 1-15% 1 point | |
| 2 d | Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000 | >40% 5 points | 35.1-40% 4 points | 30.1-35% 3 points | 25.1-30% 2 points | 1-25% 1 point | |
| 3 | Non-CDBG Funds Secured: Non-CDBG funds have been secured, partially secured, or applied for. | Secured 3 points | Partial 2 points | Applied 1 point | | | |
| 4 | 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 | |
| 5 | Project's Geographical Impact: Projects will be rated on their relative impact in the community both in terms of numbers and relative need. | County 5 points | Portion of County 4 points | Community 3 points | Portion of Community 1 point | | |
| 6 | LMI Population: Percent of the projects beneficiaries considered 80 percent or less LMI. (based on LMI survey) | >80% 5 points | 76-79% 4 points | 61-75% 3 points | 56-60% 2 points | 51-55% 1 points | |
| 7 | Extent Of Poverty: The percentage of Low Income (LI: 50% AMI) and Very Low Income (VLI: 30% AMI) persons directly benefiting from the project. | >20% 5 points | 15.1-20% 4 points | 10.1-15% 3 points | 5.1-10% 2 points | 1-5% 1 point | |
| 8 | Project Maturity: Project demonstrates capacity to be implemented and/or completed in a timely manner. (See Note #8 for scoring) | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | | |
| 9 | Applicant Funded In Previous Years: | 4 or more prior funding cycles 4 points | 3 prior cycles 3 points | 1-2 prior cycles 2 points | last funding cycle 1 point | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| 10 | Project Priority: Determined by the CDBG Administrator with consultation of the AOG Executive Board members. This Board comprises of a mayor and commissioner from each county. | Street/Sidewalk Improvements 6 points | Water Infrastructure or Recreation 5 points | LMI Housing Activities 4 points | Sewer/Storm Infrastructure 3 points | Public Facilities, Public Health/Safety 2 points | Accessibility (ADA) 1 point | |
| 11 | Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA): Does this project work to remove architectural barriers to persons with disabilities and/or is the project ADA compliant? | Yes 2 points | No 0 points | | | | | |
| 12 | Health And Safety: Does the project address serious health and safety threats. | Yes 3 points | No 0 points | | | | | |
| 13 | LMI Housing Stock: Infrastructure for the units, rehabilitation of units, new units and/or accessibility of units for LMI residents. | >20 units 6 points | 15 - 20 units 5 points | 10 - 14 units 4 points | 5 - 9 units 3 points | 1 - 4 units 2 points | | |
| 14 | Affordable Housing Plan Implementation: City/County has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project addresses some element of that plan. | Yes 2 points | No 0 points | | | | | |
| 15 | Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #15 for scoring) | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | | | |
| 16 | Civil Rights Compliance: Applicant is in compliance with federal laws and regulations related to civil rights. (See Note #16 for scoring) | 2 points | 1 point | 0 Points | | | | |

Notes:

#1 - All applicants will receive 5 points for this category unless state CDBG staff has evidence or compelling reason to believe the applicant lacks capacity. In this event, the state staff will give the applicant a score of less than 5.

#8 - One point will be awarded if an architect/engineer is already selected and is actively involved in the application process. One point will be awarded if there is evidence that the project manager has the capacity to carry out the project in a timely manner. One point will be awarded if the proposed solution is identified in a well defined scope of work. One point will be awarded if architectural/engineering designs/plans are completed for the project.

#15 - One point will be awarded if the applicants general plan has been updated in the previous 5 years. (ex. For the 2018 cycle: updated during or after 2013) One point will be awarded if the applicant maintains a detailed Capital Improvements List for future projects. One point will be awarded if the applicant keeps a detailed Asset Inventory list. One point will be awarded if the applicant can document an active planning and zoning commission.

#16 - One point will be awarded if the applicant has completed the "ADA Checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal" form. One point will be awarded if the applicant has adopted all of the following policies: Grievance Procedure under the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 and ADA Effective Communication Policy, Language Access Plan, and Section 504 and ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy. (Forms available from SCAOG)

Appendix IV: PY 18 CDBG Applicant Scoring & Funded Projects

Six County Association of Governments 2018 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet

| CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria | | Data Range/Score (Mark only one for each criteria) | | | | | Mt Pleasant | Ephraim | Ft Green | Spring City | Redmond | Richfield | Sigurd | Kanosh |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1 | Capacity To Carry Out The Grant: Rated by state staff. (See Note #1 for scoring) | 5 points | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 points | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2a | Jurisdictions with a population less than 500 | >10% 5 points | 7.1-10% 4 points | 4.1-7% 3 points | 1-4% 2 points | <1% 1 point | | | | | | 2 | 1 | |
| 2 b | Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000 | >20% 5 points | 15.1-20% 4 points | 10.1-15% 3 points | 5.1-10% 2 points | 1-5% 1 point | | | | 5 | | | | |
| 2 c | Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000 | >30% 5 points | 25.1-30% 4 points | 20.1-25% 3 points | 15.1-20% 2 points | 1-15% 1 point | 3 | | 1 | 5 | | | | |
| 2 d | Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000 | >40% 5 points | 35.1-40% 4 points | 30.1-35% 3 points | 25.1-30% 2 points | 1-25% 1 point | | 1 | | | | 5 | | |
| 3 | Non-CDBG Funds Secured: Non-CDBG funds have been secured, partially secured, or applied for. | Secured 3 points | Partial 2 points | Applied 1 point | | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 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 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 5 | Project's Geographical Impact: Projects will be rated on their relative impact in the community both in terms of numbers and relative need. | County 5 points | Portion of County 4 points | Community 3 points | Portion of Community 1 point | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 6 | LMI Population: Percent of the projects beneficiaries considered 80 percent or less LMI. (based on LMI survey) | >80% 5 points | 76-79% 4 points | 61-75% 3 points | 56-60% 2 points | 51-55% 1 points | 5 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 7 | Extent Of Poverty: The percentage of Low Income (LI: 50% AMI) and Very Low Income (VLI: 30% AMI) persons directly benefiting from the project. | >20% 5 points | 15.1-20% 4 points | 10.1-15% 3 points | 5.1-10% 2 points | 1-5% 1 point | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 8 | Project Maturity: Project demonstrates capacity to be implemented and/or completed in a timely manner. (See Note #8 for scoring) | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 9 | Applicant Funded In Previous Years: | 4 or more prior funding cycles 4 points | 3 prior cycles 3 points | 1-2 prior cycles 2 points | last funding cycle 1 point | | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 10 | Project Priority: Determined by the CDBG Administrator with consultation of the AOG Executive Board members. This Board comprises of a mayor and commissioner from each county. | Street/Sidewalk Improvements 6 points | Water Infrastructure or Recreation 5 points | LMI Housing Activities 4 points | Sewer/Storm Infrastructure 3 points | Public Facilities, Public Health/Safety 2 points | Accessibility (ADA) 1 point | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 11 | Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA): Does this project work to remove architectural barriers to persons with disabilities and/or is the project ADA | Yes 2 points | No 0 points | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Health And Safety: Does the project address serious health and safety threats. | Yes 3 points | No 0 points | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | LMI Housing Stock: Infrastructure for the units, rehabilitation of units, new units and/or accessibility of units for LMI residents. | >20 units 6 points | 15 - 20 units 5 points | 10 - 14 units 4 points | 5 - 9 units 3 points | 1 - 4 units 2 points | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | Affordable Housing Plan Implementation: City/County has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project addresses some element of that plan. | Yes 2 points | No 0 points | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | Pro-active Planning: Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. (See Note #15 for scoring) | 4 points | 3 points | 2 points | 1 point | | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 16 | Civil Rights Compliance: Applicant is in compliance with federal laws and regulations related to civil rights. (See Note #16 for scoring) | 2 points | 1 point | 0 Points | | | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Total Points | | | | | | | 38 | 39 | 36 | 46 | 45 | 41 | 36 | 35 |
| | | | | | | | Mt Pleasant | Ephraim | Ft Green | Spring City | Redmond | Richfield | Sigurd | Kanosh |

Six County Association of Governments

Approved Rating and Ranking by the Six County Regional Review Committee on March 7, 2018

| Rank | Applicant | CDBG Funds | Balance | | Applicant | CDBG Funds | Points |
|----------|-------------|------------|-------------------|----|-------------|------------|-----------|
| | | | \$ | \$ | | | |
| | | | \$ 657,000 | | | | |
| | SCAOG Admin | \$ 50,000 | \$ 607,000 | | Mt Pleasant | \$ 237,700 | 38 |
| | SCAOG Rehab | \$ 100,000 | \$ 507,000 | | Ephraim | \$ 174,000 | 39 |
| 1 | Spring City | \$ 250,000 | \$ 257,000 | | Ft. Green | \$ 133,650 | 36 |
| 2 | Redmond | \$ 77,632 | \$ 179,368 | | Spring City | \$ 250,000 | 46 |
| 3 | Richfield | \$ 179,368 | \$ - | | Redmond | \$ 77,632 | 45 |
| 4 | Ephraim | | \$ - | | Richfield | \$ 275,000 | 41 |
| 5 | Mt Pleasant | | \$ - | | Sigurd | \$ 123,000 | 36 |
| 6 | Ft. Green | | \$ - | | Kanosh | \$ 259,000 | 35 |
| 7 | Sigurd | | \$ - | | SCAOG Rehab | \$ 100,000 | |
| 8 | Kanosh | | | | SCAOG Admin | \$ 50,000 | |

Appendix V: Citizen Consultation Form

Citizen Participation Outreach Tracking Form

1. AOG: Six County AOG Employee: Travis Kyhl

2. Mode of Outreach:

Public Meeting

Newspaper Ad

Public Hearing

Internet Outreach

Other:

URL if applicable: <http://sixcounty.com/>

3. Target of Outreach:

Non-targeted/Broad Community

Minorities

Non-English Speaking- Specify language _____

Persons with Disabilities

Residents of Public and Assisted Housing

Other:

4. Summary of response/attendance

0 responses

5. Summary of comments received

N/A

6. Summary of comments not accepted and reasons

N/A

Citizen Participation Outreach Tracking Form

1. AOG: Six County AOG

Employee: Travis Kyhl

2. Mode of Outreach:

Public Meeting
 Newspaper Ad

Public Hearing
 Internet Outreach

Other:

URL if applicable:

3. Target of Outreach:

Non-targeted/Broad Community
 Minorities
 Non-English Speaking- Specify language _____

Persons with Disabilities
 Residents of Public and Assisted Housing

Other:

4. Summary of response/attendance

Public Comment Meeting was held on February 7, 2018.

5. Summary of comments received

N/A

6. Summary of comments not accepted and reasons

N/A

Citizen Participation Outreach Tracking Form

1. AOG: Six County AOG

Employee: Travis Kyhl

2. Mode of Outreach:

Public Meeting

Public Hearing

Newspaper Ad

Internet Outreach

Other:

URL if applicable:

3. Target of Outreach:

Non-targeted/Broad Community

Persons with Disabilities

Minorities

Residents of Public and Assisted Housing

Non-English Speaking- Specify language _____

Other:

4. Summary of response/attendance

Public Comment Period January 25 to February 24, 2018.

5. Summary of comments received

N/A

6. Summary of comments not accepted and reasons

N/A

Appendix VI: Agency Consultation Forms

1. AOG: Six County AOG Employee: JaLyne Ogden

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Service Provider’s Council Date of Consultation: February 7, 2018

3. Agency/Group/Organization Type **(Check all that apply)**

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Services-Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PHA | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Services-Elderly Persons | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Services-Employment |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with Disabilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Victims of Domestic Violence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Fair Housing |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Health Agency | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child Welfare Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Civil Leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Publically funded institution/System of Care* | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other government-Federal | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-State |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-County | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other government-Local | <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee Department |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Organization | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Business leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector | <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhood Organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Institution | <input type="checkbox"/> Banking/Financing | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Major Employer | <input type="checkbox"/> Foundation | |

*Organizations which may discharge persons into homelessness, such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions.

4. What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? **(Check all that apply)**

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing Needs Assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Housing Needs | <input type="checkbox"/> Market Analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Chronically homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Families with Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Needs-Veterans |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Needs-Unaccompanied Youth | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Strategy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special Needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: general needs | |

5. Briefly describe how the Agency/Group/Organization was consulted?

The Annual Action Plan was discussed and the Council was invited to take a survey regarding area needs.

6. What are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation of areas for improved coordination?

Maintain general knowledge of area needs and learn potential ways to solve them.

1. AOG: SCAOG Employee: JaLyne Ogden

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Six County AOG Housing Department Date of Consultation: February 1, 2018

3. Agency/Group/Organization Type (**Check all that apply**)

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PHA | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Elderly Persons | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Employment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with Disabilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Victims of Domestic Violence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Fair Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Welfare Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Civil Leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Publically funded institution/System of Care* | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Federal | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-State |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-County | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Local | <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee Department |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Planning organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Business leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector | <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhood Organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Institution | <input type="checkbox"/> Banking/Financing | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Major Employer | <input type="checkbox"/> Foundation | |

*Organizations which may discharge persons into homelessness, such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions.

4. What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? (**Check all that apply**)

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Needs Assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Housing Needs | <input type="checkbox"/> Market Analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Chronically homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Families with Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Needs-Veterans |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Needs-Unaccompanied Youth | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Strategy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special Needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: | |

5. Briefly describe how the Agency/Group/Organization was consulted?

Meeting to discuss programs, etc.

6. What are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation of areas for improved coordination?

Better knowledge by planning of housing programs, also to collect data on housing that is rehabilitated etc.

1. AOG: Six County AOG Employee: JaLyne Ogden

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Six County AOG Community Action Programs

Date of Consultation: February 1, 2018

3. Agency/Group/Organization Type (**Check all that apply**)

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PHA | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Elderly Persons | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Employment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with Disabilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Victims of Domestic Violence |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Services-Homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Fair Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Welfare Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Civil Leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Publically funded institution/System of Care* | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Federal | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-State |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-County | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Local | <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee Department |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Planning organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Business leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector | <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhood Organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Institution | <input type="checkbox"/> Banking/Financing | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Major Employer | <input type="checkbox"/> Foundation | |

*Organizations which may discharge persons into homelessness, such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions.

4. What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? (**Check all that apply**)

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing Needs Assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Housing Needs | <input type="checkbox"/> Market Analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Chronically homeless | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Families with Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Needs-Veterans |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Needs-Unaccompanied Youth | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special Needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: | |

5. Briefly describe how the Agency/Group/Organization was consulted?

Meeting with program managers to discuss programs.

6. What are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation of areas for improved coordination?

Planners gain knowledge of programs by Community Action, and goals are set regarding rental assistance and homeless prevention.

1. AOG: Six County AOG Employee: Travis Kyhl

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Elected officials of every SCAOG jurisdiction

Date of Consultation: Month of January

3. Agency/Group/Organization Type (**Check all that apply**)

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PHA | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Elderly Persons | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Employment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with Disabilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Persons with HIV/AIDS | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Victims of Domestic Violence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Services-Fair Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Welfare Agency | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Civil Leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Publicly funded institution/System of Care* | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-Federal | <input type="checkbox"/> Other government-State |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other government-County | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other government-Local | <input type="checkbox"/> Grantee Department |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Planning organization | <input type="checkbox"/> Business leaders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector | <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhood Organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Institution | <input type="checkbox"/> Banking/Financing | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Major Employer | <input type="checkbox"/> Foundation | |

*Organizations which may discharge persons into homelessness, such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions.

4. What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation? (**Check all that apply**)

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing Needs Assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Housing Needs | <input type="checkbox"/> Market Analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Chronically homeless | <input type="checkbox"/> Homeless Needs-Families with Children | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Needs-Veterans |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Needs-Unaccompanied Youth | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness Strategy | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Homeless Special Needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HOPWA Strategy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Anti-Poverty-Strategy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lead-based Paint Strategy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: development needs | |

5. Briefly describe how the Agency/Group/Organization was consulted?

Individual in-person interviews

6. What are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation of areas for improved coordination?

This improves visibility of the AOG, also assisted in creating the capital improvements list.

Appendix VII: CDBG Application Policies & Procedures

SIX COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

CDBG Application Policies

2018 Program Year

Method of Distribution

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

CDBG POLICIES – 2018 Program Year

The following policies have been established to govern the CDBG award process. All eligible project applications will be accepted for rating and ranking.

1. The Six County Association of Governments approved \$50,000 of the total allocation for administration of the SCAOG CDBG program, to be subtracted from the SCAOG total. The remaining amount is allocated on a competitive basis. To encourage multiple projects and local match, no project will receive more than 50% of the net allocation. Depending on funding, the SCAOG Regional Review Committee (RRC) reserves the right to eliminate the 50% rule by a vote of the board.
2. In compliance with the policies of the State of Utah CDBG program, and to be eligible for funding consideration, all grantees or sub-grantees must have drawn down 50% of any prior year's CDBG funding prior to the RRC rating and ranking session.
3. Applicants must provide written documentation of the availability and status of all other proposed funding at the time the application is submitted, including all sources of funding which are considered local contributions toward the project and its administration. A project is not mature if funding cannot be committed by the time of the application.
4. State policy has established the minimum amount of funding of \$30,000 per project and the maximum amount is limited only by the annual allocation amount, and the Six County CDBG policies outlined in paragraph 1 (one).
5. Projects must align with and be consistent with the Region's Consolidated Plan. Sponsored projects on behalf of an eligible sub-recipient may not necessarily be listed in the jurisdictions capital investment plan, but the sub-recipient's project must meet goals identified in the Region's Consolidated Plan.
6. Attendance at one of the annual How to Apply workshops is mandatory of all applicants and sub-grantees. The project manager and an elected official from the applicant's jurisdiction should be in attendance. Newly elected officials and project managers are

especially encouraged to attend since the administrative requirements and commitments of a CDBG project are considerable.

7. Housing projects are encouraged to use SCAOG Housing Department's available resources and emergency projects may be considered by the RRC at any time. Projects applying for emergency funding must still meet a national objective and regional goals and policies. Projects may be considered as an emergency application if:
 - Funding through the normal application timeframe will create an unreasonable risk to health or property.
 - An appropriate third party agency has documented a specific risk (or risks) that in their opinion need immediate remediation.
 - Cost overruns from a previously funded project may be funded only if the RRC deems it an appropriate emergency.
8. The amount of any emergency funds distributed during the year will be subtracted from the top of the regional allocation during the next funding cycle. Additional information on the emergency fund program is available in the Application Policies and Procedures manual developed annually by the state in Chapter II, Funding Processes.
9. Applications on behalf of sub-recipients (i.e., special service districts, non-profit organizations, etc.) are allowed. The applicant city or county must understand that even if they name the sub-recipient as project manager the city/county is still responsible for the project's viability and program compliance. A subcontractor's agreement between the applicant entity and the sub-recipient must accompany the application (after funds have been committed to the project).
10. Multi-year projects will be considered. Proposals must contain specific cost estimates and work elements by year so that annual allocations by the RRC can be determined at the outset. No projects over 2 years will be considered.
11. Project maturity will be considered in determining the awarding of funds for the funding cycle, i.e., project can be completed within eighteen months, leveraged funds are in place, detailed scope of work is developed, engineer's cost estimates in place, etc.
12. The application must be submitted by 5:00 PM, January 31, 2018. Any applications received after this date and time will not be considered for funding.
13. Applicants with lower populations will receive additional points in the non CDBG funds category.
14. In the event of a tie the following policies will be followed:
 - A) The project is located in a Distressed Community
 - B) The project that has the highest percentage of LMI beneficiaries
 - C) The project with the most non CDBG funds leveraged
 - D) The Project with the most points in the Geographical Impact category

15. All projects will be fully funded in the order of their rating and ranking prioritization. If a balance remains insufficient for the next project in priority to complete a project in the current year, the funds will continue to be applied to the next project in priority if the funds are sufficient to fund that project. Once no additional projects can be funded, the balance will be added to the region's single family housing rehab program allocation for that funding cycle.
16. The SCAOG RRC is filled by the members of the SCAOG Executive Board. This 12 member committee comprises a commissioner and a mayor from each county of the region. Members of the committee are appointed by their county and fulfill terms until the end of their elected period or reappointment if they still hold office. Due to election cycles the average term of a board member is 4 years. The chair of the RRC is the chair of the SCAOG Executive Board.

The Six County Regional Review Committee has approved the following set-aside of funding:

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