AGENDA

I. WELCOME
A. Call to Order
B. Conflict of Interest
C. Approval of October 2018 Minutes

II. Approval – Rated and Ranked 18-19 Applications

III. Training – 1920 Capital Improvement List

IV. Draft of Rating and Ranking

V. Elections: Greg Miles, Chairman
   Dean Baker, 1st Vice Chairman
   2nd Vice Chairman, Nominee from Daggett County

VI. ADJOURN
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Zac Whitwell
Toni Ansel

UBTech
Department of Workforce Services
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MINUTES

I. WELCOME – Chairman Asay welcomed everyone to the meeting.

A. Call to order – Chairman Asay called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

B. Conflict of Interest – None

C. Approval of June 2018 Minutes – Chairman Asay asked for approval of the June 2018 minutes.

MOTION: Commissioner Todd made a motion to approve the June 2018 Minutes, Commissioner Shepherd seconded, motion carried.

II. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Review and Clarification and Deadline of CDBG Capital Improvements List – Kevin said, “the first national objective is benefitting low and moderate income. Low to moderate income families are defined as those families whose income does not exceed 80% of the county median income. If that is the objective you are doing, you can either do site specific activities, city or county wide activities or limited clientele activities. The second national objective is aiding in the prevention or elimination of slums or blight and acquisition clearance, historic preservation, building rehabilitation activities that eliminates specific conditions of blight or physical decay on the spot basis. The third national objective is urgent needs, which is those that pose a serious and immediate threat to health and welfare of the community. Who’s eligible to apply for this funding? Counties, cities, association of governments, non-profits; but if they do they have to be sponsored either by a city or a county. Who’s eligible for this program in 2019? We held a mandatory
workshop on October 10, and the list below are entities who attended and who are eligible to apply for funding this year: FFS, the women’s shelter in Vernal, Town of Manila, Naples City, Duchesne City, Dutch John Town, Uintah County, Vernal City, Roosevelt City, Duchesne County and Uintah Basin Association of Governments. How much funding is available for the year 2019 in the Uintah Basin Region? What we talked about in the past, if you remember they come up with a new funding allocation for the State of Utah, the estimated amount that we will be receiving for that year is $572,537. You as a Board elected to set-aside $285,000 to the UBAOG Single Family Housing Rehab Program, which leaves $287,537 for region wide competitive funding. If your entity is eligible to apply for funds this year that’s the amount of funding that is there for the taking if your project qualifies and ranks high enough.” Commissioner Winterton asked, “doesn’t the project need to be on the list.” Kevin said, “yes that is what I was getting to right here. In the past we have lost a lot of staff through each of the entities and even at our agency and we are starting fresh with a new Capital Improvements List. I handed each one of these out just to kind of give you an idea, it is a simpler version of the CIB, but it is not the CIB list it is different. I just want emphasize that this is a completely separate list from CIB. The CDBG Capital Improvement List is specific to the CDBG Program with eligible projects by each entity in order to apply for funding. You as a Board, the Regional Review Committee has determined in the rating and ranking criteria that the longer a project is on the Capital Improvements List, the higher the amount of points the project will receive in the application process. So everybody that is starting fresh this year will receive the same amount, but from here on out even if you are not awarded funding this year, the longer it’s on there the higher on the scoring criteria. The second questions is, is this document the same as the CIB Capital Improvements list, no. This list is specific to the CDBG Program and it is a separate list. While you can put both the monies together, if you apply for funding and your leveraging funding for both CIB and CDBG you can do that, however keep in mind if you do that it taints CIB money with federal ties. Laurie said, “I was just going to intervene and say CDBG is one of two federal programs that can match another federal program. What Kevin just said this is probably the most complicated of any of the grants that I can think of that you are ever going to administer, because of what he just said if you can’t separate your projects out; I’m going to pick on you Roosevelt City. You recently did a combination of a Department of Transportation, CIB and a component of this, when they did this they had to advertise their project, they picked an area where they were doing a major project, one block of that project was very low income. They had to do a survey to insure that the individuals that lived on that route were eligible to receive this and they were the recipients of a new water line. So they took $167,000 and they did just that project and if they wouldn’t have done it that way, advertise it separately, just do that project then, because that project had to be tracked with Davis Bacon. Probably for minor construction it’s not going to affect you that much, but for major where you are bringing in track hoes and that it raises the cost of the project up a lot more. The objective of the CDBG Program is to create jobs and assist low income people, so if they wouldn’t have done it that way it would have that meant that it brought this funding in and it tainted the entire project. Davis Bacon would have had to been
tracked through the entire project and you have to do income surveys, you have to receive those and make sure everything is correct on them, it’s a lot of extra work, but that component assisted them with just that much.” Kevin said, “if you will just look on the Capital Improvements List, like I said it’s a simpler version of the CIB, it’s the same format but we want it just specific to CDBG. If you’ll just put the applicant priority, which the project description the same as the CIB, the project estimate of the total cost and how much of that is going to be CDBG funds and then the year that you are looking at applying for that. We are doing 2018 to 2023 and then like I said the longer it is on there the more points you will get in the coming years. What we did, the entities that were able to attend our How to Apply Workshop we gave them a deadline at the end of this month to go and talk to you and decide which projects you wanted to put on, and after talking to staff at our building we thought we would push that date back a little bit for you to hear from us. He asked Laurie what date we decided on? Laurie stated, “November 15.” Kevin said, “if you can have that back to our office by then.” Laurie asked Kevin to talk about his handout just a little bit. She said, “it’s part of this big book, this is the book for anybody that attended the workshop, this is what it takes to administer this program.” Kevin said, “this is just a snippet of that book, it goes into what the national objectives are. On the packet we sent out we have a thing that says eligible activities and there is a list about two or three pages long of projects that very well could be eligible, so that can give you an idea where to start.” Laurie said, “remembering there is your list, but it still has to tie back to one of those three national objectives for it to be eligible and the reason we’re stopping and emphasizing you, is you as the elected officials need to compile that list. Especially those who are going to apply this year, for those who can’t it’s still good to start to work it together so that you can go through it and of course then it is rated and ranked every year of where it’s at on the project list. The reason we are stopping and going back and emphasizing is, some have already turned a list in and I’m really hoping that they ran it by their elected officials to make sure. The first public hearing that is required with this asks for the public input on the projects that you as the elected officials in each of your entities have chosen.” Kevin stated, “I was going to say this handout that you see goes into more detailed description of what those national objectives are. On the last page under letter C, Consistency with the Consolidated Plan, every year our agency has to complete what is called the Consolidated Plan for the region to talk about projects and housing issues and different things like that. We put in that plan the Capital Improvements Lists and get input from your entities on issues that you are seeing within your communities, cities, counties or whatever it may be. The Capital Improvements Lists that we get back from you is part of that plan. For the state to look at our Consolidated Plan and they don’t see your project listed in that plan, you will not be eligible for funding. That is why we are emphasizing this the way that we are.” Laurie said, “it’s a lot like CIB but I’m thinking people are getting the acronyms mixed up and we received a call and I told Kevin after we received it that we need to go back and emphasize this, because you did give the AOG funding two years ago. Two years ago you gave us the entire allocation and what did we do with that, we targeted a group meaning for every housing rehab whether it be Daggett, Uintah, or Duchesne County, Altamont Town, Roosevelt, Vernal, we take an
application on them and make sure that they meet the income qualifications in order to receive that housing rehab on their home. We do have a poor housing stock for our mid to lower income residents, there is not enough of it and this targets that to try to maintain housing for the lower section, because the upper section is thriving. That is what we used the largest allocation for was that and also a Down Payment Assistance, meaning again the person has to qualify through an application. We review that application and they have to meet the income guidelines, meaning how many live in their household compared to the income, if they don’t meet that they are not eligible. That is what you would have to do if you were doing a survey of an area that you wanted to target. The rest of the remaining funds we targeted through a targeted group by low income targeting ADA, ADA is another targeted group. Women’s Crisis Center is a targeted group, Children’s Justice Centers, your Senior Centers are targeted groups. This is the first time that it has appeared on their list in probably six years, Manila Town is automatically eligible for anything within the town, and the entire entity is eligible as a low income area. In the past there was also Ballard, Altamont, Duchesne occasionally, and Myton and if you are on that list you are automatically eligible you can do any project, but the only one so far this year so far is Manila Town. Is it making sense to you? Let’s go back, I have the master list of everything you have done since this program started, clear back in 1982. I’m going to send this to you, but I’m going to pick one, in the year 2015-16 UBAOG applied for and received admin/planning, that’s mandatory if you don’t have a Consolidated Plan and the Capital Improvements List we compile in your behalf then you are not eligible for anything. So $50,000 of it went there, $256,908 went to Down Payment Assistance to low income individuals to get them into housing and Housing Rehab again. Uintah County you received an infrastructure water and sewer. How did you meet that criteria? You met that criteria because you targeted that we are doing this land development and we did this specifically for low income housing combined with us, we brought our Self-Help Program in and our building on the lots you assisted us with. It is still targeted, that means that anyone who receives that lot then has to fill out this application and they have to meet the criteria which is HUDS and Self-Help follows the same guidelines as HUD and they are a USDA Program and that’s how we made that eligible. Are you understanding what I am doing to you? The reason is, is because we received a call and I told Kevin because of the complication of this Kevin and I are willing to come and assist you on your first list compilation so that you have a better understanding, because she understood what she was doing, she was just a little bit ahead of herself. You have to have a first public hearing and ask for the public’s input, but you as the elected officials have to decide on the projects you want to present to the public, which ones would they like to see happen, but it has to meet this same criteria.” Mayor Bird stated, “the project that comes to mind is Cottonwood Creek, it’s in the backyards of a lower income part of town and it’s not a real big project.” Commissioner Lytle asked, “is Cottonwood Creek the one that runs down towards the high school?” Mayor Bird said, “it runs past the high school and down in the backyards of several people.” Laurie stated, “I’m going to make you put your thinking cap on. What is this service going to provide that you’re dealing with Cottonwood Creek?” Mayor Bird said, “it’s going to provide safe walking paths
and those types of things for those people in that area.” Laurie asked, “are you sure that is the only ones that are going to utilize that area?” Mayor Bird said, “no there are probably more.” Laurie stated, “that is what you have to think of then is who is going to use this project.” Mayor Bird said, “they will be the main ones.” Laurie stated, “they will be the main ones, but the state’s going to come back and say who else is going to use it, is half of Roosevelt going to use it. If more than half of your residents are going to use it then you’ve got to do a survey at least of half of your town and Kevin and I don’t even know how to calculate that. We have to go back to the state and they tell us how many surveys you have to have and then how many have to come in that meet the 51% of low moderate income. It’s quite a process.” Kevin said, “I will say there is a struggle too, because some people don’t want to fill out a survey and tell you how much money they are making, so there is that.” Commissioner Winterton asked, “does the state even look at the magi, does that have anything to do with it, a lot of times that is what it is based on.” Laurie said, “no not on this one, it’s a one on one survey with the individuals and like Kevin said some will fill it out and some won’t, it’s a very simple survey and any income in the house has to be accounted for. The best way to do that is what we made you do, we had you have one of your staff members go door to door, because we were only surveying 20 homes.” Kevin said, “at least 51%, so not everybody.” Mayor Bird asked, “so probably like streets, waterlines those things that are just more or less directly affecting that area would be better.” Laurie stated, “what it means is you just have to do a lot of preplanning, the other yes because then you are targeting. I remember when we tried to put in tennis courts at your old park and they made us survey half of Roosevelt City for that and people are not as willing anymore to let you know their income, because you work for the government. I think it was Mayor Rowley, you could not get your residents to respond.” Mayor Rowley said, “10% turned the survey back in the last time we did it.” Laurie said, “if you don’t have a broad range of your surveys returned then it doesn’t make you eligible. She asked did this help, do you have a better understanding?” Mayor Rowley asked, “how does this work with the private sector. Like if Mayor Watkins has a trailer park that he has with a problem, private ownership can we do that.” Laurie said, “I don’t know how you could go in and help assist.” Mayor Bird said, “ordinances, we are looking into that.” Laurie stated, “we can look into that for you mayor and we will respond, but usually going into the private sector, because you don’t own the land, at least with the waterlines they own the lines they are replacing. Those who are going to apply, you have to get us back a list. Those who are not applying because you didn’t attend the mandatory workshop then we are not going to push you as hard, but the sooner we get your lists started and get you thinking then the better the process, because you also approve the rating and ranking.” Kevin said, “the highest rating is housing because the funding comes fromHUD.”
is your turn to have the representative. Commissioner Winton asked, “is this a quarterly meeting?” Kevin stated, “so what this member does is at least what Commissioner Burdick has done is with all the other association of governments in the state, they decide the allocation of how the federal money will be dispersed. So this person has quite a bit of pull in how much our region will received funding wise.” Chairman Winton stated, “after last year we upped our allocation $200,000.” Laurie said, “yes then the state wasn’t happy with that so they made you do a new one again this year and we lost money, but we have always been the lowest funded so we just accept it and go on, but it is an important position, four times a year and they need to be in attendance.” Commissioner Winton stated, “I would feel comfortable electing one of our mayors and letting them attend the meetings.” Laurie said, “they rotate the meetings around the state.” Commissioner Winton commented, “there is a retreat and the retreat will actually help you understand the program and the allocations.”

MOTION: Mayor Bird made a motion to nominate and approve Mayor Rowley as the CDBG Policy Committee Member, Commissioner Lytle seconded, motion carried.

VI. ADJOURN

Sharon Christensen, Recep./Secretary ____________________________ Date ______________

*NOTE: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during this meeting should notify Laurie Brummond at the address or phone below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating and Ranking Criteria Description</th>
<th>Scoring (Circle One for Each Criteria)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Capacity to Carry Out Grant: Greater Past History in Administer DDBG Grants</td>
<td>Excellent = 5 points</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Good = 4 points</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good = 3 points</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average = 2 points</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor = 1 point</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Project warranty: running sooner be prioritized to those projects which are the most &quot;mature&quot;: For the purposes of this process, maturity is defined as those situations where: 1) the applicant has assigned a qualified project manager; 2) the engineer (engineer/architect); 3) a proposal is ready to proceed immediately; 4) has completed architectural/engineering design (blueprints); and 5) identifies all funding sources and funding status.</td>
<td>Excellent = 5 points</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Good = 4 points</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good = 3 points</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average = 2 points</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor = 1 point</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Infrastructure: Project is a an infrastructure Project</td>
<td>Yes = 10 points</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Improvement of Existing Units: Improvement of existing Housing Stock with Rehabilitation</td>
<td>&gt;10 units = 10 pts</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 units = 7 pts</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10 units = 5 pts</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 units = 2 pts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Health and Safety: Serious Health &amp; Safety threats as defined by HUD</td>
<td>Yes = 10 points</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 LMI Population: % of residents considered LMI (based on the most current census data or survey)</td>
<td>&gt;75% = 4 pts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65% - 75% = 3 pts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56% - 65% = 2 pts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51% - 55% = 1 pt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Targeted LMI Population: OR: Project serves a targeted group in which 100% of clients that will be served are LMI.</td>
<td>Yes = 5 points</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Financial Commitment - Local Funds: Have local funds been committed to the project?</td>
<td>$30+ per person = 4 pts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$21-30 per person = 3 pts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$11-20 per person = 2 pts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10 per person = 1 pt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Financial Commitment - Outside Funds: Have outside funds been committed to the project?</td>
<td>$50,000-99,999 = 3 pts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000-249,999 = 2 pts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000-999,999 = 1 pt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Consolidated Plan Capital Improvement List: Length of time the project has been on the Regional Capital Improvement List.</td>
<td>4+ Years = 4 pts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Years = 3 pts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Years = 2 pts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Year = 1 pt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Consolidated Plan: Entity has submitted required information for annual Cap Plan update</td>
<td>Yes = 5 points</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Project Area: Points are given based on area project will serve. Multiple county projects receive four points, community receive two</td>
<td>Multiple County (IRR) = 10 pts</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Wide Project = 7 pts</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Project = 5 pts</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Specific = 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Civil Rights - Complete &quot;ADA Checklist for Ready Achievable Items&quot; for city/country office</td>
<td>Yes = 1 point</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No = 0 points</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Civil Rights - City/County has adopted the following policies: Grievance Procedure under the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 and ADA Effective Communication Policy, Language Access Plan and Section 504 and ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy.</td>
<td>Yes = 1 point</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No = 0 points</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Points Awarded: 0
Policy and Procedures

1. The Uintah Basin Association of Governments (UBAOG) will provide assistance in completion of the CDBG application. All applications for CDBG funds will be made and processed in accordance with Utah State and Federal Regulations.

2. Applicants that do not attend the UBAOG CDBG “How to Apply Workshop” will not be eligible to apply for funding. Applications submitted after the deadline will not be considered for funding.

3. All applications will be scored by the UBAOG staff using criteria approved by the Rating and Ranking Committee (RRC). The RRC is comprised of 19 members: three County Commissioners in each county, Daggett, Duchesne and Uintah Counties, as well as the Mayors of Altamont, Duchesne, Tabiona, Roosevelt, Myton, Ballard, Vernal, Naples, Dutch John, and Manila. Committee members serve on the RRC as long as they retain their elected position of the respective county or city. Staff will make recommendations to the RRC on each application. Staff will present the applications to the RRC for final rating and ranking and approval. State CDBG staff must review/approve all applications as being “threshold eligible” prior to rating and ranking.

4. Timeline for rating and ranking criteria
   - June 2018 - rating and ranking distributed to all committee members
   - July 2018 - final approval of rating and ranking criteria by committee members
   - August 2018 - submittal to the State Community Block Grant Program staff

5. Eligible applicants are cities, towns and counties. Applications on behalf of sub-recipients (i.e., special service districts, non-profit organizations, etc.) are allowed. City and county sponsors will be responsible for sub-recipient’s project viability and program compliance. They must maintain active oversight of the project and sub-recipient’s performance. An inter-local agreement between the sub-recipient and the sponsoring city or county must accompany the application. This inter-local agreement must state the details of the coordination between the sponsor and the sub-recipient and how the sponsor will monitor the sub-recipient.

6. All projects must be consistent with the region’s Consolidated Plan. All projects applied for must be on the prioritized one-year capital improvement’s list. Projects not on the one-year list will not be considered for funding.

7. The minimum project size for CDBG funding is $30,000 as per state policy. Projects less than $30,000 will not be considered.
8. As per state policy, grantees with open grants from previous years that have not yet spent 50 percent of their previous funding are not eligible to apply for new CDBG funds.

9. Applicants must provide written documentation of the availability and status of any matching funds for the project at the time of application. Changes in funding after this time may result in a modified rating and ranking.

10. In case of scoring ties the project with the most LMI beneficiaries will get funded. In a case of a tie, the project with the most leveraged funds will have priority.

11. After all projects have been fully funded in the order of their Rating and Ranking prioritization and a balance remains insufficient for the next project in priority to complete a project, the funds will be first applied to the highest scoring project. An amount, determined by the RRC, will be used for construction contingency. Any remaining balance not allocated to the highest scoring project will be allocated to the region’s single family housing rehab program.

12. The Uintah Basin Regional Review Committee has approved the following set asides:
   - $50,000 set aside for administration of region-wide administration and consolidated planning activities of the AOG.
   - $150,000 set aside for Housing Rehabilitation
   - $45,500 set aside for Housing Rehabilitation program delivery
   - $36,000 set aside for Homebuyers assistance
   - $4,000 set aside for Homebuyers assistance administration
   - Total Housing set aside = $285,000

13. Emergency projects may be considered by the Regional Review Committee at any time during the year. Projects that are considered for emergency CDBG funding must still meet a national objective and regional goals set by the committee. Projects may be considered an emergency if the following apply:
   - Funding through a normal CDBG funding cycle time frame would create an unreasonable health and/or safety risk to people or property.
   - A public health and safety crisis experienced by a city or county which could not have been foreseen (i.e. fire, flood, act of God)
   - Alternative funding or temporary solution is not available.

If an applicant deems it necessary to apply for emergency funding, they must contact the Uintah Basin AOG promptly to review the project. Emergency funds are limited on a statewide basis and require approval from the State CDBG Policy Board. The amount of emergency funds awarded will be deducted from the region’s allocation during the next funding cycle.
Application Scoring Information

Application scoring by the UBAOG and the RRC members will be according to the following guidelines.

1. **Capacity to Carry-Out Grant:** The grantee must have a history of successful grant administration in order to receive full credit in the category. First time grantees and grantees that have not had an application funded in the past six years will receive 2.5 by default. Applicants with poor past performance must present a plan, at the time of application, showing how they will overcome past issues and make this a successful application. The state CDBG staff will award 1-5 points for this criteria.

2. **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.

3. **Infrastructure:** Ten points are awarded to any Infrastructure project.

4. **Improvement of Housing Units:** Rehabilitation of housing units will receive points based on the units being rehabilitated. The number of units to be rehabilitated must be provided at the time of application.

5. **Health and Safety:** Projects that address a threat to public health, safety or the ability to provide basic services (water, sewer, natural disaster) to an area or serve a need will receive ten points. These projects must be presented as a health or safety issue at the time of application.

6. **LMI Beneficiaries:** Points will be awarded based on the percentage of project beneficiaries that are Low-Moderate Income (LMI) based on information provided by the most current census data or approved income survey. LMI population of more than 76% will be awarded 4 points, 66% 3 points, 56% 2 points, and 51-55% 1 point.

7. **Targeted LMI Population:** Projects that target the percentage of the beneficiaries that are LMI beneficiaries will receive 5 points. Applicant must demonstrate that 100% of the beneficiaries are LMI.

8. **Financial Commitment-Local Funds:** If local sources such as the town or county have contributed a cash match to the project, points will be
awarded based upon the amount contributed. Points will be awarded on a per capita basis. For example, if a town of 500 contributes $10,000 to the project, the funds will be divided by the population. In this example, $10,000 would be divided by 500 to get a per capita of $200 per person contributed. Points are awarded on that per capita contribution. Documentation of the commitment of the additional funding sources must be submitted with the application.

9. **Financial Commitment-Outside Funds:** If funds are contributed from an outside source, points will be awarded based on the amount of funds contributed. If more than $50,000 is contributed, full points will be awarded. $25,000 to $49,999 contributed will receive three points. $10,000 to $24,999 will receive two points. And $500 to $9,999 will receive one point.

10. **Consolidated Plan-Capital Improvements List:** Projects must be listed in the Regional Consolidated Plan’s One-Year Capital Improvements List to be considered for funding. Projects that have been considered for a longer amount of time and have shown prior planning will be given more points. Projects that have been on the list for four or more years will receive four points, three years will receive three points, two years will get two points, one year will get one point.

11. **Consolidated Plan:** Each entity is required to submit information for the annual update of the Regional Consolidated Plan. Those entities that have submitted their information, in a timely manner, to the UBAOG to complete that update will be awarded full points.

12. **Area Served by Project:** Points are given based on the area served by the project. If a project will benefit multiple counties (UBAOG), it will receive 10 points. If the project will benefit one entire county, it will receive 7 points. If the project benefits a city or town it will receive 5 points. If the project benefits a specific site it will receive 2 points.

13. **Civil Rights Compliance:** Applicants (City/County) will receive points for compliance with federal laws, executive orders and regulations relate to civil rights. 1 Point will be given by completing the “ADA Checklist for Readily Achievable Barrier Removal” for city/county office.

14. **Civil Rights Compliance:** 1 point will be given to a city/county who has adopted the following policies – Grievance Procedure under the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 and ADA Effective Communication Policy, Language Access Plan and Section 504 ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy.