

CDBG POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

March 14, 2024

Location: 250 North Main Street Richfield, UT 84701

Sevier County Administration Building

Electronic Meeting Link:

10:00 AM - 1:00 PM

In Attendance:

Board Members:

Kendall Crittenden (Representing Mountainland Region)
Matt Tippetts (Representing Uintah Basin Region)
Mark Allen (Representing Wasatch Front Region)
Larry Jacobsen (Representing Bear River Region)
Danny Van Wagoner (Representing Southeastern Region)
Paul Cozzens (Representing Five County Region)
Scott Bartholomew (Representing Six County Region)

Housing and Community Development Staff:

Christina Oliver Director
Jennifer Domenici Assistant Director
Zach Leavitt CDBG Program Manager
Sarah Moore Environmental Review Spc
Tamara Dockstader CDBG Program Spc
Janell Quiroz HCD Administrative Asst
Julie Tuimauga CDBG Program Spc
Nicole Kerr CDBG Program Spc

AOG Representatives:

Kevin Yack (Representing Uintah Basin AOG)
Christy Dahlberg (Representing Wasatch Front RC)
Lacee Meyer (Representing Southeastern UALG)
Shay Morrison (Representing Six County AOG)
Cody Christensen (Representing Five County AOG)
Debby Lauret (Representing Mountainland AOG)
Brian Carver (Representing Bear River AOG)

Additional Attendees:

Trevin Morgan DWS Contract/Grant Analyst
Elliot R. Lawrence DWS Attorney
Sarah Smith DWS Contract/Grant Analyst
Kelly Jorgensen HUD
Abby Adams HUD
Bill Rees UDEG/DERR
Hans Millican UDEG/DERR

Welcome – Chairman Kendall

Opened meeting announcing time, date, location and board members in attendance.
Introduced new Staff Tamara Dockstader and new Southeast UALG representative Lacee Meyer, Elliot Lawrence Attorney and Trevin Morgan Contract analyst.

Review Policy Committee Terms – Chairman Kendall

Paul Cozzens term is expiring in December, will you be staying on for a new term. The Five county board will need to approve. CDBG will need a letter from Five County AOG stating that Paul will be representing them for another term.

Scott Bartholomew expires in December he will be replaced by Commissioner Jensen.

Danny Van Wagoner expires in December – He understands he will be renewed by his AOG board.

For all renewing and replacing board members we will need the proper letter from the AOGs

Annual Training on Open & Public Meeting Act – Elliot Lawrence

Reviewed Utah code, Title 52, Chapter 4 Public policy

All public meetings of public bodies are open to public, any deliberation must be done in public and actions and votes must be done in public. It's part of the law that public bodies must receive training which is why we are here today. Lawrence continued through his presentation going through definitions and policies around Public meetings including agendas, closed meetings, public notices, recordings, minutes, site tours, electronic meetings, explanations of what the meeting is for and what part of the meeting you are in, maintaining order and control, etc.

Q Kendall - if the by laws and policies of a body have a different definition of Quorum do they go by the Body's bylaw?

A Lawrence – yes it could be changed by rule and it's also possible to have certain circumstances where super majority or $\frac{3}{4}$ majority is needed.

Q Kendall – is character and competence of an individual or maybe an investigation into misconduct a reason to not record.

A Lawrence – It would still need to be recorded but the recording would not need to be disclosed or publicly posted in some circumstances. For privacy reasons there are some circumstances where the recording could be deleted.

Q Kendall – so it's not subject to GRAMA

A Lawrence – right it would not be subject to GRAMA. However, we do make the recording, because there may be circumstances where we would have to release it. Just so it's just to be safe. We do keep the recording. It's just not disclosed to the public unless it's ordered to be disclosed.

Q Carver - so by court order to release, right?

Q Cozzens – On another public body, we even have the secretary leave, and it's a separate piece of the meeting. They stop and restart it for that portion. I think that's one thing that I learned in a training like this that I've been involved in a long time ago. But they said technically, you should. If you have several items to address in a closed session, you should list the first one, vote to go into closed session for that reason. Go in, come back, list the

next one. Go back and do it separately. We've never done that, but somebody that taught this in another training advised. What's your thoughts on that?

A Lawrence – that may be a good practice. If for no other reason than you don't give people a reason to think something is going on. It's very clear and above board

Lawrence – a closed meeting should be an exception. There are circumstances when it's appropriate (Protect a persons' privacy or business interest) but it should be the exception.

Q Kendall – On the allowed comments I'd like to hear more about that. We had a meeting a couple weeks ago in Midway that was hijacked by some people and they couldn't cut them off and they kept coming back to world peace and we've got to do this and this against Israel and so on. And so now we're looking at our laws and policy to see how we can control comments that could be inappropriate. So what do the rest of you do?

A Lauret – when I did city council we gave a 3 minute limit and then we would thank them.

Q Kendall – Do you allow comments on agenda items?

A Cozzens – we allow a public comment section and for 3 minutes they need to state their name and their comment. We've been advised by our attorney not to engage. They can state their comment but if it's not on the agenda we can't respond. But on public hearing we let everyone speak unless there's a time crunch then we say ok, pick a spokesperson for this point of view we only have 30 minutes or whatever it is.

A Jacobsen – there's a difference between public meetings and public hearings. Public meetings people get to come and watch you work, public hearings people come and have the right to offer comments. You don't have to take public comments in a public meeting unless it's a public hearing.

A Lawrence – that's correct. And we could say "within reason". It is appropriate to kindly say that there are a lot of people that want to talk so please your comments brief and avoid repetition. It is also appropriate to ask a member of the public to leave if they are being disruptive. You can let them say their piece and you can say hey, we have business to do we need to move on.

Voluntary Cleanup Program for CDBG grantees – Bill Rees

Rees reviewed UDEG/DERR process and program and how they work with communities and developers. The issuance of COC

Q Cozzens – Who issues the COC

A Rees – we do

Q Lauret – Phase 1 and 2 have significant price tags, who pays for those? Are there grants?

A Rees – Yes, developers, landowners, cities may all pay and there are opportunities for grants. It may be dictated by the lender. Phase 1 is about \$4000, and Phase 2 is \$30,000-\$40,000. DERR has a grant as well.

Q Kendall – I thought you could build on top of landfills, do you have to remove the landfill to certify it?

A Rees - Not all landfills are going to be vertical builds, a lot of them are subgrade builds. And so, you end up in a situation where an old landfill needs to be cleaned up. Sometimes they have to dig it all out. And getting the work done isn't just always environmental. Sometimes it's strictly for Geo technical purposes.

Q Cozzens – there is a commercial property a block from my cabin, we've had several recyclers come through there and 1 was crushing computers and sticking it in 4x4 containers in a mobile unit and it's pretty much toxic waste and when they went under the land owner was just stuck with it.

A Rees – I think a property like that would have a tainted perception and if a community were to acquire a property like that there are grants and tools to help offset the costs but a lot of cleanups come down to economics and whether it's cost effective to clean them up.

Q Kendall – so can they acquire the land and clean it up and then sell it?

A Rees – yes absolutely

Q Lauret – you've referenced grants, are they difficult to obtain?

A Rees – Yeah, they can be very difficult and technical. However, people have gotten better at filing and sometimes contractors help. I don't think Utah has missed out on a single grant that has been applied for.

Q Tippets – the town of Manilla has a 10 acre abandoned site that consists of old sewer ponds. Would a site like that qualify for this program?

A Rees – It might, depending on if it's under an existing permit with another part of my agency. If that were the case there are exclusions in the definition of a Brownfield. We can't usurp another program so if it's under permit from the division of water quality it may not qualify.

Domenici - Yeah. So you guys have lots of questions. The AOG reps have been asking questions. Board members have been asking questions. So I would just recommend that during your fall, "how to apply" workshops, that you invite Bill, and if he's able to attend, maybe those that are planning to apply for the next funding cycle can ask specific questions about their projects and get a better idea if a project is shovel ready, and if not, how long that could take.

Leavitt – Bill, I can get you a schedule of those so we can get the word out about this.

Q Kendall – Jen are you suggesting that tying into CDBG money to some of the grant opportunities for these sites?

A Domenici – I'm saying that applicants are required to attend a "How to Apply" workshop and that's a great time to meet with Bill and get this overview and have him answer questions. As applicants learn how to apply for CDBG they may realize that they are not quite shovel ready and Bill's program could address some due diligence questions they may still need to work on. Having these questions addressed at the workshop might help applicants realize they're not quite ready to apply due to environmental factors that still need to be addressed.

A Rees – we do a lot of help with due diligence to help work with HUD regulations.

For mor info from Ree and the DERRs his contact info is Bill Rees 801-536-4100
<https://deq.utah.gov/environmental-response-and-remediation/cercla-comprehensive-environmental-response-compensation-and-liability-act/brownfields-program/brownfields-program>

Q Kendall – do you suggest we share this with members within our jurisdiction?

A Rees – yes the fact sheet in the PowerPoint is a great place to start.

Q Lauret – in the rules of HUD of your total allocation 30% could be used for blight projects. I'm assuming it's the same for the state?

A Rees – yeah we have to serve under served communities so there are certain things we have to run, that's really an imposition of the federal government today.

Acceptance of Sep 2023 Meeting Minutes – Kendall

MOTION Proposed Crittenden/Second Van Wagoner

Kendall Crittenden -Yes

Larry Jacobsen - Yes

Paul Cozzens - Yes

Scott Bartholomew - Yes

Danny Van Wagoner - Yes

Matt Tippets - Yes

Mark Allen – Yes

Motion to approve draft minutes from September 2023 meeting passed.

2024 Regional Allocations – Zach

We had a lot of reallocated funds this year. We have not had the totals for the new year come in from HUD yet. Any guess Kelly of when we'll know what the allocations are for this year?

A Jorgensen – the Our headquarters office in DC runs the formula so that the budget was just passed on the third or fifth of this month. So, it's pretty recent still.

Q Kendall – any indication that it'll be less than average?

A Jorgensen – it's hard to know, the national allocation was the same as last year but every year we have new entitlements that come into it and changes in population, housing and other formula factors, we usually think it's around the same but we don't yet.

We had a large amount of reallocated funds due to a couple of cancellations in large projects.

Q Carver – Why is Smithfield in red?

A Leavitt- that is unintentional, it was copied from another spreadsheet and the conditional formatting must have had an issue, I missed correcting it.

Q Bartholomew – This is confusing, you've got large amounts being turned back in Huntsville returning 426,000, why? They've got to know going into the applications that there are factors to account for.

A Lauret – I had heard they had sold some land and received more than expected so they were able to backfill the new project with the additional funds.

A Domenici – CDBG funds are hard to use, they come with more protocols and stipulations and a lot of regulations, Davis Bacon, America by America, environmental reviews etc so smaller communities, if they can come up with other funds, they'll choose to use those other funds.

Domenici – What we wanted to talk to the board about today is each region is allocated an amount to use for this years rating and ranking for this year's projects. What has been happening, though the past couple of years is not all regions are able to fully use their allocation. And so, because the way that our CDBG program is set up right now, what we have been doing is if we have an area that cannot use their full allocation we are holding onto those funds for an entire year and then going through the method of distribution the following year and dividing those out equally. HUD does a spend down report every quarter and we gauge how we're doing with our CDBG funds. And they base a lot of performance metrics on this spend down report. And we've been in the top 3 for years and we want to stay #1 for as long as we can. When we are holding onto funding for an entire year because a region couldn't spend it, it can negatively affect that report. We want to ask the Board is if there is an area that cannot fully spend their regional allocation maybe looking at the possibility of funding shovel ready projects across the state that are ready to go.

Kendall – we talked the other day about if a region had 500,000 in allocation but the projects that applied only came to 400,000 they're going to 100,000 that will not be spent. So we're talking about that-

Leavitt – Yeah

Kendall – but know you just mentioned funds being awarded and then returned unfunded, but we wouldn't know that until later in the year when they were returned, right?

Domenici – In February State staff review the applications with the AOGs to determine if they meet the CDBG requirements. If they do AOGs do their rating and ranking the month of March (they're usually done the end of March) and so in April, if an AOG has funding left over that they can't use then we would like to use that funding before we start contracting in July on shovel ready.

Kendall - In other words, the money would be released soon enough that another area that had maybe 5 projects apply but only enough funding for 4 but the 5th is a good, valid, ready to go project could use it that year on the ready project.

Q Cozzens – can you turn around the paperwork that quick, in only a couple months?

Q Kendall - that's a question I have too-

A Domenici - The project would already be rated and ranked and approved

Q Cozzens – so we would need the Feds to approve to ship that money to another area’s project?

A Domenici – we would have to make a policy change, HUD doesn’t care, we would have to have an update to our policies and procedures. We gotta make those updates and get approvals from the Board.

Q Cozzens – I think it’s a no brainer, I’m mean we’ve got projects that are ready and funds sitting around waiting for next year to be reallocated, why wouldn’t we do that?

Q Domenici – Christina did I miss anything on that?

A Oliver – No.

Q Tippetts – Is there a reason why the region can’t bank the funds for future projects, or do they have to go back? Does the HUD program require documentation that those funds are used in a certain time frame?

Q Kendall – so you’re saying bank it in the region?

A Domenici – that’s a great question and that’s the problem that we’re running into now. CDBG funding is not funding that we can sit on and wait until we have a project ready. We have to get it spent as fast as possible or it affects our federal reporting, the spend down reporting and we get flagged in IDIS which is HUD’s reporting system. We need to be identifying projects and beneficiaries, sitting on it has adverse consequences. We can’t hold onto it; it needs to be spent as quickly as we can.

Q Tippetts - Based on that fact it would make sense to not let a region sit on it but return it to the whole state pot and get it used as quickly as possible.

Domenici – if we put it back in the state pot using our current method of distribution it would be distributed evenly to all regions. Our ask is to consider a policy change that instead of being evening distributed the funds are used for the next shovel ready project regardless of what region it is in.

Q Tippetts – so move it from one region to another and not put it back into the pot?

A Domenici - Yes

Q Kendall – How do we determine priority if multiple regions have shovel ready projects?

A Leavitt – we would need to establish a procedure for determining.

Q Dahlberg - If we hold it for a year in a region or at the state level how is that different it would still get spent at the same time, right?

A Domenici – no. Right now we’re holding remaining funds and reallocation next year, what we want to do is take remaining funds and use immediately.

Q Dahlberg – Yeah, I get that what I'm asking is a different conversation. Right now, we hold the leftovers and they get redistributed among the regions the next year. Why aren't the regions getting to keep their leftovers in their region for the next year, either way it's being spent next year, why is it being redistributed. Would it be possible to change the policy so the funds remain with the region for the next year?

A Leavitt – the spend down report begins the moment we obligate the funds and leaving the unobligated also affects the spend down report that's why we're discussing a change.

Q Dahlberg – but as of right now it's still being held for a year, so whether it's held for a year and then divided by 7 or held for a year and retained by the region it's the same so why can't the region retain the funds. I get that it's not the conversation we're having right now. I understand the conversation we're having right now is trying to spend the funds in the same year but I'm just wondering, like, if that doesn't pass, like, the spend down is the same.

Q Kendall - are you talking about the amount on the report – the green number?

A Dahlberg – Yeah

A Kendall – cuz that does get held a year because they were approved and for whatever reason they weren't able to spend it? That's the difference.

A Morrison – I think that's where the confusion is coming from, these are two different conversations that need to be separated.

Domenici – if why have a approved project that is funded and for whatever reason the project comes back and say nevermind we can't use these funds the board could decide instead of waiting a whole year to go ahead and fund a contract that or to fund a project that is ready to go. Then we would have more than 1 application cycle. Does that make sense.

Kendall – I think we need to keep these two separate.

Q Bartholomew – Ok back to Jennifer's original question. I don't understand why you can't spend these monies in your AOGs? Every year we have a list that we can't fund, we have to cut them off. We've got 6 applications right here now that we couldn't fund. We'd be more than happy to take your money if you can't spend it.

Kendall – and that's what the proposal is.

Bartholomew - I'm 100% for that.

Domenici – we are still struggling with public hearings, public notices being done incorrectly and then project become ineligible as a result. I think once we get down to the areas discussion on their rating and ranking they can explain how it's going a why they've only got a couple applications.

Q Lauret – we've had several projects that were looking good but then a city council changed their mind and then surveys came back saying they didn't qualify, I think in our area we would have had more but we just ran into snags. My concern is we have some left

this year but next year we will need the whole amount, will taking the money change what I get next year?

A Kendall – we don't want the formular to change, start fresh the next year.

A Leavitt – correct, it's a one-time movement based on the current circumstance for just the current year.

Q Cozzens – would it be appropriate to make a motion?

A Kendall – Yeah

Motion Cozzens – I move . . .

Kendall – wait, are there any more questions?

Q Tippetts – what about a hybrid, I'm familiar with joint highways and their procedures. I don't know if anybody else is, but what they do is that you know there's a certain amount of money that's available for projects applicants can apply for. Then they rank the projects. And if you're in the top rankings based on the amount that's available, you get funded if each region were to do that, and maybe that's what's happening. But if I would say I would like for each region to get the priority of using the money before it goes back into the total fund. I understand the issue of timing, but if they have all the rankings done, and a funded project falls off the list, then you just take the next one or 2 projects in that region. Now, if they don't have any projects in the region, I think it totally makes sense to put that back into the overall pot for a ready project in another region. But I'd like to see the region have priority to use the funding that they've received.

Q Carver – that's the way we used to do it 5-6 years ago if we didn't spend all the money allocated the state would put the money back into that region's allocation for the next year. It was determined that it was too much to try to keep track of in IDIS and so they consolidated it into one and ran it through the redistribution system. And I'll let Jen and Zach defend that, but it has been tried before and there were problems. And that's kind of why we do it the way we do it now. But to speak to the original question about redirecting unallocated funds to use on projects in areas that have more requests than funds available, yeah I believe we've had a conversation about using unallocated funds in order to help projects that were awarded in previous years but are now over budget due to inflation or scope creep or whatever. I've got a couple projects in my area that are over budget due to whatever complications arose through project development. Would it be possible to take some of these unspent or unallocated funds and put them into projects already under contract?

Domenici – if I can, maybe we put a work group together and talk through some options and present something in the September meeting.

Cozzens – that was going to be my proposal.

Kendall - I liked the comments given.

Cozzens - Well, we had a fire station in Newcastle, just west of Cedar City that we built. We did everything we should have. The contractor applied for a SAMs# he is a very qualified contractor. And for some reason they just, he did everything he was supposed to, and he, they just wouldn't give him a number, and it delayed our project 8 months. And so the inflation thing kicked in, and it was then out of budget. We had to go back and beg for more money from CIB to finish project, so that would be a great a great option if we could do something like that.

Q Kendall - Would that require reopening their contract? But I like the idea.

A Cozzens – probably

A Domenici – yeah, we'd have to that figure out, we'd have to change policy and amend contracts. I would have to get with Christina and get her thoughts. It would require a work group to figure it all out.

Dahlberg – I know I'm not a voting member but I definitely second not making a decision right now and having a work group go through the options in more detail. And then also just wanted to add that I was meaning to bring up this topic in this meeting today. When Jess was in the position he had sent an email that contingency funds were going to be allowed in this funding cycle. And so we put that in our policies and procedures that was published in the Handbook for this year, and so I'm not. But then I don't know. I don't know. There, like we've I've had some conversations with the State, and I don't know if that was actually put into policy, or what's going on, but definitely an option we'd like to discuss and keep up, if possible.

Morrison – just a thought if we're looking to propose this in September, I don't know about the other AOGs but we look at adopting policies and procedures in June/July so it would be beneficial for us to have this figured out prior to that time because we would have to change things in our own policies and procedures for programming 2025. As it currently stands I think there would be some complications if we went the route of allowing our funds to go back and fund projects that may be over budget for whatever reason. Just a thought

Q Domenici- are you talking about your rating and ranking policies?

Morrison – we approve in June or July and then we bring them to the board for approval. So essentially we would be approving in June or July something that board wouldn't approve until September and if we're not all in alignment it could cause issues down the road.

Cozzens – so we'd need it ready by June for the AOGs to approve it in June/July and then we'd approve it in September.

Kendall – to make it state level

Leavitt – so the work group would need to have a finished project by June at the latest.

Moore – the only thing this would affect is anything in our rating and ranking that is not funded but approved.

Morrison – other wording that might need to be considered is that the scope or the budget cannot change because it affects the rating and ranking order. And so if we're awarding projects and then they're over budget working back and allowing us a change in scope or changing budget, it's technically changing their rating, ranking order from when they were initially ready to rank. And so then, we have language in there that that states that that cannot happen at this point. And it's still changing the budget which changes the rating in rating order. Right? I'm not saying we're opposed to changing it, I'm just saying it'll need consideration.

Kendall – this task force is going to have to get busy.

Cozzens – we'll have to change the way we notice awards saying, you weren't funded but there may be funds available later. We'd still need to have that done before the Grantee workshop in April.

Cozzens – Motion to authorize staff to create a work group from this body to talk about these policy changes where, if there's a shovel ready project in another AOG, and we have excess funds, that those could be reallocated to them. But it doesn't affect your ranking. We authorize the work group and staff to check with HUD and those agencies to ensure compliance overall.

Kendall – maybe in the workgroup look at the issue that Brian brought up as well that it could maybe go to a prior project in that region before it goes out to another region.

Bartholomew – 2nd

Kendall do we have any discussion on the motion?

Q Jacobsen – do we have a due date for a deliverable from the work group?

A Cozzens – sounds like June would be the date so the other AOG's have time to vote and implement and then we can vote in September.

Cozzens – I'll add that to my motion that it has to be completed by, when do the AOGs meet? June?

Morrison – I think the issue is you're not giving the work group approval to approve just to propose an idea so it wouldn't be approved until September.

Cozzens – each AOG group would have to vote on it right?

Kendall - Well, we thought on this meeting September, you're getting the work group and come up with such a great idea. There's no way it's going to be voted down. At that time.

Carver - The AOG's can create their a proposed policy but this Board has to approve that policy going forward?

Cozzens - Can we give them a template to consider? And then they can each vote on it. Then we can approve it in our September meeting, if they're all on board.

Leavitt - that would be the goal. I think middle of June.

Kendall – we're going to jump to the Motion! Second still stand Scott?

Bartholomew – yes

MOTION Proposed Cozzens/Second Bartholomew

Kendall Crittenden -Yes

Larry Jacobsen - Yes

Paul Cozzens - Yes

Scott Bartholomew - Yes

Danny Van Wagoner - Yes

Matt Tippets - Yes

Mark Allen – Yes

Motion passed

CDBG regional Applications – Zach

Leavitt – met with AOGs to go through all applications. We had a few that we had to deem ineligible, either due to public meeting notices not being posted correctly or in the correct time frame or being unable to demonstrate beneficiaries met the requirement of low to moderate income. Recommend amending rating and ranking policies to collect applications earlier so there's time to follow all the protocols. A good example is Six Counties, they have a December 15th deadline to be able to advance in the process in their region. We recommend an early deadline so if there are issues with public notices or public hearings they have time to redo or address.

Lauret – we have January 15th as our deadline.

Leavitt – another call for attention from the Board is that we've had a lot fewer applications for funds so a lot more is going into single family. So, we're going to throw out another recommendation similar to last year's rating and ranking and that's to up your caps on the amount of money that a project can ask for, or perhaps eliminate the cap. That's a discussion for the local rating and ranking, just a recommendation.

Oliver – as we're looking at single family we do have \$500,000 /year on the Olene Walker Board that's state funds for home repairs in rural Utah. And we have another 2.75 million/year for lot development, predevelopment or purchase for single family home and we want to make sure we're utilizing that that. There are 2 other funding streams through OWHLF (Rehab and self-help). So I just want to ensure that we provide everybody a menu.

Leavitt – Staff will get something around to the board to show those options.

Domenici – we're hoping when we hear from the AOGs that they will discuss what's happening at the “how to Apply” workshops and why they're not seeing many applicants. Do we need more marketing for CDBG. And maybe share some best practices as well to increase applicant success so we're not rolling so much over to single family rehab, especially since there is so much other funding for those situations.

Regional Rating/Ranking & Awards – AOG Reps

Carver – We had 23 communities and organizations represented at the “How to apply” workshop in October. By December we were working on 7 applications and by January we have 3 ready to submit. As of today, I’ve had 1 actually complete and submit an acceptable application. We struggled with public notice requirements. These last 3 applicants each held more than 1 public hearing in an attempt to try and get public hearing notice requirements. @ of them still failed on their second meeting. I had problems with a newspaper that failed to publish the notice as requested. Part of the problem is the people that come to workshops to learn how to apply correctly are not the people actually writing up and publishing the notice. The notices are being written and posted by town clerks and for whatever reason they have the wrong date or the wrong notice title so I’m trying to figure out what I can do to catch these errors earlier. If I had even 1 more application come through completed, I wouldn’t be turning any money back this year, but now almost half of my allocation is going to our single family rehab. It’s going to be a challenge to get that spent. Especially when there are easier choices for single family rehab. My Board is looking at other ways to use this funding to make an impact within the region. How can we do more projects within Logan city which is an entitlement city. We have some considerable regional needs in terms of our food pantry and county senior centers as well as a mental health and homeless individual service center. It makes sense to locate these facilities inside Logan city even though they would provide a regional benefit. We want to find a way to share costs with Logan city and that will require a change in policy on the States part and our local part. Normally we have more applicants than funds, so it’s been an off year.

Dahlberg – We had 14-15 communities/ entities at our how to apply workshop and we ended up with 6 applications. 2 were disqualified, 1 because it’s in Ogden which is an entitlement city. I would be interesting, Brian in helping work through and bring about the ability to work with entitlement cities. It’s a county owned community center and it benefits the whole county. Ogden city doesn’t put any money into it but because of where it’s physically located we’re not able to spend money on it. Our regional review committee unanimously stated their support for a project like that if we could work out the policy and logistics. The other disqualification was a typo in the public hearing notice with the wrong year. It’s disappointing but we’ll be better prepared next year. So we’ll have 4 contacts out with awards. And then not to bring up a topic that I guess maybe we’ve moved on from, but I again just wanted to get a little bit of clarity on you know we were told by Jess that contingency funds would be allowed in this year. And that was in our rating, ranking policy, which was approved by this group in September. So unsure, if that will be available for projects this year or not. But if it is, we will have some funding left over for contingency if allowed.

Lauret – we had 12 at our “How 2 Apply” 4 moved forward and then a city council tabled 1 project after we had done all the work. 1 project did an LMI survey and did not qualify based on the numbers their income was too high. 1 project had difficulty with their methodology and that left just 1 project that applied. We were successful with single family, it was MAGs

first year we had about 300,000 we have 130,000 left, we helped 22 families and it's making a huge difference. The average award is 20,000 and that a lot of roofs, a lot of driveways, anything health and safety so we're pleased with the amount done. We'll have funds from projects that didn't materialize to put into single family again this year and we've spread it out between the counties. I do expect the three projects that didn't make it this year to be back next year.

Yack - for us at our "how to apply" we had nearly every eligible entity that could apply for CDBG come. CDBG, kind of scares people out here, due to the Federal reporting requirements and some of the extra burden that that comes with Federal funds. We did have a project lined up for one in Una County that was ready to go clear until the end until their estimates. They got official estimates back, and it was just more than they wanted to put in after they would be awarded, even knowing that they probably would get a sizable portion of the fund. So they pulled out at the last second. We place a high importance on housing improvements due to the extraction industry and the fact that we have booms and bust frequently in our area. Our housing stock is greatly affected. From the seventies on from the different times of boom and bust. Every year we do a set aside for our single family rehab, and all unallocated funds that don't get awarded go back to our single family program, and we were very grateful for all the single family assistance that the State has provided. We can and do spend all of the different pots of funding in very different ways. But for CDBG we do have a waiting list of up to 2 years of individuals that that need assistance with our single family program that we run. So that's where we're at. We're trying our best to advertise it. Typically, our region has gone to and elected to use CIB funding instead of CDBG funding due to the more of a relaxed nature. But due to the nature of the current CIB funding I would anticipate that CDBG will become more popular because of the lack of funds available through CIB. So that's where we're at.

Morrison – Six County had around 23 at the "How to Apply" workshop which is actually slightly lower than most years. But that's maybe on purpose. We tried to work with our communities before that, so that we knew actually who needed to attend. We had 16 out of those 23 ended up working with. Of the 16 one of them did not end up finishing through with their survey, so they'll finish up the survey for next year. One of them was deemed ineligible for CDBG. So we went down to 14 applications that we had turned in in January. Of those 14 Sevier county was deemed to be an incomplete application because they didn't attach a concrete bid. We work with them before but that wasn't including the application. So we're down to 13 total that we're moving forward with. We have a couple of questions on a couple of waiting for answers from HUD. But we feel pretty good about where we're at. Of those 13 some of the projects are sanitary Improvements, multiple park projects, a few water system improvements, community center acquisition, a senior center, and food bank improvements. So that's kind of the list of the projects that we got, mostly recreation and water. Some things that have worked for us to avoid disqualification with notices: We write almost all the notices for our communities, and fill it out all the way, and then send it to them to post, we go on and check it, and if it's not correct, then we're just calling and saying, Hey, this is incorrect, and you fix it, and then they repost it. We check it again until it's correct. And then, in addition to that, we tried to attend most of the public hearings. So the

team of guys that we have down the office we're working with the communities writing the notices, preparing for and going to the public hearings and making sure that they're actually covering what they need to cover in the public hearing. So that was also good. We also help them write out the minutes and get that approved. When we're sending out information in the start of the year we have been not only emailing all the communities and calling them, but we also attend most of their city council meetings prior to the "How to Apply" workshop and discuss CDBG. So most of them have a face to face interaction about the program. We work with them on their CIPs and see what projects on their improvement list they could maybe come to see CDBG for. And then, in addition to that we have heard several complaints from community similar to what many of you have said, that Federal funding is getting too difficult and that they don't want to even play the game anymore. They're willing to just not accept the money, etc., and so the way that we've kind of made up for that and got people to apply is literally just doing the work for them. Most of our applications were filled out by our team. We just drive out to the communities and fill out the web grants applications with them. We're coordinating with them on all their fees and their estimates, and we check their SAM.gov, etc. I anticipate we'll do that even more next year to the point where our communities probably aren't just going to be doing much of the work at all. We'll probably be doing most of the lifting. We're having slightly less communities come to the "How to apply" but we're having more apply. So we have had a growth in the amount of those that apply and a decrease in the amount that are attending the workshop and a decrease in the percentage that are attending the workshop and not applying. I think that's just due to working more closely with those communities. Happy to answer any questions.

Q Kendall - Do you have a bigger staff than the other AOGs? Could others do what he's talking about doing?

A Lauret – it would have to be me, I have maybe 2 others that could help with stuff.

A Morrison - Yeah, so we have 5. We had one planner for a while there, and then we went to 2 and then with the legislative money that we got last year we were able to go to 5. But we do have 49 communities that we cover as well. Each of us covers about 10 communities. Over the span of a month and a half-2 months we all attend almost every single city council meeting in the region.

Meyer - I'm relatively new to the position of CDBG manager. The previous manager was there up until the end of January, so I've just been doing it since then. So most of the work that would have been done prior to the rating and ranking process was done before I joined the agency so I won't speak on that just because I don't think that I could give a fair representation of what happened. But what has happened in the last month and a half has gone pretty well. We were able to update our annual action plan. Fairly quickly I was able to get that done. We were able to successfully hold our public hearings. Both for the first public hearing, and for the opening of our AAP and the close of that which went very well. We did unfortunately have one of our projects get disqualified, due to the lack of an income survey which was due to a miscommunication between the applicant and the former CDBG manager, which was unfortunate. To mitigate that going forward, I will be making sure that our applicants are aware of the income survey requirements and other requirements that go along with CDBG program. But outside of that as an agency, we've also just decided to help

that applicant source other funding for the project that they were looking to develop there. Yeah. Other than that it's going pretty well. We're finding out our new funding allocation. We're having our rating and ranking committee vote on that, and that probably will be wrapped up today or tomorrow we're just waiting for a few more votes on that email ratification of that update. But other than that, I think everything is about to be wrapped up.

Christensen - I think we had about 15 come to our "How to Apply". Initially had 4 applicants that I was working with. Big Water missed a deadline on their income survey so they couldn't apply. And then Glenwater had almost everything done, they did their public hearing had everything in web grants and then they just dropped off the face of the earth, I don't know what happened to them. I couldn't get a hold of them and they won't call me back, I don't know if they don't need the funding, I just don't know what happened to them. So should have had 3 applicants but I ended up with 2. We also had an emergency application last year that took some funding off the top of this year. So that pretty much helped us spend all of this year's funding. As far as spending money, when we have our "How to Apply"s we usually have several applicants that are excited about the application and process. It just depends on if they can come up with a project that is ready. I usually end up with 2-3 that are ready and it just comes down to getting everything done in time. And one thing I did do last year was move my application up also to December fifteenth. That helped a bunch with public hearings and things like that. So if there's any issues with that, I also moved up about 2 weeks to help me with things like surveys. I thought that would help but we still missed Bigwater. Hopefully we'll get the survey wrapped up this summer so they can apply next year. I think as far as CDBG goes we come up with some good projects every year.

Cozzens - We were very grateful for the 365,000 emergency funds. We had a fire truck the frame broke, and that's what happens a lot on these old fire trucks. These little fire departments have old used equipment and the fire truck engine frame just snapped. They were not covered at all in that whole valley. So there was a truck available and we were able to purchase that with this emergency funding, and I was very grateful to the steering committee because they all supported us. Washington County where they have enterprise right there in the valley will benefit from that too. They have been so supportive.

Domenici - we want to put one more thing on your radar, we're working to streamline things that can be streamlined so that our programs aren't so siloed. And one of the things that we've been working on is with CIB, the AOGs, you guys are familiar with the CASI and the lists that have to be submitted with applications. Well, in CDBG part of the requirement with our application is that communities submit their prioritization list. But the problem with some of the lists that we get is we don't know where they're coming from. If they've been vetted or not. If it's just an Excel sheet that they slapped a couple of projects on and sent with their application. They just don't make sense. We really haven't been able to use these lists to make sure that the priority that you're rating and ranking systems are prioritizing projects, that they are actually projects that are prioritized in your areas. And so there will be some changes to the CASI. And we're going to be using the same list. So one list for CIB and CDBG that lists the actual projects and gaps in all of the areas. And so with applications, we will get those lists and CIB will be able to say have you applied to CDBG to

fund this? So we'll be working off of the same list of projects where we can really see the projects that are needed and the gaps in all of the areas. It'll come from the CASI.

Oliver – this is something many of the divisions are working on, to get a comprehensive picture of the types of things that are needing to be funded. We want a comprehensive list so all the decision-making bodies can have transparency on what's being funded. We recognize that CIB is everyone's go to because it has fewer regulations, but those funds are being reigned in and the criteria may be changing, the board is meeting and working on tool factors, so there will be some changes. So we just want to get a better picture on what may be needed across the state and compile them into one consolidated list. We recognize for example that a smaller municipality may say well, we put in a sewer 25 years ago and the expectancy is 30 years and they just put together a basic list of upcoming needs and another municipality may have a complex tracking system for upcoming projects. But the CASI, CIB and CDBG will be combined into one list so that all parties have visibility to what is being applied for and what's being prioritized. This way we can promote the more essential, critical needs first.

Leavitt – CASI is capital asset self-inventory. It's a tool in development that we can put into the hands of communities, it's self-guided. It's a tool that helps us identify the priority of the projects across the state in a unified and consistent format. And to help Boards across the departments making decisions about funding and to be able to get good information to help communities.

Q Morrison – Clarification question, in the past six county has not provided a list of projects for CDBG but just priorities of focusses like water, recreation, roads. We survey our communities and collect the priorities, but they don't make lists of their projects. And for CIB we've kept a list of those that have CASI and those that do not, but we haven't turned over all CASI data to CIB. All they have requested of us is to know who has it and who doesn't. So my question is, for CDBG purposes are we going to be required to have a list actual projects rather than priorities and for CDBG and CIB purposes is the actual CASI going to have to be turned in to create that list or is it still just going to be a checklist? I guess what I want to know is what requirements are going to be placed on us outside or previous requirements or if we're talking about streamlining what's already in place?

A Oliver – It's combining all of the 3 different reports into 1. Recognizing that historically, you haven't identified projects in specificity for CDBG. But we do want to start moving in that direction. We want one list so everything will be transparent across funding streams. This is something that has been discussed with the AOGs so it shouldn't come as a surprise, and it is something we will be moving forward on.

Q Tippetts - I am a little concerned that perhaps it could be moving to another outside group prioritizing a project that a local community ought to have that right to prioritize. There's nobody better to prioritize projects than the local municipality or county in my opinion.

Q Morrison – is everyone going to be required to use the same form/format (in the past they could all create their own) for example Richfield fills out their own form and has never filled out your CASI form. Are they ok to keep doing their own thing.

A Domenici - Yeah. So for now, it's okay. Eventually, we want to get to the point where we're all using the same thing. And the reason why is like Christina was saying, if we are aware of certain grants out there, and it's not just HCD it's statewide, when we become aware of all of this other funding out there we can say, Oh, this is a perfect project for that grant or that project should apply for this funding etc.

Morrison – if we're going to require this going to have to be better. Better software and larger municipalities have more complex and better ways that they track their projects than just an excel spreadsheet.

Bartholomew - CIB is going to be requiring applicants to check other sources first and we'll become more like a last resort rather than first.

Kendall – I'm assuming the application for CIB is easier because of the lack of federal regulations.

2024 Grantee Handbook & Workshop –CDBG Team

Leavitt – shared list of changes (mostly cosmetic) and the additional wording around Build America by America

Leavitt - we would like to add in language that AOG's can add a designee to sign on behalf of the AOG if they would like to.

MOTION to accept changes to Grantee Handbook

Proposed Cozzens /Second Tippets

Kendall Crittenden -Yes

Larry Jacobsen - Yes

Paul Cozzens - Yes

Scott Bartholomew - Yes

Danny Van Wagoner - Yes

Matt Tippets - Yes

Mark Allen – Yes

Motion passed

Mandatory grantee workshop April 25th at the state street office in Salt Lake City. We'll walk through how to administer the program and workshops.

Q Dahlberg – will there be a virtual option, I will be out of town

A Leavitt – TBD

Review Bylaws – Kendall

Q Kendall - Do we need to read these? There have been no changes, right?

Q Domenici – do you all understand what the bylaws are?

A Domenici - So the bylaws just outline exactly what your role and responsibility is as a board member. So if you're not familiar with them.

Kendall – please review them.

Q Morrison – AOGs have to have their ratings and rankings policies and procedures reviewed and approved by this board. There was a situation this year where we needed to make a change to our policies and procedures, but it wasn't around a time when this board was going to be meeting. Is there anyway could make a change that our board could approve time sensitive and mission critical changes. Is there a way for AOGs to have some say without the approval of the board during certain times of the year?

A Domenici - so I would say that that would need to be a change that's made in our policies and procedures application which we're going to be updating and improving in September. So I would get with Zach and have it added to the agenda.

Next Meeting – September -- Kendall

Where would we like to meet?

Lauret – we could hold it in Orem at the water conservative building

Kendall - Let's look at some dates- does Thursdays work for everyone.

September 19th in Orem 10-1.

Board agreed

Leavitt will firm up plans and send an invite.

Discussion to see a CDBG project – Board determined to it a day do to moving in storm.

Motion to adjourn Bartholomew/ second Van Wagoner. No opposing vote Meeting adjourned 13:20