

The CDBG funding cycle begins in fall each year.

August - October -

- The AOG will host a public open house and hold a 30 day public comment period for the annually updated Rating and Ranking Criteria, noticed on the public meeting notice website and WFRC's website.

October/November -

- Applicants are required to attend the How to Apply Workshop hosted by the AOG, advertised via email, public notice website, flyer, and on WFRC's website.

November/December -

- Applicants will need to hold a public hearing to let your community know that you intend to apply for CDBG funds, and receive public comment.

January 31 -

- All applications are due on WebGrants by no later than 5 PM to be eligible for funding.

February/March -

- Applications are reviewed and scored by the AOG's CDBG governing body, and decision letters are sent to applicants.
- The Consolidated Plan/Annual Action Plan will be updated by AOG staff and a public hearing and 30 day public comment period will take place. It will be noticed on the public meeting notice website and WFRC's website.

April/May -

- Attend Grantee Workshop hosted by the Utah State Department of Workforce Services. Attendance is mandatory, you will be notified by AOG staff about the date and time.

May/June -

- Before you spend any money on your project, be sure you have received a notice to proceed from the State. You must complete all steps outlined in the Grantee Workshop including conducting an environmental review and holding a second public hearing to inform your community what you plan to spend your award on.

July -

- The State will provide you with your contract so that you can start spending your money on July 1st. Again, do not spend any money before you have a notice to proceed from the Department of Workforce Services.

**WASATCH FRONT REGIONAL COUNCIL  
SMALL CITIES COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT  
REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**BY-LAWS**

Adopted:

June 15, 2009

Revised:

July 14, 2010 | October 13, 2010 | January 12, 2011 | February 18, 2015

November 20, 2018

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of the CDBG Regional Review Committee (RRC) is to provide a structured method for reviewing and rating and ranking CDBG applications at the beginning of each annual funding phase. The rating and ranking is based on requirements of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, the region's Consolidated Plan, the Five-Year Action Plan and the One-Year Annual Action Plan. The RRC is also charged with making recommendations to the Utah Housing and Community Development Division regarding project funding and appointing a representative and an alternate to the State's CDBG Policy Committee.

**MEMBERSHIP**

The RRC is made up of six members. Each participating county's Council of Governments (COG) will appoint one elected official and one staff member to the Committee as necessary annually in the first COG meeting of the calendar year for each county. The participating counties include: Morgan, Tooele, and Weber Counties.

RRC members shall serve two-year terms with no limitation on number of terms served. Where a member is an elected or appointed official, the term shall not extend beyond the official's time in office. If necessary, each participating county's COG may fill vacancies of a local elected official or staff member to serve on the RRC for the remainder of the unexpired term.

The Community Development Block Grant Small Cities State Policy Board Representative (Representative) shall be nominated by the RRC at the first RRC meeting of the calendar year, and appointed by the Governor. The Representative must be an elected official currently serving on the RRC. That Representative may serve two-year terms with no limitation on number of terms served. The Representative shall continue to serve until his/her successor has been appointed. If necessary, the RRC may nominate a new Representative from the RRC to be appointed by the Governor to fill a vacancy for the remainder of the Representative's unexpired term.

Regardless of appointment, RRC members shall have a fiduciary duty to represent the interests of all members in fulfilling the purpose of the RRC.

The RRC Chair and Vice-Chair will be appointed by the RRC. The Chair and Vice-Chair shall serve two-year terms with no limitation on number of terms served.

The Wasatch Front Regional Council CDBG program administrator will staff the RRC, arrange and provide resources for RRC meetings. The WFRC staff member will act in a facilitating, non-voting capacity to the RRC.

**MEETINGS**

The RRC meets the third Tuesday of every February, May, August, and November at 12:00 p.m., unless otherwise determined by the RRC. Members will be notified of meetings by email (unless regular mailing is requested) at least one week prior to the meeting date. Meetings may be cancelled due to lack of an agenda. If meetings are cancelled, members will be notified at least one week prior to the meeting date.

Meetings are subject to the requirements of the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act, and the meeting agenda will be posted on the Utah Public Notice Website.

### QUORUM

A quorum shall be declared when at least four of the six RRC members are present at a meeting.

### VOTING

Each member of the RRC shall have one vote on all matters coming before the RRC. A majority vote of those members present, a quorum being established, shall decide all matters coming before the RRC unless otherwise mandated by state or federal requirements.

RRC members must be present in order to vote and participate in RRC activities. A member that is unable to attend a RRC meeting may designate, in writing or via email, another representative from the same county to attend and participate. This alternate will count toward a quorum and may cast a vote.

At RRC meetings where the ranking of projects will take place, WFRC staff will pre-score each application and provide a summary of such to each member. Projects will be ranked based on final scores determined after review and discussion by the RRC on the project's pre-scores. A summary of all scores will be made available immediately upon request after scoring is complete and has been tabulated by staff and approved by the RRC.

### RECORDS

Written minutes shall be provided by WFRC staff to RRC members summarizing the proceedings of each meeting.

Score sheets used by RRC members to rate and rank projects will be kept on file by WFRC staff for at least five years.

### APPEALS

An applicant may appeal the RRC project ranking if the appeal is made in writing within ten working days following the RRC rating and ranking meeting, and if the applicant cites a specific procedural violation made by the RRC. WFRC staff will contact the applicant prior to the hearing to obtain all pertinent information about the appeal, clarify any misunderstandings concerning facts or policy of the RRC, and identify any alternatives to an appeal and to resolve, if possible, the conflict and obtain a written withdrawal of the appeal. If an appeal is still required refer to Chapter VII of Utah's "CDBG Application Policies and Procedures" guidebook.

## WASATCH FRONT REGIONAL COUNCIL

### 2022 RATING AND RANKING CRITERIA - GENERAL POLICIES

The Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) staff assists applicants through the CDBG process. Applicants are encouraged to take advantage of this service to help reduce administrative costs. Contact Christy Dahlberg at [christy@wfrc.org](mailto:christy@wfrc.org) or 801-363-4250 with questions.

#### FUNDING INFORMATION

- 1 Minimum grant amount is \$30,000 per year.
- 2 The maximum multiple-year grant amount is \$200,000 per year, up to two years (amount may change based on funding appropriation). All applicants proposing projects requiring two years of funding must have a cost estimate and/or breakdown for each year. If a project has been awarded a two-year grant, the second year's grant amount will be taken from the region's appropriation at the beginning of that year's rating and ranking process.
- 3 The maximum grant amount per year for community infrastructure projects is \$250,000. Community infrastructure projects can include water, sewer, street, sidewalk, curb, and gutter projects.
- 4 A single entity may not receive more than \$250,000 in one funding cycle. Multiple projects may be awarded to a single entity in one funding cycle, so long as they do not exceed \$250,000. An exception will be made if there is more funding available after all eligible projects have been funded.
- 5 After fully funding all projects in ranked order, any remaining funds shall be awarded to the next ranked project if it is determined that partial funding is a reasonable option. If partial funding is not an option, then the next ranked project shall be reviewed and funded if possible and so on. Should there be more funding available once all eligible projects are fully funded, up to \$20,000 can be used to study the feasibility of a Revolving Loan Fund (RLF).
- 6 In compliance with the policies of the State of Utah CDBG program, and to be eligible for funding, all grantees or sub grantees must have drawn down at least 50% of any prior year's CDBG funding before the RRC's rating and ranking meeting.

#### APPLICANT INFORMATION

- 7 All applicants are required to attend the region's annual "How to Apply" workshop. The project manager should attend the workshop. If the project manager cannot attend, he or she needs to identify an alternate representative. If sponsorship is required, representatives from the sponsoring city or county and the sub-recipient must also attend. See number 8 to determine if you need a sponsor.
- 8 Only cities and counties are eligible to receive CDBG funding. Applicants, other than cities or counties, are required to gain the sponsorship of a city or county no later than the date of the first public hearing. The decision to sponsor non-governmental entities is entirely up to the city or county. Sponsoring entities are required to ensure all program requirements are met including, attending the How to Apply workshop, ensure that the project is viable, and provide active oversight of the project and contract performance. Sponsors are also required to ensure that the project is part of the Consolidated Plan and that a subcontractor's agreement is mutually agreed on and signed by both entities.

#### PROJECT INFORMATION

- 9 Public service providers are encouraged to apply for capital improvement projects and/or major equipment purchases. Examples include delivery trucks and other public service vehicles, fixtures, computer equipment, construction, remodeling, and facility expansion. State policy prohibits the use of CDBG funds for operating and maintenance expenses including administrative costs or salaries and items that can be easily removed from the building such as office supplies, cleaning supplies, etc. No more than 15% of the state's yearly allocation of funds may be expended for public service projects.
- 10 Projects must be consistent with the region's Consolidated Plan and included in a city or county prioritized capital investment list and meet the overall goals identified in the Plan.
- 11 Emergency projects may be considered by the RRC at any time. An emergency project is one that eliminates or mitigates an imminent threat to health and safety. These projects must meet all CDBG requirements. Applicants must work closely with WFRC staff to ensure program compliance. Emergency projects will be reviewed by the RRC to ensure that a regional goal listed in the Consolidated Plan will be met. Emergency

	projects must be approved by the statewide CDBG Policy Committee. Any funding awarded for emergency projects will be deducted from the subsequent year's annual regional allocation.
12	WFRC staff will visit each applicant on site for a project evaluation/review.
13	The RRC may approve regional CDBG set-asides under the following conditions: 1) they are consistent with the region's Consolidated Plan; 2) they are approved prior to the "How to Apply" workshop.
RATING AND RANKING INFORMATION	
14	In order to receive points for any of the evaluation criteria, applicants must state and include the necessary information as an attachment in WebGrants. The RRC reserves the right to eliminate incomplete applications.
15	WFRC staff preliminarily evaluate all applications using these criteria. The pre-evaluation will be shared with the RRC who makes the final rating and ranking and funding recommendations to the Housing and Community Development Division.
16	In the event that two or more projects receive the same rating and ranking score, the RRC will rank them using the regional priorities identified in Criterion 10. If there is still a tie score, the applicant with the highest percentage of other matching funds shall prevail.
17	Prior to adoption, these Criteria shall be publicly noticed and made available for a 30-day public comment period and public open house.
REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (RRC) INFORMATION	
18	The members of the RRC are listed below along with their respective appointed terms. The RRC consists of six members, two from each of the three counties plus one staff member from WFRC. Each County Council of Governments appoints one elected official and one staff person to represent their county on the RRC. Each member serves a two-year term with no limit upon succession.
19	The RRC reviews the Rating and Ranking Criteria annually to ensure the available funding promotes regional needs and program goals.
20	RRC Membership:
	Thomas Karjola, Mayor, Town of Stockton, January 2020 – December 2021
	Rachelle Custer, Community Development Director, Tooele County, January 2020 – December 2021

	Mark Allen, Mayor, Washington Terrace City, Weber County, January 2020 – December 2021
	Melissa Freigang, Weber County Center of Excellence, January 2020 – December 2021
	Jared Andersen, Councilmember, Morgan County, January 2020 – December 2021
	Lance Evans, Community Development Director, Chair, Morgan County, January 2020 – December 2021
	SET-ASIDES
21	The Wasatch Front Regional Council will set aside \$50,000 of the region’s annual CDBG allocation to provide administration and planning assistance to eligible entities.

WASATCH FRONT REGIONAL COUNCIL			
2022 RATING AND RANKING CRITERIA			
<i>Rank</i>			
<i>Applicant</i>			
<i>Sub-Applicant</i>			
<i>Project</i>			
<i>Total Points</i>			
<i>Total Project Cost</i>			
<i>2020 CDBG Request</i>			
<i>2021 CDBG Request</i>			
<i>% Match</i>			
<i>ACTUAL 2021 CDBG Funding</i>			
CRITERIA	MAX SCORE	DESCRIPTION	APPLICANT SCORE
1. CAPACITY	5 *select up to 4	The grantee's capacity to carry out the CDBG grant. Points are awarded based on historical CDBG grant administration. State staff set and award points for these criteria.	0
Project manager consistency	1		
Documentation and communication	1		
Project was completed within the contract period	1		
Compliance with regulations and laws	2		
First time grantees (default is 2.5 points - no other points awarded)	2.5		
2. HOUSING STOCK	8 *select up to 2	Project results in the construction of housing units; or, housing units made accessible to LMI households. Projects may include acquisition of property and/or construction of infrastructure in support of the proposed housing units. Double the score if the	0

		project serves chronically homeless individuals (up to 8 points). Add 1 additional point if the project serves homeless individuals or families (up to 7 points).	
1 housing units	1		
2 housing units	2		
3 housing units	3		
4 housing units	4		
5 housing units	5		
>5 housing units	6		
Project serves chronically homeless individuals	x2		
Project serves homeless individuals or families	1		
<b>3. MODERATE INCOME HOUSING PLAN</b>	<b>3 *select up to 2</b>	<b>Project results in the development, update, or implementation of a housing project identified in the jurisdiction's Moderate Income Housing Plan. Towns not required to comply will receive 1 point if the project benefits an affordable housing goal identified in the Consolidated Plan.</b>	<b>0</b>
Project results in the development of a Moderate Income Housing Plan	1		
Project results in the update to a Moderate Income Housing Plan	1		
Project implements a Moderate Income Housing Plan element	2		
Project implements a Consolidated Planning housing goal (towns)	1		
<b>4a. EXTENT OF <u>VERY LOW</u> INCOME SERVED BY THE PROJECT</b>	<b>6 *select 1</b>	<b>Project directly benefits very low-income households (household income is at or less than 30% area median income).</b>	<b>0</b>
1 - 5%	1		

6 - 10%	2		
11 - 15%	3		
16 - 20%	4		
21 - 25%	5		
>26%	6		
4b. EXTENT OF <u>LOW</u> INCOME SERVED BY THE PROJECT	5 *select 1	Project directly benefits low-income households (household income is 31%-50% area median income).	0
1 - 10%	1		
11 - 20%	2		
21 - 30%	3		
31 - 40%	4		
>41%	5		
4c. EXTENT OF <u>MODERATE</u> INCOME SERVED BY THE PROJECT	4 *select 1	Project directly benefits moderate income households (household income is 51%-80% area median income).	0
1 - 20%	1		
21 - 40%	2		
41 - 60%	3		
>61%	4		
4d. PRESUMED LMI GROUPS OR TARGETED LMI	6 *select 1	Projects that are completed by a public service provider and directly benefit the following: PRESUMED LMI GROUPS: elderly (62+), severely disabled adults, homeless, abused children, battered spouses, migrant farm workers, illiterate adults, and persons living w/AIDS. TARGETED LMI: project targets persons or households that are less than 80% area median income (must be income qualified).	0
Presumed 51% LMI persons or households	5		
Targeted 100% LMI persons or households	6		

5. FINANCIAL MATCH	6	The percent of non-CDBG funds the applicant commits toward the total project cost. Percentage is based on the jurisdiction's population (where the project is located).	0
Less than 1,500 persons	*select 1	1,501 to 7,000 persons	
Match is 1 - 4%	1	Match is 5 - 9%	
Match is 5 - 8%	2	Match is 10 - 14%	
Match is 9 - 12%	3	Match is 15 - 19%	
Match is 13 - 16%	4	Match is 20 - 24%	
Match is 17 - 20%	5	Match is 25 - 29%	
Match is >21%	6	Match is >30%	
7,001 to 10,000 persons	*select 1	10,001 to 20,000 persons	
Match is 8 - 13%	1	Match is 11 - 17%	
Match is 14 - 19%	2	Match is 18 - 24%	
Match is 20 - 25%	3	Match is 25 - 31%	
Match is 26 - 31%	4	Match is 32 - 38%	
Match is 32 - 37%	5	Match is 39 - 45%	
Match is >38%	6	Match is >46%	
More than 20,000 persons Or Public Service Providers	*select 1		
Match is 14 - 21%	1		
Match is 22 - 29%	2		
Match is 30 - 37%	3		
Match is 38 - 45%	4		
Match is 46 - 53%	5		
Match is >54%	6		

<b>6. MATURITY OF PROJECT</b>	<b>5 *select up to 5</b>	<b>The applicant has proven that the project is mature and have provided the necessary information in their application.</b>	<b>0</b>
Project manager is dedicated, involved, and attended the How to Apply workshop	1		
Scope of work is complete, detailed, and concise	1		
Detailed cost estimate with map AND photos of the project area	1		
Project manager has provided a timeline showing that the project can be completed within an 18-month period (12 months for non-construction projects)	1		
Architectural or engineering design is complete (If N/A, this is a free point)	1		
<b>7. REGIONAL QUALITY PLANNING</b>	<b>4 *select up to 4</b>	<b>Applicants can receive points if they provide information in their application proving, they abide by regional quality planning efforts. Applicants must provide documentation.</b>	<b>0</b>
Coordinates planning w/other governments in accordance w/Wasatch Choice 2050	1		
Plans and develops infrastructure efficiently including roads, water, and utilities	1		
Incorporates fair housing opportunity and affordability into community planning	1		
Plans/protects/conserves critical land, water, air, and historic sites	1		
<b>8. LOCAL PLANNING</b>	<b>4 *select 1</b>	<b>The applicant's project must be included in the jurisdiction's Capital Investment Plan (CIP). Points are awarded to CIP projects ranked 1 - 4.</b>	<b>0</b>
High/Medium #4	1		
High/Medium #3	2		

High #2	3		
High #1	4		
9. RECENT CDBG FUNDING	6 *select 1	The applicant or sub-applicant, when applicable, has not received CDBG funding in recent years (based on the CDBG program's fiscal year).	0
Received CDBG funding in FY2021	2		
Received CDBG funding in FY2020	3		
Received CDBG funding in FY2019 or older	4		
Has never received CDBG funding	6		
10. REGIONAL PROJECT PRIORITY	6 *select 1	Project meets one more of the region's priorities that are identified in the region's Consolidated Plan.	0
Public health and safety equipment	2		
Community facilities or Removal of ADA barriers	3		
Public service activities	4		
Public utility infrastructure	5		
LMI housing activities	6		
11. GEOGRAPHICAL IMPACT	5 *select 1	Area impacted by and benefitting from the project.	
Site specific	1		0
Community-wide	5		
12. BENEFIT COST RATIO	5 *select 1	Project benefits the most people with the least amount of investment. Points are determined by dividing the total CDBG dollar amount requested by the number of proposed beneficiaries.	
>\$6,001	1		0
\$4,001 - \$6,000	2		

\$2,001 - \$4,000	3		
\$1,001 - \$2,000	4		
<\$1,000	5		
13. PROPERTY TAX RATE	5 *select 1	Jurisdictions with a higher tax rate will receive additional points. Points awarded based on the jurisdiction's rate as a percent of the maximum rate allowed by law (compared to the tax ceiling set by State Tax Commission). The tax rate noted above shall include the levy for police, fire, sewer and water services that may be assessed by a multi-jurisdictional special service district. For non-taxing entities, the jurisdiction's tax rate applies where the majority of the beneficiaries reside.	
0 - 19%	1		0
20 - 30%	2		
31 - 40%	3		
41 - 50%	4		
>51%	5		
14. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) CHECKLIST	1 *select 1	Jurisdictions will receive one point if they have completed the ADA checklist for "Readily Achievable Barrier Removal" for their city/county office and provide documentation in the application.	
Completed the checklist and provided documentation	1		0
15. CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLIANCE	1 *select 1	Jurisdictions will receive one point if they have adopted Civil Rights Compliance procedures and provided documentation in the application.	
Adopted an ADA Grievance Procedure	1		0
Adopted an ADA Effective Communication Policy, Language Access Plan	1		
Adopted an ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy	1		

<i>TOTAL</i>	85	
		0

WASATCH FRONT REGIONAL COUNCIL			
2021 RATING AND RANKING CRITERIA - SUPPLEMENTAL SCORING INFORMATION for CERTAIN CRITERIA			
2. HOUSING STOCK			
Definition of a homelessness:	1) literally homeless - individuals and families who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence and includes a subset for an individual who resided in an emergency shelter or a place not meant for human habitation and who is exiting an institution where he or she temporarily resided.		
	2) Imminent risk of homelessness - individuals and families who will imminently lose their primary nighttime residence.		
	3) Unaccompanied youth - unaccompanied youth and families with children and youth who are defined as homeless under other federal statutes who do not otherwise qualify as homeless under this definition.		
	4) Fleeing/attempting to flee domestic violence - individuals and families who are fleeing, or are attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or other dangerous or life-threatening conditions that relate to violence against the individual or a family member.		
Definition of chronically homelessness:	1) Chronically homeless individual with a disability who lives in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, an emergency shelter,		

	or institutional care facility continuously for 12 months or on at least 4 separate occasions in the last 3 years that total 12 months.		
	2) Chronically homeless families have an adult or minor head of household who meets the "individual" definition of chronically homeless.		
Resource:	<a href="https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/Defining-Chronically-Homeless-Final-Rule.pdf">https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/Defining-Chronically-Homeless-Final-Rule.pdf</a>		
If applicable, explain how the project benefits homeless persons/families.			
3. MODERATE INCOME HOUSING PLAN			
ALL APPLICANTS must provide documentation showing their plan is in compliance.			
4a. EXTENT OF <u>VERY LOW</u> INCOME SERVED BY THE PROJECT			
Cities and counties use this criterion to determine the extent of low to moderate income beneficiaries.	Household income is at or less than 30% area median income.		
If applicable, provide survey packet (survey methodology, map, tally sheets, and results).			
4b. EXTENT OF <u>LOW</u> INCOME SERVED BY THE PROJECT			

Cities and counties use this criterion to determine the extent of low to moderate income beneficiaries.	Household income is 31%-50% area median income.		
If applicable, provide survey packet (survey methodology, map, tally sheets, and results).			
<b>4c. EXTENT OF <u>MODERATE</u> INCOME SERVED BY THE PROJECT</b>			
Cities and counties use this criterion to determine the extent of low to moderate income beneficiaries.	Household income is 51%-80% area median income.		
If applicable, provide survey packet (survey methodology, map, tally sheets, and results).			
<b>4d. <u>PRESUMED LMI</u> GROUPS OR TARGETED LMI</b>			
Public service providers use this criterion to determine the extent of low to moderate income beneficiaries.	Projects that directly benefit the following. PRESUMED LMI GROUPS: Elderly (62+), severely disabled adults, homeless, abused children, battered spouses, migrant farm workers, illiterate adults, and persons living w/AIDS. TARGETED LMI: project targets persons or households that are less than 80% area median income (must be income qualified).		
<b>(Population bracket)</b>	<b>5. FINANCIAL MATCH</b>	<b>(Actual population)</b>	
0-1500:	Vernon	390	
	Rush Valley	496	
	Huntsville	648	

	Stockton	682	
	Uintah	1353	
1500-7000:	Wendover	1525	
	Marriott-Slaterville	2037	
	Morgan City	4361	
	Harrisville	6872	
7000-10000:	Plain City	8799	
	Farr West	7815	
	Riverdale	8968	
	Hooper	9692	
	Washington Terrace	9406	
10000-20000:	Pleasant View	11181	
	Grantsville	12994	
	Morgan County	12460	
	West Haven	17987	
	South Ogden	17375	
>20000:	North Ogden	21820	
	Tooele	37465	
	Roy	40315	
	Tooele County	76799	
	Weber County (excluding Ogden City population)	180330	
6. MATURITY OF PROJECT			
All APPLICANTS must provide a concise scope of			

work, detailed cost estimate, map and photos of the project area.			
7. REGIONAL QUALITY PLANNING			
ALL APPLICANTS must provide their designation as a Quality Growth Community; or, information detailing how they meet each of the 4 planning goals. Acceptable documents to prove compliance with the outlined criterion include but are not limited to; adopted plans and conservation easements. If you have any questions about acceptable documentation, please contact Christy Dahlberg.	Accepted documents to prove quality planning include but are not limited to; adoption of policies that allow for more affordable housing options such as an ADU policy, higher density allowances in a center or station area, etc., adoption and/or implementation of a center, a multi-city plan, and adopted plans and conservation easements. To inquire about additional documents that may qualify, contact Christy Dahlberg, <a href="mailto:christy@wfrc.org">christy@wfrc.org</a> .		
8. LOCAL PLANNING			
ALL APPLICANTS must provide their jurisdiction's Capital Investment/Facilities Plan			

and highlight the proposed CDBG project.			
<b>10. REGIONAL PROJECT PRIORITY</b>			
Public health and safety equipment:	Projects that protect property such as lead based paint screening, flood control and fire protection.		
Community facilities or Removal of ADA barriers:	Projects can include senior citizen centers, food banks, or health clinics. Removal of ADA barriers refers to projects that improve the accessibility of public facilities to persons with disabilities.		
Public service activities:	Projects can include services for child care, youth, seniors, handicapped, mental health, legal, transportation, substance abuse, abused and neglected children, and battered and abused spouses.		
LMI housing activities:	Projects can include fair housing activities, rental housing, housing counseling, homeownership assistance, rehabilitation of housing,.		
Public infrastructure and public utilities:	Public infrastructure and public utility projects include the construction of streets, water, and sewer facilities and projects that increase the capacity and safety of water and sewage systems.		
<b>12. BENEFIT COST RATIO</b>			
Example:	A project seeking \$200,000 that benefits 250 people has a cost benefit of \$800 ( $200,000 / 250 = 800$ ).		
<b>13. PROPERTY TAX RATE</b>			
city max rate:	0.007		
county max rate:	0.0032		
0 - 19%	Farr West	0.000617	9%
	Harrisville	0.001123	16%
	Hooper	0.000544	8%
	Huntsville	0.001261	18%

	Marriott-Slaterville	0	0%
	Plain City	0.000463	7%
	Pleasant View	0.001188	17%
	Riverdale	0.000921	16%
	Rush Valley	0.000908	13%
	Uintah	0.000945	14%
	Vernon	0.000888	13%
	West Haven	0	0%
20 - 30%	Morgan City	0.001544	27%
	North Ogden	0.00118	20%
	Tooele County	0.001938	23%
	Tooele City	0.00203	29%
31 - 40%	Grantsville	0.002559	37%
	Morgan County	0.002517	32%
	Roy	0.002828	40%
	South Ogden	0.0027	37%
	Stockton	0.002605	37%
	Washington Terrace	0.00283	40%
41 - 50%	Weber County	0.003012	43%
	Wendover	0.003226	46%
>51%			

#### 14. ADA CHECKLIST

ALL APPLICANTS shall provide a copy of their jurisdiction's ADA			
---	--	--	--

checklist titled, Readily Achievable Barrier Removal.			
<b>15. TITLE IV COMPLIANCE</b>			
ALL APPLICANTS shall provide a copy of their jurisdiction's adopted Title IV Compliance procedures.			

### **Minutes**

Wasatch Front Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Regional Review Committee (RRC) Meeting

May 18, 2021

12:00 – 1:00 pm

A meeting of the Wasatch Front Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Regional Review Committee (RRC) was held on Tuesday, May 18, 2021 via Zoom to adhere to the Governor's stay at home order and maintain social distancing.

The meeting was called to order at 12:00 p.m. by Christy Dahlberg. The following were in attendance:

#### **Attendance**

Mayor Karjola

Mark Allen

Lance Evans

County

Melissa Freigang

Jared Anderson

Christy Dahlberg

Mayor, Stockton Town

Mayor, Washington Terrace City

Planning and Development Services Director, Morgan

Weber County Prosperity Center of Excellence

Council Member, Morgan County

Wasatch Front Regional Council

#### **MEETING OBJECTIVES: Review and approve February minutes, Review and update CDBG-CV funds, Review and Update Rating and Ranking**

The minutes were reviewed and Mayor Allen made a motion to approve them and Mayor Karjola seconded the motion and the motion passed.

We then reviewed the remaining CDBG-CV funds that the Committee divided based on population for each county to spend as they see fit on eligible projects. Christy informed the members that they would need to have project proposals for their respective counties to Christ by the end of June for eligibility review. Some projects that are in the works were discussed and it was indicated that unspent money would have to be sent back to HUD.

We then reviewed the Rating and Ranking criteria for potential updates. It was recommended that the rating and ranking remain the same, and that

examples should be provided detailing what documents will be accepted to show good planning on criteria 7.

The format of future meetings was discussed and it was decided that we should meet in person one or two times a year, and continue to have some virtual meetings to reduce travel time.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

Updated Rating and Ranking will be drafted.

Next meeting will be August 17<sup>th</sup> at 12



*Utah Small Cities Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program*

# 2020-2025 CONSOLIDATED PLAN

## 2022 Annual Action Plan

**MORGAN COUNTY**

**TOOELE COUNTY**

**WEBER COUNTY**

For July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023

Wasatch Front Regional Council | 41 North Rio Grande Street, Suite 103, Salt Lake City, UT 84101 |

801-363-4250 x 5005 | [christy@wfr.org](mailto:christy@wfr.org) | [www.wfr.org](http://www.wfr.org)

## Executive Summary

The 2022 Annual Action Plan is an annual update to the region's five-year Consolidated Plan. The Consolidated Plan is required by the U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in order to best appropriate Small Cities Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. The Consolidated Plan is updated annually and goes through a major revision every five years. The Plan is created in order to best promulgate CDBG program information and funding.

The 2022 Annual Action Plan identifies current housing, economic, and community development priorities based on local and regional needs for the Wasatch Front Region. See below for a list of the cities and counties that make up the Wasatch Front Region's Small Cities CDBG Program and their 2022 population based on Wasatch Front Regional Council projection population data.

<b>Eligible Jurisdictions within the Wasatch Front Region's CDBG Small Cities Program 2022 Wasatch Front Regional Council Population Projections</b>	
<b>Morgan County</b>	<b>13,909</b>
Morgan City	5,655
Unincorporated County	8,254
<b>Tooele County</b>	<b>87,002</b>
Grantsville City	14,056
Rush Valley Town	497
Stockton Town	782
Tooele City	47,078
Vernon Town	263
Wendover City	1,660
Unincorporated County	22,666
<b>Weber County (excluding Ogden City, ineligible)</b>	<b>170,120</b>
Farr West City	7,152
Harrisville City	6,783
Hooper City	9,780
Huntsville Town	684
Marriott-Slaterville City	2,567
North Ogden City	18,707
Plain City	7,462
Pleasant View City	10,762
Riverdale City	10,844
Roy City	38,537
South Ogden City	20,412
Uintah Town	1,233
Washington Terrace City	8,991
West Haven City	18,715
Unincorporated County	7,491

## Consultation and Outreach

As the CDBG Program administrator for Morgan, Tooele and Weber Counties, the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) sought involvement from other organizations on the development of the 5 Year Consolidated Plan update which informs the 2022 Annual Action Plan through public announcements and via attendance at housing, community, and economic development related meetings. The Plan was also published online at the Wasatch Front Regional Council's website: [www.wfrc.org](http://www.wfrc.org). There was a 30-day public comment period before the draft was finalized, and no public comments were received. Feedback on the CDBG Program is always encouraged and can be offered anytime by e-mailing WFRC staff member Christy Dahlberg at [christy@wfrc.org](mailto:christy@wfrc.org).

### *Entities Consulted*

City and county representatives as well as representatives from service providers were all encouraged to offer input. Results of the participation process are reflected in the Capital Investment Plan or in the Needs section of the Plan. The following organizations offered input or have been consulted with:

- Morgan County
- Tooele County
- Weber County
- Washington Terrace
  
- Morgan City
- Vernon Town
- 
- South Ogden
- Huntsville Town
- Roy
- Marriott-Slaterville
- Tooele City
- Wendover City

## Public Participation

Public participation began with a How to Apply workshop in which the CDBG program is explained to any interested entity or person throughout the region. All applicants become part of the planning process through the submission of a locally prioritized set of projects known as a Capital Investment Plan (CIP). Additionally, each applicant holds a public hearing in order to inform and receive feedback from the general public. In late 2021 and early 2022, six public hearings were held throughout the regions seeking public input. WFRC has a copy of the comments received from the public hearings.

The public was notified of the Consolidated Plan update through a public notice published on the State public notice website [www.Utah.gov/pmn](http://www.Utah.gov/pmn) noticing the public comment period seeking input and

participation. The 30-day public comment period began February 5, 2020 and ended March 7, 2020. A public comment open house notice was also published for February 18, 2020 held at the Wasatch Front Regional Council at 41 North Rio Grande Street, Salt Lake City Utah, 84101 at 4 pm.

Copies of the Consolidated Plan are available through each city, county, WFRC, select providers, and the State Housing and Community Development Division. WFRC will also provide a copy of the Plan to anyone who makes a request. The public is encouraged to participate in the planning process via the WFRC website, the adoption process for city and/or county Capital Investment plans, the public notice website, direct mail, email or telephone.

The 2022 Annual Action Plan was noticed for a 30-day public comment on January 26, 2022 as well as notice for a public open house to take place via Zoom on February 8<sup>th</sup> at 4 pm.

## Goals & Objectives

The Wasatch Front Region may provide capital infrastructure improvements or assistance to the following:

- Tooele City
- City of Washington Terrace
- Uintah City
- Tooele Housing Authority
- Weber Housing Authority

Goal Outcome Indicator	Quantity	Unit of Measurement
Public facility or infrastructure activity other than low/moderate income housing benefit	11,212	Persons Assisted
Public facility or infrastructure activities for low/moderate income housing benefit	52	Households Assisted
Public service activities other than low/moderate income housing benefit	0	Persons Assisted
Rental units rehabilitated	0	Household Housing Unit
Homeowner housing rehabilitated	0	Household Housing Unit
Direct financial assistance to homebuyers	50	Households Assisted
Homelessness prevention	0	Persons Assisted

Buildings demolished	0	Buildings
----------------------	---	-----------

## Allocation Priorities

The Region will consider capital improvement, homebuyer assistance, and other such projects for the benefit of the citizenry that fall within the CDBG guidelines.

The following organizations could receive funding in 2021:

- Uintah CityWeber County
- City of Washington Terrace
- Wendover City
- Tooele City
- Tooele County

*Include a list of projects which you may to do in the upcoming year*

- Waterline Replacement
- Water Meter and Vault Upgrades
- Fire Department Equipment
- Sewer Infrastructure
- Homebuyer Assistance
- Land Acquisition

See Appendix A for a more detailed project list.

## Expected Resources

*Annual Allocation, Program Income, Prior Year Resources, Total*

2020 Allocation	Program Income	Re-Allocated Funds	Total
\$978,712	\$0	\$0	\$978,712

*Narrative Description of the funds*

The Wasatch Front Region will receive an estimated total of \$978,712 for the 2021 program year. The base 2022 allocation was \$978,712. Zero dollars were received in program income. Zero dollars were received in re-allocated funds. Of the 8 new requests, 6 are anticipated to be fully funded, 1 will be partially funded, and 1 will not be funded at all.

*Plan to leverage funds with private, other state, and local funds, including any matching requirements*

The Wasatch Front Region does not require that projects have a match. However, those projects that do match CDBG funds with other funds will receive additional points when it comes to project rating and ranking. In 2022, of the projects that may be funded, 4 would provide additional local funding. The total project cost of all 2022 applications was \$4,565,997.

## Method of Distribution

Here are the steps used to effectively distribute CDBG funds in the Wasatch Front Region.

### 1) Identify Regional Priorities

Regional priorities are identified based on local goals and objectives. Since 2012, the region's priorities are housing for LMI persons and community infrastructure for LMI persons. The Committee weighs certain criteria higher in order to reflect the regional priorities. Any project that provides housing for LMI persons will receive 6 additional points. Community infrastructure projects that maintain, preserve, or update the jurisdiction's water or sewer systems, or other capital infrastructure for LMI persons will receive 5 additional points.

### 2) Identify Local Projects

In order to determine which projects are awarded, applications are reviewed and ranked according to regionally adopted Rating and Ranking Criteria. The rating and ranking process begins with each community developing a capital investment plan that identifies goals and investment priorities. The plans are updated in connection with one-year action plans.

### 3) Rate and Rank Projects

Projects are then ranked using a set of criteria called Rating and Ranking Criteria. Wasatch Front Regional Council staff work with a Regional Review Committee (RRC) to review and revise the region's Consolidated Plan, Rating and Ranking Criteria, and to conduct project rating and ranking. The Committee is made up of two officials from each of the three counties in the region: Morgan, Tooele, and Weber. The RRC is responsible for reviewing and selecting projects based on the region's Rating and Ranking Criteria. The Criteria are made up of eight basic required elements that the Utah Division of Housing and Community Development have identified. Additionally, the Regional Review Committee has included additional criteria. These criteria may change depending on the needs and goals that have been identified in the Consolidated Plan. The Criteria are updated annually. The Criteria help ensure that the projects that receive CDBG funding are the ones that are the most needed or desired.

*How can potential applicants access the application manuals or other materials describing the application criteria?*

Contact Christy Dahlberg at the Wasatch Front Regional Council at 801-363-4250 x 5005 or [christy@wfrc.org](mailto:christy@wfrc.org). Visit our website at [www.wfrc.org](http://www.wfrc.org) for more information.

*How are potential applicants made aware of the possibility of using CDBG funds?*

Participation begins annually with a How to Apply workshop in which the CDBG program is explained to any and all interested entities throughout the region. This notice is made via an email flyer distributed to all cities, counties, service providers, and others that may qualify for CDBG funding throughout the region. Additionally, CDBG program information is available on the WFRRC website, [www.wfrc.org](http://www.wfrc.org).

*What is the process for awarding funds?*

Grantees are notified of a CDBG grant award by email and/or phone. All grantees must attend a “grantee workshop” sponsored by the State of Utah’s Housing and Community Development Division. This Division also executes the contracts with the grantee.

*Describe threshold factors and grant size limits*

The minimum grant amount per year is \$30,000. The maximum multiple-year grant award is \$200,000 per year, up to two years. The RRC will not commit more than half of the available funds for any year to any one project. Multiple-year project(s) will not be allowed when existing multiple-year projects commit 50% or more of the following year’s regional allocation. Maximum grant amount per year for community infrastructure projects is \$250,000. Community infrastructure projects include (but are not limited to): water, sewer, street, sidewalk, curb, and gutter. No entity shall receive more than \$250,000 in a single funding cycle, regardless of number of applications.

*Anticipated outcomes as a result of the distribution formula*

The Consolidated Plan goes through a strategic planning process geared toward housing, homelessness, community service, and community infrastructure, local governments, community organizations, state and federal agencies, service providers, and citizens are all part of the planning process to ensure that local and regional needs, goals, and objectives are considered and planned for. The Wasatch Front Region will have achieved a favorable outcome when Community Development Block Grant funds are distributed to applicants that best meet federal and state program goals, as well as the regional goals identified in the Consolidated Plan.

## Affordable Housing

*Actions planned during the next year to address the needs for public housing*

The jurisdictions within the region must continue to update and report on their moderate-income housing plans, which will help guide future housing related decisions, such as affordability issues, housing choice, workforce housing, building or rehabilitating housing to make more energy efficient, funding opportunities and the like. The state has multiple resources that can be used to help the cities prepare or update their moderate-income housing plans. Cities desiring to do this may contact the Utah Housing and Community Development Division or regional Association of Government. The Regional Council will continue to inform local governments of the need to report on these Plans and the benefits associated with having a “good” plan.

The Regional Council will continue to inform local housing authorities and other housing providers and lenders of the CDBG program to help ensure collaborative planning and funding opportunities.

*Actions to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership*

Work with housing authorities and other housing providers to ensure they are aware of housing related funding that is available to them for homeownership opportunities.

*Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing*

In the 2019 Legislative Session, the Utah Legislature passed an “Affordable Housing Modifications” bill, Senate Bill 34, which encourages local communities to plan for housing for residents of all income levels, and coordinate that housing with transportation as well as chose three to four “menu” options of strategies to pursue in order to further Moderate-Income Housing goals. These plans must be reported annually to the Department of Workforce Services, which also administers CDBG to the AOGs. For more information on S.B. 34 visit [www.wfrc.org/public-involvement/governmental-affairs/](http://www.wfrc.org/public-involvement/governmental-affairs/)

The menu items from the bill are:

- (A) rezone for densities necessary to assure the production of MIH
- (B) facilitate the rehabilitation or expansion of infrastructure that will encourage the construction of MIH
- (C) facilitate the rehabilitation of existing uninhabitable housing stock into MIH
- (D) consider general fund subsidies or other sources of revenue to waive construction related fees that are otherwise generally imposed by the city
- (E) create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, accessory dwelling units in residential zones
- (F) allow for higher density or moderate income residential development in commercial and mixed-use zones, commercial centers, or employment centers
- (G) encourage higher density or moderate income residential development near major transit investment corridors
- (H) eliminate or reduce parking requirements for residential development where a resident is less likely to rely on their own vehicle, e.g. residential development near major transit investment corridors or senior living facilities

- (I) allow for single room occupancy developments
- (J) implement zoning incentives for low to moderate income units in new developments
- (K) utilize strategies that preserve subsidized low to moderate income units on a long-term basis
- (L) preserve existing MIH
- (M) reduce impact fees, as defined in Section 11-36a-102, related to low and MIH
- (N) participate in a community land trust program for low or MIH
- (O) implement a mortgage assistance program for employees of the municipality or of an employer that provides contracted services to the municipality
- (P) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for state or federal funds or tax incentives to promote the construction of MIH
- (Q) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for programs offered by the Utah Housing Corporation within that agency's funding capacity
- (R) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for affordable housing programs administered by the Department of Workforce Services
- (S) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for programs administered by an association of governments established by an interlocal agreement under Title 11, Chapter 13, Interlocal Cooperation Act [not in county list of recommendations]
- (T) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for services provided by a public housing authority to preserve and create MIH
- (U) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for programs administered by a metropolitan planning organization or other transportation agency that provides technical planning assistance
- (V) utilize a MIH set aside from a community reinvestment agency, redevelopment agency, or community development and renewal agency
- (W) any other program or strategy implemented by the municipality to address the housing needs of residents of the municipality who earn less than 80% of the area median income

*Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards*

Within the region, housing authorities can inspect and mitigate lead-based paint. Additionally, in most counties, the health departments have trained and certified inspectors who test residential properties and have brochures and information for residents who think they may have a home with lead-based paint. These agencies handle information calls and explain the process of removing lead-based paint safely. They also coordinate with state programs on how to help educate residents on the dangers of lead-based paint. The Utah Division of Environmental Quality can assess a home for lead hazards and identify certified lead hazard contractors.

*Actions planned to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social services agencies*

The Regional Council can assist in the coordination of activities among public and private organizations. First, the Council should become aware of all the related low- and moderate-income housing providers within the region. Council staff can then work to ensure that these providers are familiar with one another and work to promote collaboration. Efforts can be made to seek input from these entities as well as to

possibly leverage funding in order to consider larger scale projects that would benefit the region as a whole.

### *Barriers to Affordable Housing*

The Regional Council will further efforts to remove or mitigate 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. Communities may consider creative ways in providing housing opportunities for all residents no matter their income, race, family size, culture, gender, etc. Local governments are responsible for working with others to limit potential housing barriers as reflected in their respective moderate-income housing plans. There are a few ways to identify the barriers to affordable housing within a community. The various cities can answer the following questions (and more):

- Has your housing plan been updated within the last two years (as required by law)?
- Does your housing plan provide estimates of the projected housing needs for low income housing with a five-year outlook (or longer)?
- Are housing types and densities considered?
- Do your zoning ordinances allow for various types of housing, including townhomes, manufactured homes, PUDS, duplexes, etc.?
- Is your general plan and zoning consistent with the Wasatch Choice for 2050 Vision for Growth and Development which encourages higher density centers-based development and transit-oriented developments?

Cities should continue to update and report on their moderate-income housing plans, which will help guide future housing related decisions, such as affordability issues, housing choice, workforce housing, building or rehabilitating housing to make more energy efficient, funding opportunities and the like. The state has multiple resources that can be used to help the cities prepare or update their moderate-income housing plans. Please refer to the following table (table 2) for some affordable housing barriers and solutions.

**Table 2. Affordable Housing Barriers and Strategies**

<b>Barriers</b>	<b>Strategies</b>
Community lacks political will to develop multiple-family housing units.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Share smart growth policies from the Wasatch Choice for 2040 Vision for Growth and Development</li> <li>– The Regional Council gives additional points to requests for funding from cities that support the goals of the Wasatch Choice for 2040 Vision which includes the creation of higher density centers based transit oriented developments</li> </ul>
Community does not make concessions for multiple-family housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Encourage affordable housing professionals to meet with local planning committees and councils to explain the needs and benefits.</li> </ul>
Community has no available land for new development; they are built-out; only option is tear down and build new or infill.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Zone for higher densities and allow for multiple family housing and accessory dwelling units.</li> </ul>
Zoning ordinances limit or restrict multiple-family housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Request flexibility in zoning ordinances.</li> <li>– Zone for higher densities and allow for multiple family housing and accessory dwelling units.</li> </ul>
Housing costs are extremely high i.e. property, construction, building, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Request a reduction in impact fees for low-income housing developments.</li> <li>– Create partnerships with housing authorities, Habitat for Humanity, Affordable Land Lease Homes, Utah Housing Corporation, Rural Housing Development, non-profits, etc.</li> <li>– Encourage more efficient uses of building materials, construction methods and design.</li> </ul>
Community lacks the staff with the capabilities needed for developing affordable housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Encourage participation of staff in various State training programs.</li> </ul>
All resources are fragmented, i.e. federal, state and local.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Partner with housing providers and lenders to increase opportunities.</li> <li>– Provide educational programs and services or direct citizens to such programs and services.</li> </ul>
Moderate-income housing plans are not up to date and/or implemented. (House Bill 295 does not require implementation.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Seek funding from housing programs to hire temporary staff to update plans.</li> </ul>
Land owners and developers likely focus on higher profit margins, i.e. upscale developments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Offer incentives to affordable housing developers.</li> </ul>
Citizens in rural areas tend to prefer single-family homes on larger lot sizes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Explain the need for more affordable housing and housing choice; public awareness is needed.</li> </ul>
Communities may feel that multiple-family housing units increase the crime rate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Explain how affordable housing can be scattered throughout the community; 2 unit condos, townhomes, patio homes.</li> </ul>
Good landlord laws are not enforced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Work with local and state legislators.</li> </ul>
There is no state law for written rental agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– There are existing laws. They tend to favor the landlord, however.</li> <li>– Work with local and state legislators to enact one to benefit renters, not just landlords.</li> </ul>

## Other

### *Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing*

In 2022, the region's housing authorities plan to foster and maintain affordable housing through education and training for low- and moderate-income households. In addition, the Regional Council is actively fostering smart growth policies to its member cities which include higher density transit-oriented developments based on the centers design. The housing authorities also offer homeownership opportunities such as down payment assistance. It should be noted that community resistance to high density housing has declined markedly over the past several years and many have been or are being built. The challenge now is to make a share of those high-density units available for low to moderate income persons. Salt Lake City has committed a large share of its redevelopment agency budget to low income housing.

Also reference pages 7 and 8 regarding S.B. 34.

## APPENDIX A

### WFRC Capital Improvement Project List

*With each project describe the reason for prioritizing that project and what needs you are trying to address*

Grantee Name	Sub-Grantee	Project Name	Why a Priority	Needs Addressed
Tooele County	Wasatch Front Regional Council	Planning and Administration	Ensures all eligible entities within the region are aware of program and make a viable application	Program awareness, i.e. all needs
Washington Terrace*	n/a	Fire Department Equipment	Ensures public safety in LMI area	Public Safety
Washington Terrace*	n/a	Water Meter Infrastructure	Public Infrastructure in LMI area	LMI Services
Wendover City	n/a	Pilot Peak Waterline Replacement	Public Infrastructure in LMI area	Adequate Water Service
Uintah City	n/a	Water Meter Vault Replacement	Public Infrastructure in LMI area	Adequate Water Service
Tooele City	Tooele Housing Authority	Homebuyer Assistance	LMI Housing Needs	LMI Housing
Tooele City*	n/a	Water/Sewer Improvements	Public Infrastructure in LMI Area	Adequate Water Service
Weber County*	Weber County Housing Authority	Acquisition	Low Income Housing	LMI Housing
<i>*Project has secured matching funds</i>				