



MAG

Expert Resources. Enriching Lives.

CDBG Consolidated Plan Summit and Wasatch Counties

July 1 2025 - June 30 2026

Prepared by

Heather Mills

Mountainland Association of Governments

586 E 800 N, Orem, UT 84097

801.229.3815

hmills@magutah.gov

Contents

Executive Summary..... 3

Outreach..... 6

 Consultation..... 6

 Citizen Participation..... 8

Needs Assessment..... 10

Priority Needs..... 16

Expected Resources..... 16

Goals & Objectives..... 17

Allocation priorities..... 18

Public Housing..... 26

Barriers to Affordable Housing..... 27

Other..... 28

Appendix I..... 29

Executive Summary

Objectives and Outcomes

The objectives of the Mountainland Association of Governments Summit and Wasatch Counties region are largely to ensure community development and a viable economic future by addressing infrastructure and housing needs. Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) brings local elected officials together for the purpose of identifying regional priorities, making plans, policies, and funding decisions that address regional priorities. This cooperative process provides input into a range of community development, economic development, infrastructure, and human service issues. Infrastructure and housing needs continue to be the highest priorities for Summit and Wasatch Counties. The intended outcomes during this next Annual Action Plan cycle and this Consolidated Plan cycle are to improve, repair, or replace infrastructure in the counties, cities, and towns of the Summit and Wasatch region and to assist in maintaining affordable housing stock.

Community Development

Priorities in Summit and Wasatch Counties focus on providing essential services and creating livable communities. While the growth in these two counties has created opportunity, there have also been new challenges for local governments including infrastructure, public health, and housing demands. As such, the top CDBG priority of the region is the development and maintenance of community infrastructure to meet the growth and citizens' needs. The increasing population has created higher demand on the aging infrastructure in addition to the need for new-build infrastructure. Development and/or improvement of community infrastructure are essential priorities. Specifically, water and sewer infrastructure have been determined to be the region's most critical need. The following is the order of priority for the CDBG program in Summit and Wasatch Counties:

1. Water/Sewer Projects
2. Secondary Water
3. Storm Drainage
4. Single Family Rehab
5. Streets/Sidewalks
6. Public Health/Safety
7. Other Public Facilities/Housing

Housing

With population growth, the region has also seen a significant increase in the development of new housing. Although this is a positive development in improving the quality and quantity of housing stock, there has been a disproportionate development of single family housing, and development has not met the needs of lower income citizens. The region is working to address housing development needs that can provide a range of alternatives for persons with limited resources. This includes housing stock that can serve the region's workforce, low income families, students, seniors, as well as for persons with

disabilities. Single family rehabilitation is an effective way to assist with affordable housing. Summit and Wasatch Counties face a shortage of affordable housing, high demand, and rapid population growth as significant challenges to the region. Single family rehab allows health and safety issues to be repaired, thus allowing LMI individuals to stay in their homes, lessening the overall burden of affordable housing needs. Summit and Wasatch Counties are focused on providing decent, safe, and affordable housing.

Funding Priority Decision Making Process

MAG reviews all projects utilizing a comprehensive rating and ranking process to determine the priority for funding. The criterion is developed by the Regional Review Committee, with input from all jurisdictions taken into consideration. The criteria reflect both regional priorities and state, and federal program requirements.

Citizen Participation and Consultation

MAG has conducted public outreach to solicit and coordinate input into community needs, priorities, and the Consolidated Plan. MAG has also coordinated with jurisdictions, elected officials, and various agencies that have an interest in the plan. MAG has sought out general public feedback and distributed feedback forms to government agencies and non-profit organizations that serve Summit and Wasatch Counties.

Priorities

Regional priorities are established by the Mountainland Executive Council, including elected representation of all jurisdictions in the region. Funding coordinated through MAG includes Community Development Block Grant and Economic Development Administration planning funds. Other HUD resources are coordinated through the Mountainland Continuum of Care, the Utah County Housing Authority and/or the Provo City Housing Authority. State Community Impact Funds are distributed by the State of Utah through the Community Impact Board (CIB). The Mountainland Region has very limited access to CIB funds.

Evaluation of Past Performance

Project awards from 2020-2024 reflect the region’s priorities.

Applicant	Project	Anticipated Award
2020		
Echo	Water Tank	\$262,895
Henefer	Culinary Water and Meters	\$184,010
Summit County	Senior Van	\$66,000
Wasatch County	Meals On Wheels Truck	\$43,000

2021		
Summit County	PEOA Water Pipeline	\$257,054
Wasatch County	Senior Center Bus	\$28,800
Wallsburg	Waterline Replacement	\$288,429
2022		
Coalville	Storm Drain Improvements	\$122,900
Kamas	Waterline Replacement	\$170,251
Francis	Waterline Replacement	\$275,071
2023		
Kamas	Sewer Line Replacement	\$350,000
MAG	Single Family Rehab	\$336,892
2024		
MAG	Single Family Rehab	\$273,632
Kamas	Sewer Line Improvements	\$350,000

Outreach

Consultation

Public Housing Authority, Human Services, Health Service Providers, Homeless Housing and Service Providers

The MAG Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plans seek out input from multiple community members and organizations throughout the year. These include the Mountainland Continuum of Care, the Area Agency of Aging (AAA) for Summit, Utah, and Wasatch Counties, local jurisdictions, the Regional Review Committee (RRC), and Economic Development District Board (EDD Board), other agencies, and general citizen participation.

The Continuum of Care includes representatives from the following agencies:

- Center for Women and Children in Crisis
- Central Utah Center for Independent Living
- Children’s Justice Center
- Community Action Services and Food Bank
- Department of Workforce Services
- Division of Housing and Community Development
- Food & Care Coalition of Utah Valley
- Golden Spike Outreach
- Habitat for Humanity
- Housing and Urban Development
- Housing Authority of Utah County
- Intermountain Health Care (IHC)
- The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Bishops Storehouse
- Mountainland Community Housing Trust
- Mountainland Head Start
- Neighborhood Housing Services
- Peace House (Park City)
- Provo City Housing Authority
- Rural Housing Development
- Social Security Administration
- United Way of Utah County
- Utah County Substance Abuse
- Veterans Center
- Wasatch Mental Health

The representatives of these organizations provide feedback that is applied in the creation of the Annual Action Plan as well as the Consolidated Plan. Much of the work of the Continuum in identifying needs, services, projects, and goals has been incorporated into this document.

Senior Care Facilities and Providers

MAG serves as the Area Agency on Aging (AAA) for the three-county area of Summit, Utah, and Wasatch Counties, and as the focal point for services and resources available to serve the senior population. The AAA works closely with the 14 Senior Centers in the MAG region, and contracts with most of the area's senior service providers (home health agencies, etc.). Development of this consolidated plan included consultation with these agencies and service providers.

Jurisdictions

The input of local jurisdictions is a key component in development of the plan. While the Consolidated and Annual Action Plans are developed to meet state and federal guidelines, the information provided by jurisdictions represents the heart of the plans. To update the Community Development needs assessment section of the Plan, MAG staff gathers feedback from planners, city managers, city or county staff members, mayors or commission chairs. MAG staff also gathers updated Capital Improvement Lists from the cities and counties.

Regional Review Committee

The RRC is an appointed group of four elected officials from Summit and Wasatch Counties. This Committee is the local advisory board to the CDBG program. Their responsibility is to provide oversight to the rating and ranking process of CDBG applications, to rate and rank projects, make funding decisions, and to develop and approve CDBG policies including rating and ranking. As such, the RRC provides significant input into the distribution of the funding section of the Plan.

Economic Development District Board

The EDD Board is a group including elected officials, economic development professionals, business and private sector representatives. The composition of the EDD Board is designated by the Economic Development Administration (EDA). The Board provides oversight to the economic development activities of the Mountainland Economic Development District. For the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan, the EDD Board was consulted in developing information included in the Economic Development section of the Plan, including goals and objectives for the EDD program.

Other Agencies

A primary purpose of MAG is to coordinate federal, state, and local programs across the MAG region. Much of this coordination involves aspects of the consolidated planning process. Efforts made during the preparation of this Consolidated Plan include:

- Representation on the Utah Small Cities CDBG Policy Committee. The committee develops policy that guides the implementation of the small cities CDBG program.
- Involvement with the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget in development of population projections and criteria.
- Close interaction with the region's state legislative delegation in advocating for various community and economic development, transportation, and human service needs.

- Annual meetings with the federal elected officials to advocate for various community and economic development, transportation, and human service needs.
- Participation and interaction with the Economic Development Administration (EDA) and development of the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). EDA has embraced the concept of combining the consolidated planning process with the CEDS to create a truly consolidated planning approach.
- Participation with the Utah Area Agency on Aging Association, regular contact and interaction with various divisions of the Utah State Department of Human Services, and Utah State Department of Health, in providing and advocating for aging services.

Citizen Participation

MAG makes every effort to encourage responsible input into the Consolidated Plan from involved or interested parties and the public. To the extent possible, any comments received are incorporated into the final Consolidated Plan document. Public notice of public meetings and comment periods are posted on Utah's Public Notice website, on MAG's website, as well as being posted in newspapers, at local Department of Workforce Services, and in online arenas such as Facebook. Accommodations are made available to any needing language, hearing, or other accommodations.

Public interaction is also available through the MAG website. The Consolidated Plan is posted on the web, and the public is invited to submit comments via e-mail, by phone, or regular mail.

Community newspapers are utilized to highlight specific elements of the Plan and educate and inform citizens on CDBG. Newsletters are sent to the public on MAG's mailing list, governments, agencies, and organizations. Social media outlets, including LinkedIn and Facebook, are utilized to reach and engage with the public.

MAG conducted Roadshows to each municipality to provide CDBG information and gather feedback on critical needs of counties, cities, and towns.

A draft plan is provided to the State Division of Housing and Community Development who provides public notice and asks for feedback. Additionally, the State has held a public comment period for feedback on the Citizen Participation Plan.

Feedback

Some citizen feedback MAG received include the following pressing needs for the community: water and sewer improvements, affordable public and nonpublic housing, building and property upgrades and maintenance, ADA accessibility, traffic and transportation, responsible growth, and water storage. Responders felt some areas have had successful coordination including the Rural Planning Organization, coordination between municipalities and non-profits, coordination between MAG and cities applying for TAG grants, and work being done for seniors. Responders felt improved coordination would benefit the community in various ways, including developers to build affordable housing, a local food pantry, study of copper or lead in pipes, lowering cost of housing, creating timely grants to allow projects to start in

good weather, helping studies of economic development in small towns, and potentially a legislative strategy that could help local preservation.

Additional feedback suggested pressing needs including homeless needs for families with children. Respondents stated one successful coordination effort is the Continuum of Care is working to coordinate rapid rehousing for families. Additionally, respondents note coordination for services for families with mixed legal status are needed. Housing services for families where the adults do not have legal status, but the children do is a unique need.

More feedback emphasized affordable housing. Other needs include employee housing, community engagement areas and open space preservation. Respondents were unaware of any coordination efforts already happening within this realm.

Finally, others responding stated pressing needs include a new water system including updated water sources, water tanks, updated meters, and updated water lines.

The feedback MAG received through the various channels listed above point to the need for infrastructure and affordable housing for LMI and presumed LMI citizens. This will guide the direction of the Consolidated Plan and Annual Action Plan. It is important to note that while affordable housing and housing supply is of great importance to the Summit and Wasatch region, there is a lack of CDBG funding available or opportunities in the area to procure or provide affordable housing. As such, single family rehabilitation will be utilized to keep people safely and healthily in their homes, thus allowing the household to remain in the affordable housing unit. This will prevent the housing unit from being sold at an increasingly higher rate, preventing further unaffordability. Overall, the citizen participation MAG received communicates that infrastructure and affordable housing are the main concerns in Summit and Wasatch Counties. This aligns with the priority needs the Regional Review Committee has adopted.

Approval Process

The Executive Council includes the mayors of all jurisdictions, or one elected official representing each city or town, and three council members or commissioners representing Summit, Utah and Wasatch Counties. This Committee provides oversight and has final authority on all programs and services coordinated by MAG, including final approval authority for the Consolidated Plan.

MAG continues an effective working relationship with counties, cities, and towns. Communication in both directions is established and nurtured. MAG offers technical assistance to CDBG applicants and has created an environment of comradery and cooperation with the local governments.

Needs Assessment

Housing Needs Assessment:

Summit County

Current population: 44,128

Projected population growth by 2030: 46,948

Current number of households: 19,126

Households with one or more people under 18 years: 4,790

Households with one or more people 65 years and over: 4,227

Average household size: 2.94

Average family size: 3.38

Housing units: 25,674

Occupied Housing Units with Four or More Bedrooms 49.6%

Median Gross Rent: \$1969

Homeownership rate: 80.4%

Current median income: \$137,058

Poverty level income: 4.5%

Race and ethnicity:

White: 35,927

Black or African American: 173

American Indian or Native Alaskan: 133

Asian: 728

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 44

Hispanic or Latino: 4,737

Current number of disabled individuals or households: 2,522

Disabled individuals over 18: 2,391 or 5.4%

Median age: 41.0

Senior population: 14.7%

Wasatch County

Current population: 37,691

Projected population growth by 2030: 43,756

Current number of households: 14,934

Households with one or more people under 18 years: 4,774

Households with one or more people 65 years and over: 3,014

Average household size: 2.97

Average family size: 3.38

Housing units: 14,462

Occupied Housing Units with Four or More Bedrooms 52.1%

Median Gross Rent: \$1905

Homeownership rate: 78.9%

Current median income: \$115,146

Poverty level income: 5.1%

Race and ethnicity:

White: 29,131

Black or African American: 157

American Indian or Native Alaskan: 188

Asian: 361

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 41

Hispanic or Latino: 5046

Current number of disabled individuals: 2,664

Disable individuals over 18: 2,222 or 5.8%

Median age: 36.1

Senior population: 13.1%

The cost burden of housing is significant in Summit and Wasatch Counties. More than 80% of homes in Summit County cost over \$500,000 and 50% of them cost over \$1,000,000. Over 70% of home prices in Wasatch County are over \$500,000. Summit and Wasatch Counties' median income is \$137,058 and \$115,146, respectively. This means that the cost of housing for the majority of homes is at least four times greater than the median income and a significant portion are more than seven times greater. Affordable housing is rated to be three times more than annual income. As such, the price of housing is inflated and a significant burden. This burden is even more significant for LMI households.

Rent is more affordable than home ownership. The following tables show the levels of income and the percentage of renting options available at each income level.

Summit County	
Percentage of AMI	Affordable Housing Percentage of Total Housing Stock (Rent)
<30%	Approximately 11%
30-50%	Approximately 16%
50-80%	Approximately 20%
80-100%	Approximately 27%

Wasatch County	
Percentage of AMI	Affordable Housing Percentage of Total Housing Stock (Rent)
<30%	Approximately 8%
30-50%	Approximately 24%

50-80%	Approximately 17%
80-100%	Approximately 8%

Number of Units and Types of Properties

Summit County:

Housing Units: 27,020
 Median selected monthly owner costs - with a mortgage: \$2,805
 Median gross rent: \$1,969
 Median value of owner-occupied housing units: \$1,000,400
 Median households income: \$137,058

Wasatch County:

Housing Units: 17,242
 Median selected monthly owner costs - with a mortgage: \$2,451
 Median gross rent: \$1905
 Median value of owner-occupied housing units: \$724,400
 Median households income: \$115,146

Additionally, adults 18 and over with disabilities make up 5.4% of Summit County and the senior population is 14.7%. This means more than 20% of the population could potentially need supportive housing. Adults 18 and over with disabilities make up 5.8% of Wasatch County and the senior population is 13.1%. As with Summit County, this means roughly 20% of the population could potentially need supportive housing.

Non-Housing Needs Assessment

Although CDBG funds are an appropriate source for housing project support, these funds are very limited and are shared across a number of jurisdictions. Additionally, housing projects face competition from various other infrastructure and public service needs that are pressing. In summary, the CDBG funds available are too limited for the Summit and Wasatch region to have adequate funds to implement large housing projects. As such, there is a very small amount of funding that can go towards housing projects. Because of this, and other reasons, the region focuses on using CDBG funding for infrastructure, single family rehab, and senior services. Within those, infrastructure has the highest priority as it is a high need and positively affects the largest number of LMI citizens.

MAG staff collects Capital Improvement Lists from the cities and counties in the Summit and Wasatch region. The priorities on that list, which account for the coming year as well as the next five years, include: water lines and mains, storm drain upgrades, land purchase for affordable housing, wastewater improvements, fire station infrastructure, road improvements, sewer improvements, park development, water meters, and senior services. Due to this, infrastructure remains the primary focus of regional CDBG funding. Water and sewer projects are the two highest priorities. Most other priorities revolve around additional infrastructure needs.

Economic Growth

Economic opportunity is growing in both Summit and Wasatch Counties. Between 2025 and 2035, Summit and Wasatch Counties are expected to grow employment opportunities by 7,267 and 3,092 jobs, respectively. By 2030, Summit County is expected to have 45,221 employment opportunities and Wasatch County is expected to have 18,443. Over the course of 40 years (2025-2065), Summit and Wasatch Counties are ranked 3rd and 2nd, respectively, for employment growth in the State of Utah.

Education levels for Summit County are roughly 58% of those 25 and older with a Bachelor's degree or higher. Wasatch County has approximately 48% of those 25 and older with a Bachelor's degree or higher. Both of these are higher than the State average of 38%.

Summit County Class of Worker	
Employee of private company workers	63.0%
Self-employed in own incorporated business workers	6.9%
Private not-for-profit wage and salary workers	8.0%
Local, state, and federal government workers	13.6%
Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers and unpaid family workers	8.6%

Wasatch County Class of Worker	
Employee of private company workers	64.4%
Self-employed in own incorporated business workers	8.5%
Private not-for-profit wage and salary workers	6.7%
Local, state, and federal government workers	13.8%
Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers and unpaid family workers	6.6%

The Employment Rate in Summit County is 67.7%. The Unemployment Rate is 2.9%. The Industry for the Civilian Employed Population 16 Years and Over is as follows:

Educational services, and health care and social assistance - 20.1%

Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services - 15.0%

Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services - 13.9%
Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing - 11.2%
Retail trade - 10.0%
Construction - 7.7%
Manufacturing - 5.5%
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities - 4.9%
Other services, except public administration - 3.3%
Public administration - 3.2%

The Employment Rate in Wasatch County is 66.6%. The Unemployment Rate is 2.5%. The Industry for the Civilian Employed Population 16 Years and Over is as follows:

Educational services, and health care and social assistance - 20.0%
Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services - 15.4%
Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services - 13.9%
Construction - 10.7%
Retail trade - 8.9%
Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing - 8.5%
Manufacturing - 5.7%
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities - 4.1%
Other services, except public administration - 3.5%
Public administration - 3.3%

The CDBG program has many options in which low to moderate income persons can receive job skills training or other training that can help them live a sustainable lifestyle. Projects that create jobs receive additional points in the rating and ranking criteria. MAG is in a position to facilitate discussions, to identify methods and resources, and to provide data and plans, but is not a legislative body that can implement any specific policies or projects. It is important to note that if a project is funded with CDBG dollars and it will result in the displacement of a household from their residence, it will be required to find another residence for the household. The Utah Small Cities Program will generally not fund projects that will displace a household.

Broadband and the Digital Divide

Summit and Wasatch Counties have a very high percentage of households with a broadband Internet subscription, 95.2% and 94.2% respectively. Additionally, available broadband coverage spans where households currently exist. It is interesting to note that the poverty level in Summit County is 4.5% while the percentage of non-broadband Internet subscribers is 4.8%. Similarly, the poverty level in Wasatch County is 5.1% while the percentage of non-broadband Internet subscribers is 5.8%. As such, there could be a correlation between poverty and a digital divide. As such, it is evident that low income households need the opportunity to access broadband.

Natural Hazards and Climate

The probability risk for wildland fire in Summit and Wasatch Counties is likely to occur every year. The severity is critical with the potential to affect multiple properties and could cause injuries or fatalities. Mitigation strategies include limiting development in the Wildland Urban Interface, fuel management, prescribed burns, hardening buildings against fire with appropriate shingles and vent covers to prevent embers from entering the home, maintaining an emergency water supply and appropriate water pressures, and using appropriate plantings around homes.

The probability of flooding is likely to occur every year and dam failure is possible (between 1-10% likelihood). The severity would be critical, affect multiple properties and could cause injuries or fatalities. Mitigation strategies include adopting a sensitive lands ordinance to limit development in or near floodplains, maintaining and clearing streambeds, expanding culverts, discouraging impervious surfaces that drain to waterways, and regularly inspecting and retrofitting dams.

It is more likely than not that a critically damaging earthquake will occur in the next 50 years. (>90% likelihood an M5+ earthquake will occur by 2053). The severity of such would be catastrophic. Mitigation strategies include restricting building on known fault lines or steep slopes, requiring geotechnical studies for buildings on problem soils, retrofitting critical infrastructure, educating homeowners on retrofitting options and securing items to the wall, and requiring large/reinforced foundations or piers in liquefaction areas.

Summit and Wasatch County show moderate potential for radon levels. Public education, awareness, and testing is necessary as well as installation of radon mitigation systems as needed in private and public buildings.

Approximately 22% (Summit) and 24% (Wasatch) housing units were built before 1978. As such, these housing units potentially contain lead-based paint. As such, rough 1 in 5 or 1 in 4 houses could be contaminated with lead-based paint and need mitigation to prevent contamination.

Housing occupied by LMI households face these risks as much as, if not more than, the general population. It is important to note LMI households often do not have the resources to prevent or mitigate hazards. Any single family rehabilitation funded by CDBG tests for radon, lead-based paint and asbestos before completing any work. If these hazards are found, mitigation is completed to resolve any issues.

Priority Needs

The following are identified priority needs for the region ranking whether the need is low or high:

- Public Facilities - low
- Public improvements and infrastructure - high
- Public Services - low
- Affordable Housing - high

Expected Resources

Funding is expected to remain essentially the same as recent previous years. As such, Summit and Wasatch County are expecting to receive a total of \$623,000 for CDBG projects plus \$50,000 for administration. This allocation will leverage approximately \$100,000 in local match money per year. No match is required, however applications are scored based on the percentage of matching dollars for the proposed project. These matching funds come from the applicant's local government funding.

All applications will be fully funded beginning with the highest rated project then sequential to the next highest ranked project and so on. In the event that the next highest ranked project cannot be fully funded the following policies will be implemented to allocate the remaining funds:

- a. The next ranked application will be evaluated to determine whether or not the project is still viable and can meet a CDBG national objective with reduced funding.
- b. For projects under the \$200,000 threshold, the committee can award the project less than \$199,000 but greater than \$30,000.
- c. If there are no applications in the \$30,000 to \$199,000 range, the funds will be allocated to MAG's Single Family Housing Rehab program.

Goals & Objectives

(Do not change the Goal Outcome Indicators in the table. When completing this section, please reference the beneficiaries from the CDBG applications for your region. Only CDBG program goals should be included in this table.)

The annual action plan uses slightly different language than you may see in the CDBG application. I have included a key of terms below to assist you in completing this section.

- **Goal Outcome Indicator=** These should capture matrix codes related to these activities. See HUD’s [“Using IDIS to Prepare the Consolidated Plan, Annual Action Plan, and CAPER/PER” appendix B](#) for reference.
- **Quantity=** Number of beneficiaries
- **Unit of Measurement=** Beneficiary type

Goal Outcome Indicator	Quantity	Unit of Measurement
Public Facility or Infrastructure Activity other than low/moderate income housing benefit	238	Persons Assisted
Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities for low/moderate income housing benefit		Households Assisted
Public service activities other than low/moderate income housing benefit	211	Persons Assisted
Public service activities for low/moderate income housing benefit		Households Assisted
Facade treatment/Business building rehabilitation		Business
Rental units constructed		Household Housing Unit
Rental units rehabilitated		Household Housing Unit
Homeowner housing added		Household Housing Unit
Homeowner housing rehabilitated	11	Household Housing Unit
Direct financial assistance to homebuyers		Households Assisted
Homelessness prevention (Includes Short Term Rental Assistance)		Persons Assisted
Businesses assisted		Businesses Assisted
Jobs Created/retained		Jobs
Other	238	Other, planning

One-year goals for the number of households supported through:	
Rental assistance	
The production of new units	
Rehab of existing units	11
Acquisition of existing units	
Total	11

This section should count ONLY the households supported through CDBG funds planned in the upcoming program year (or through the projects which have applied this application cycle in your region). This section should not include the provision of emergency shelter, transitional shelter, or social services.

Allocation priorities

Due to aging infrastructure and large population growth, maintaining and improving public infrastructure is a high priority for the Summit and Wasatch County region. The following is the priority list, in order of priority for the area:

Water/Sewer Projects
Secondary Water
Storm Drainage
Single Family Rehab
Streets/Sidewalks
Public Health/Safety
Other Public Facilities/Housing

In Summit and Wasatch County, infrastructure projects have the biggest impact on the most LMI individuals. Additionally, funding infrastructure projects also meets the needs of the increasing population combined with an aging infrastructure. Single Family Rehab allows households to remain in their homes, preventing an increase in unaffordable housing.

Funding infrastructure and single family rehab will meet the objectives in the Consolidated and Annual Action Plans by funding the greatest need based on community feedback.

Applicants can access the detailed application process as well as the Consolidated and Annual Action Plans on MAG's website. The process for awarding funds is described in MAG's CDBG Policy under the Mountainland CDBG Rating and Ranking Policies on MAG's website as well.

The Rating and Ranking Policy is as follows:

Mountainland CDBG Rating and Ranking Policies - FY25
Approved June 5, 2024

The following policies have been established to govern the MAG CDBG award process so that HUD dollars are targeted toward projects of greatest need and impact, and to determine project eligibility under CDBG federal and state program guidelines. All eligible project applications will be accepted for rating and ranking.

1. In compliance with the policies of the State of Utah CDBG program, in order to be eligible for funding consideration, all grantees or sub-grantees must have expended 50% of any prior year's CDBG funding prior to the Rating and Ranking Committee's (RRC) rating and ranking session (generally mid-January).
2. Applicants must provide written documentation of the availability and status of all other proposed funding at the time the application is submitted, including all sources of funding which are considered local contributions toward the project and its administration. A project is not mature if funding cannot be committed by the time of application.

3. All proposed projects must be listed in the latest capital improvements list submitted by the applicant for the Consolidated Plan, and must meet the regional priorities identified in the Consolidated Plan. First time applicants and those submitting projects through a sponsoring city or county must make reasonable effort to amend the sponsor's listing in MAG's Consolidated Plan in a timely manner as determined by the RRC.
4. To maintain project eligibility, attendance at the annual "How to Apply" Workshops held in the Mountainland Region is mandatory for all applicants and sub-grantees. The project manager and an elected official from the applicant's jurisdiction should be in attendance. Newly elected officials and project managers are especially encouraged to attend since the administrative requirements and commitments of a CDBG project are considerable.
5. HUD regulations provide that no more than 15% of the State CDBG allocation can be used for "Public Service" activities. It is MAG's intent to generally apply that same cap to the regional allocation. Consideration of any exceptions will be coordinated with the State and will be based upon impact to the state-wide cap.
6. The state allows up to \$50,000 in funding for the MAG region for program administration and consolidated planning. The actual amount of funding allocated to the AOG for regional program administration and planning will be determined by the RRC.
7. The minimum CDBG allocation per project is \$200,000, except if it is rated on question 11 (to develop and improve infrastructure) and given a 4-7 point score, then the project can be awarded funds greater than \$10,000 but less than \$199,000.
8. The RRC may establish a set aside for project applications in a broad category on an annual basis based on regional needs identified in the MAG Consolidated Plan (i.e., planning, housing, infrastructure, economic development, public service, etc.). For any such set aside(s) that may be established, the RRC will provide notification to eligible jurisdictions of the type and amount of the set aside(s), and rating and ranking policies to be applied, prior to the commencement of the application process, usually in August of each year. There is no specific set aside identified for project applications received in the FY2025 program year.
9. Projects that are primarily designed to enhance private businesses or developers will be denied. Ownership of CDBG funded improvements must remain in the public domain.
10. Any project that can or will receive greater than 50% of project from private funding sources (excepting grants), will be ineligible for CDBG funds.
11. Mountainland Association of Governments will provide application assistance at the request of any jurisdiction. Technical assistance provided prior to the award of the contract, such as filling out applications, submitting information for the Consolidated Plan, LMI surveys or public hearings, shall be provided without cost to the applicant.

12. RRC, MAG staff and State staff review of all applications will proceed as follows:

- a. MAG staff will review all applications and become familiar with each project prior to meeting with State staff for review.
- b. RRC will interview applicants at least one week prior to the application deadline.
- c. MAG staff will review all applications with the State CDBG staff to determine eligibility and national objective compliance.
- d. RRC members will review all applications that are determined eligible.
- e. RRC members will rate and rank projects.
- f. The RRC determines final rating and ranking of projects and funding allocations. This information is reported to the Executive Council.

13. Funding will be awarded based on project ranking. The RRC may award less funding than the application request based upon project needs and ability of the jurisdiction to complete the project, including consideration of project planning (is the community prepared to implement the project), project timing (when will the project begin), project phases (can the project be completed in phases), supplemental funding (timing and availability of matching funds), jurisdiction commitment to the project, demonstrated need for the project in the community weighted against project needs for other communities.

14. Multi-year funding (maximum of two years) for projects will generally not be awarded, unless a specific request for multi-year status is received from the project applicant based on defined project needs, and the amount and timing of future funding available can be adjusted to meet such a request.

15. Any appeal of the Mountainland CDBG review process and/or funding allocations will follow the State Regional Appeal Procedure.

16. Emergency Projects: An emergency project is defined as one that addresses a detriment to the health, safety and/or welfare of residents. For any critical project that meets this definition, a jurisdiction may submit an application for emergency CDBG funding outside the normal allocation cycle.

- a. The application must be made utilizing the state's application form for the most recent funding cycle, and by holding a public hearing. All emergency applications must meet CDBG program requirements, and the Mountainland CDBG policies defined herein, including meeting minimum matching requirements, if any (see Paragraph 5).
- b. AOG staff will review the application for eligibility and consistency with the Consolidated Plan.
- c. The RRC will review the project application, including the jurisdiction's capacity to meet funding needs.
- d. If the RRC recommends the application to the State Policy Committee, the state staff will review the application to ensure the project meets program eligibility and national objective compliance. The state reserves the right to reject or amend applications that do not meet these threshold requirements.
- e. The state will permit applications for emergency projects. The State Policy Committee will make the final review and funding determination on all emergency projects.
- f. Any emergency funds distributed to projects in the region will be deducted from the region's allocation during the next funding cycle. Therefore, any emergency funds awarded to a jurisdiction will be considered as a funded project in the next funding cycle. Policies on second round funding will be

applied as outlined in Paragraph 5.

g. Additional information on the Emergency Fund program is available in the Application Policies and Procedures handbook developed annually by the state in Chapter 2, Funding Processes.

17. Membership on the RRC is by appointment of the Chairman of the Executive Council with annual ratification by the full Council. RRC membership will include at least two representatives from each county (1 from the county and 1 from a city/town). There are four members of the RRC. One member of the RRC will be appointed to sit on the State CDBG Policy Committee. RRC members representing jurisdictions that are submitting applications must abstain from ranking their applications.

18. MAG CDBG Rating and Ranking Policies are updated annually by MAG Staff and the RRC, with consideration given to guidance from the State CDBG Policy Committee and/or State CDBG Staff. Rating and Ranking policies are published for public comment and provided to all eligible cities and counties. The RRC has final review and is responsible to adopt the MAG CDBG Policies and Rating and Ranking System.

19. In the event of a tie for the last funding position, the following are the tiebreakers in order of priority:

- a. The project with the highest percentage of LMI
- b. The project that has highest percent of local funds leveraged
- c. The project with the most other funds leveraged
- d. The project with the largest number of LMI beneficiaries

20. All applications will be fully funded beginning with the highest rated project then sequential to the next highest ranked project and so on. In the event that the next highest ranked project cannot be fully funded the following policies will be implemented to allocate the remaining funds:

- a. The next ranked application will be evaluated to determine whether or not the project is still viable and can meet a CDBG national objective with reduced funding.
- b. For projects under the \$200,000 threshold, the committee can award the project less than \$199,000 but greater than \$10,000.
- c. If there are no applications in the \$10,000 to \$199,000 range, the funds will be allocated to MAGS Single Family Housing Rehab program.

Rating and Ranking System Notes: Underlined Criteria are required by the State of Utah.

1. Percent of the applicant's total population directly benefiting from the project (7 POINTS):

Regardless of size, the applicant jurisdiction is given greater priority for projects that benefit the highest proportion of the applicant's total population. Direct benefit will result from the project for:

More than 75% of the applicant's total population - 7 points

Between 50-74.9% of the applicant's total population - 5 points

Between 25-49.9% of the applicant's total population - 3 points

Less than 25% of the applicant's total population - 2 points

2. Percent of the jurisdiction's LMI population directly benefiting from the project (for site-specific or city/county-wide projects) (5 POINTS):

Points are awarded to applicants serving the highest percentage of their LMI population.

A substantial proportion of LMI served (>70%) - 5 points

A more moderate proportion of LMI served (55-69%) - 4 points

A moderate proportion of LMI served (45-54%) - 3 points

A small proportion of LMI served (< 45%) - 1 point

OR

Project serves a limited clientele group (presumed to be 51% LMI) OR targeted LMI group(100% LMI):
Points are awarded to limited clientele activities that serve a HUD presumed LMI group (abused children, seniors, disabled, homeless, etc.), a documented low income group (LMI income certification required for program eligibility), or activities that serve a targeted LMI group, where benefit is provided exclusively to LMI persons based upon their income eligibility (example: construction of new housing whose occupancy is limited exclusively to LMI individuals or families).

Project serves a limited clientele, or targeted LMI group as defined by HUD - 3 points

3. Points are awarded to projects which serve low-income (defined as 50% Area Median Income) and very low-income (defined as 30% of the County Median Income) beneficiaries as documented by survey (5 POINTS):

25% or more of the direct beneficiaries are low or very low income - 5 points

20-24.9% - 4 points

15-19.9% - 3 points

10-14.9% - 2 points

1-9.9% - 1 point

4. Local dollars invested in the project (8 POINTS):

Points are awarded to applicants investing local (city/county) dollars in their own projects, thus leveraging regional CDBG funding. Local contribution must be documented, and includes bonded indebtedness that is directly attributable to a proposed project, loans, and city/county funds. Points are awarded based upon the following scale:

Population	8 Points	5 Points	3 Points	2 Points	1 Point
< 1,000	> 20%	17.1% – 200%	14.1% – 17.0%	10% – 14.0%	<10%
1,001 to 10,000	> 30%	24.1% – 30%	18.1% – 24%	10% – 18%	<10%
> 10,000	> 40%	30.1%– 40%	20.1% – 30%	10% – 20%	<10%

5. Amount of outside project leveraging by the applicant (5 POINTS):

Points are awarded to applicants who are able to use CDBG dollars to leverage other state or federal funds. This includes federal and state grants. Leveraging is based on outside funds committed that are currently available.

Outside funding is 40-49% of the total cost - 5 points

Outside funding is 30-39% of the total cost - 4 points

Outside funding is 20-29% of the total cost - 3 points

Outside funding is 10-19% of the total cost - 2 points

Outside funding is 0-9% of the total cost - 0 point

6. Type of jobs created or retained (permanent or construction)(5 POINTS):

The type of actual jobs created or retained as a result of the project is evaluated as follows:

Permanent full-time jobs created or retained - 5 points

Temporary jobs only - 2 points

7. The capacity of the grantee to carry out the project (5 POINTS):

Points will be awarded on a scale of 1-5 to grantees who have previously demonstrated the ability to successfully administer and carry out a CDBG project, or to new grantees who have administered other grants in the past and demonstrated an understanding, capacity and desire to successfully administer a CDBG project.

Previous Performance (Rated by State CDBG Office) - 1-5 Points

OR

No Previous Experience - 3 Points

8. Points are awarded to applicants (not project sponsor) based on the amount of funding received in prior years (5 POINTS):

Applicant has not received funding in the last two years - 5 Points

Applicant received less than \$150,000 in last two years - 3 Points

Applicant has received from \$150,000 to \$299,999 in last two years - 1 Points

Applicant has received more than \$300,000 in last two years - 0 Points

9. Moderate income housing planning by the applicant or its sponsor (5 POINTS):

As part of the Housing Plan defined by state statute and/or adopted by city/county ordinance and included in the General Plan. Towns less than 5,000 are not required to have a housing plan. However, they will receive 2 points if they do not have one and 5 points if they do have a housing plan.

Compliant/Adopted by Ordinance - 5 points

Small Cities (less than 5,000) - 2 points

Non-compliant - 0 points

10. Project which support affordable housing for LMI up to 80% AMI (3 POINTS):

The majority of project funds will be used to improve, expand, or support LMI housing education, choice, availability, affordability, or opportunity.

Projects benefiting 10 or more units or individuals - 3 Points

Projects benefiting 5-9 units or individuals - 2 Points

Projects benefiting 1-4 units or individuals - 1 Point

11. Projects which develop/improve infrastructure (7 POINTS):

The majority of project funds are for the expansion of basic infrastructure (water, sewer) or other physical infrastructure (fire stations, community center, etc.) to create suitable living environments for the residents of the community.

Water/Sewer Projects - 7 Points

Secondary Water - 6 Points

Storm Drainage - 5 Points

Single Family Rehab - 4 Points

Streets/Sidewalks - 3 Points

Public Health/Safety - 2 Points

Other Public Facilities/Housing - 1 Point

12. For water projects - system user fees are competitive according to state drinking water and water quality standards (7 POINTS)

Maximum Affordable Water Bill = 1.75% of MAGI. Non-Water Projects get a default score of 5

7 Points	5 Points	3 Points	0 Points	The Jurisdiction's Tax Rate as a Percentage of State Ceiling
Fee rate > 1.25% of MAGI	Fee rate 0.75- 1.25% of MAGI	Fee rate 0.51- .75 of MAGI	Fee rate < 0.5% of MAGI	

13. Attendance by an elected official of the applicant at the "How to Apply" workshop (2 POINTS):

Elected official in attendance - 2 Points

Elected official not in attendance - 0 points

14. Jurisdiction participated in updating the Consolidated Plan (5 POINTS):

Provided MAG with updated materials for the consolidated plan and capital improvement list - 5 Points

Did not provide MAG with updated materials for consolidated plan and capital improvement list - 0 Points

15. Project meets jurisdiction priorities identified in the consolidated plan priorities (5 POINTS): Local priorities identified in each jurisdiction's capital improvements list will be used to determine jurisdiction priorities.

On Capital Improvements List - 5 Points

Not on list - 0 Points

16. Completed "ADA Checklist for readily achievable barrier removal" for city/county office (1 POINT):

Completed checklist - 1 point

Did not complete checklist - 0 points

17. City/County has adopted the following policies: grievance procedure under the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 and ADA Effective Communication Policy, Language Access Plan, and Section 504 and ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy (1 Point)

Adopted policies - 1 point

Has not adopted policies - 0 points

18. Priority will be given to projects that are mature and have a demonstrated ability to solve the problem (16 POINTS):

A mature project exhibits a specific and detailed scope of work, a timeline, a well thought out funding plan with supplemental funding already applied for and committed, and a detailed engineer's cost estimate. Immediate viability of the project means CDBG dollars can be spent in a timely manner. Points are awarded for each of the following:

a. The problem or need is clearly identified in application; applicant is able to present project clearly and concisely and can respond to questions; staff and/or engineer, etc., are involved in and understand the planning process. - 4 points

b. Proposed solution is well defined in Scope of Work and is demonstrated to solve the problem or need. - 5 points

c. Applicant has secured matching funds - 3 points -OR- Applicant is pursuing matching funding. - 1 point

d. Applicant can demonstrate a timeline for project completion during the grant period, and can give a concise description of how the project will be completed in a timely manner. - 4 points

19. Projects that have lower CDBG project costs per person will receive more points (3 POINTS):

Dividing the CDBG project request amount by the number of project beneficiaries results in a calculation of the cost per beneficiary. Projects that have a lower cost per beneficiary will receive additional points.

Projects that cost less than \$1,000 per beneficiary - 3 Points

Projects that cost between \$1,001 and \$5,000 per beneficiary - 2 Points

Projects that cost over \$5,001 per beneficiary - 0 Points

UNDER THIS SYSTEM, A MAXIMUM OF 100 POINTS ARE POSSIBLE.

Public Housing

Wasatch County Housing Authority is an Instrumentality of Government created to assist the citizens of Wasatch County obtain safe, sanitary, and affordable housing. The primary responsibility of WCHA is to offer down-payment assistance loans to qualified residents of Wasatch County. These loans have a low interest rate and a 30 year re-payment window. To address the needs of affordable housing, the Authority created a Down-Payment Assistance Fund to assist qualified persons in obtaining housing. This fund is created from monies paid to Wasatch County by developers to fulfill their affordable housing obligations under Wasatch County's amended General Plan. This program provides down-payment assistance loans to first-time home buyers in the County. Additionally, WCHA also offers low-income rental.

Notably, the Summit County Council established a Summit County Housing Authority in December 2024.

At this point, while Summit and Wasatch County now each have a Housing Authority, no CDBG funding has been awarded to the Housing Authorities. The amount of CDBG funding each year is limited and needed in many areas. The greatest impact to the greatest number of LMI persons has been set as a priority. The feedback from the community and jurisdictions also points to the same. This means that infrastructure, particularly water and sewer, are prioritized. Because of this, a higher number (in the hundreds) of LMI are benefited each year. Additionally, Single Family Rehab has received funds to ensure housing affordability for LMI individuals needing repairs to ensure their home is safe and livable. Due to this, there has been no funding planned for the Housing Authorities in Summit and Wasatch.

Barriers to Affordable Housing

In 2019, the state of Utah passed Senate Bill (SB)34, which requires cities to take state-approved steps aimed at encouraging affordable housing to be eligible to receive funds from the Utah Department of Transportation. To receive state transportation funds, cities are required to adopt three or more strategies from a menu of 22 strategies. A one-time \$20 million contribution was made in 2020 to the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund, which provides low-interest lending to affordable residential housing construction. The State of Utah contributes a new and increased level for affordable housing rehab in rural communities to the fund annually. Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) is the primary source of funding for new affordable rental housing in the nation.

In 2023, the state of Utah passed Senate Bill (SB)240. This bill created the First-time Homebuyers Assistance Program for allocation by Utah Housing Corporation. This bill provides program funds to assist approximately 2,400 first-time homebuyers to purchase a newly constructed but not yet inhabited home. Up to \$20,000 in program funds can be borrowed for the home. The purchase price is not to exceed \$450,000. First-time homebuyers must qualify for a Utah Housing Mortgage, with a Utah Housing Participating Lender. Funds are available until depleted. As of now, there are still funds available that can be applied to new-build, first-time homes.

Other

A representative from MAG participates in the Mountainland Continuum of Care. Housing and social service representatives, along with MAG and other agencies in the MAG region, coordinate and work together to end homelessness in the community. This group meets dozens of times throughout the year to find solutions for housing options for low-income and very low-income families in the community. As a continuum, they coordinate their efforts and pool all agency resources to better serve the community and end homelessness. They strive to help with everything from finding shelter to affordable home ownership. This work will continue to ensure success in the Annual Action Plan and Consolidated Plan.

Appendix I

Consultation Form

1. AOG: MAG Employee: Heather Mills

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Boys and Girls Club Date of Consultation: 10/17/2024

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Housing		Services- Victims	Neighborhood Organization
	PHA		Services- Broadband Internet Service Providers	Regional Organization
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Services- Housing		Services- Narrowing the Digital Divide	Planning organization
	Services- Children		Health Agency	Business Leaders
	Services- Elderly Persons		Child Welfare Agency	Civic Leaders
	Services- Persons with Disabilities		Agency- Managing Flood Prone Areas	Community Development Financial Institution
	Services- Persons with HIV/AIDS		Agency- Management of Public Land or Water Resources	Foundation
	Services- Victims of Domestic Violence		Agency- Emergency Management	Grantee Department
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Services- Homeless		Publicly funded institution / System of Care*	Major Employer
	Services- Health		Other government- Federal	Private Sector Banking/Financing
	Services- Education		Other government- State	Other:
	Services- Employment		Other government- County	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Services- Fair Housing		Other government- Local	

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

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

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

	Homelessness Needs- Veterans		Market Analysis
--	---------------------------------	--	-----------------

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

Questionnaires were filled out at the How to Apply Workshop.

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

Those responding stated pressing needs include homeless needs for families with children. Respondents stated one successful coordination effort is the Continuum of Care is working to coordinate rapid rehousing for families. Additionally, respondents note coordination for services for families with mixed legal status are needed. Housing services for families where the adults do not have legal status, but the children do is a unique need.

Consultation Form

1. AOG: MAG Employee: Heather Mills

2. Name of Agency Consulted: City Governments Date of Consultation: 10/17/2024

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

	Housing		Services- Victims		Neighborhood Organization
	PHA		Services- Broadband Internet Service Providers		Regional Organization
	Services- Housing		Services- Narrowing the Digital Divide		Planning organization
	Services- Children		Health Agency		Business Leaders
	Services- Elderly Persons		Child Welfare Agency		Civic Leaders
	Services- Persons with Disabilities		Agency- Managing Flood Prone Areas		Community Development Financial Institution
	Services- Persons with HIV/AIDS		Agency- Management of Public Land or Water Resources		Foundation
	Services- Victims of Domestic Violence		Agency- Emergency Management		Grantee Department
	Services- Homeless		Publicly funded institution / System of Care*		Major Employer
	Services- Health		Other government- Federal		Private Sector Banking/Financing
	Services- Education		Other government- State		Other:
	Services- Employment		Other government- County		
	Services- Fair Housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other government- Local		

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

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

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

- Rural Planning Organization
- Water and sewer compliance with state
- Open Space Preservation
- Culinary water storage tanks and water development
- Upgrading buildings and properties

	Homelessness Needs- Veterans	✓	Market Analysis
--	---------------------------------	---	-----------------

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

Questionnaires were filled out during the How to Apply Workshop

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

Those responding brought up the following pressing needs for the community: water and sewer improvements, affordable public and nonpublic housing, building and property upgrades and maintenance, ADA accessibility, traffic and transportation, responsible growth, and water storage. Responders felt some areas have had successful coordination including the Rural Planning Organization, coordination between municipalities and non-profits, coordination between MAG and cities applying for TAG grants, and work being done for seniors. Responders felt improved coordination would benefit the community in various ways, including developers to build affordable housing, a local food pantry, study of copper or lead in pipes, lowering cost of housing, creating timely grants to allow projects to start in good weather, helping studies of economic development in small towns, and potentially a legislative strategy that could help local preservation.

Consultation Form

1. AOG: MAG Employee: Heather Mills

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Heber Valley Economic Development Date of Consultation: 10/17/2024

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

	Housing		Services- Victims		Neighborhood Organization
	PHA		Services- Broadband Internet Service Providers		Regional Organization
	Services- Housing		Services- Narrowing the Digital Divide		Planning organization
	Services- Children		Health Agency		Business Leaders
	Services- Elderly Persons		Child Welfare Agency		Civic Leaders
	Services- Persons with Disabilities		Agency- Managing Flood Prone Areas		Community Development Financial Institution
	Services- Persons with HIV/AIDS		Agency- Management of Public Land or Water Resources		Foundation
	Services- Victims of Domestic Violence		Agency- Emergency Management		Grantee Department
	Services- Homeless		Publicly funded institution / System of Care*		Major Employer
	Services- Health		Other government- Federal		Private Sector Banking/Financing
	Services- Education		Other government- State		Other:
	Services- Employment		Other government- County		
	Services- Fair Housing	✓	Other government- Local		

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

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

✓	Housing Needs Assessment		Homelessness Needs- Unaccompanied Youth	✓	Economic Development
✓	Public Housing Needs		Homelessness Strategy		Lead-based Paint Strategy
	Homeless Needs- Chronically homeless		Non-Homeless Special Needs		Anti-Poverty-Strategy
	Homeless Needs- Families with Children		HOPWA Strategy	✓	Other: community improvement

	Homelessness Needs- Veterans	✓	Market Analysis
--	---------------------------------	---	-----------------

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

Questionnaires were filled out at the How to Apply Workshop.

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

Those responding stated pressing needs include affordable housing. Other needs include employee housing, community engagement areas and open space preservation. Respondents were unaware of any coordination efforts already happening within this realm.

Consultation Form

1. AOG: MAG Employee: Heather Mills

2. Name of Agency Consulted: Water Companies Date of Consultation: 10/17/2024

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

	Housing		Services- Victims		Neighborhood Organization
	PHA		Services- Broadband Internet Service Providers		Regional Organization
	Services- Housing		Services- Narrowing the Digital Divide		Planning organization
	Services- Children		Health Agency		Business Leaders
	Services- Elderly Persons		Child Welfare Agency		Civic Leaders
	Services- Persons with Disabilities		Agency- Managing Flood Prone Areas		Community Development Financial Institution
	Services- Persons with HIV/AIDS		Agency- Management of Public Land or Water Resources		Foundation
	Services- Victims of Domestic Violence		Agency- Emergency Management		Grantee Department
	Services- Homeless		Publicly funded institution / System of Care*		Major Employer
	Services- Health		Other government- Federal		Private Sector Banking/Financing
	Services- Education		Other government- State		Other:
	Services- Employment		Other government- County		
	Services- Fair Housing	✓	Other government- Local		

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

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

	Housing Needs Assessment		Homelessness Needs- Unaccompanied Youth		Economic Development
	Public Housing Needs		Homelessness Strategy		Lead-based Paint Strategy
	Homeless Needs- Chronically homeless		Non-Homeless Special Needs		Anti-Poverty-Strategy
	Homeless Needs- Families with Children		HOPWA Strategy	✓	Other: water in towns

	Homelessness Needs- Veterans		Market Analysis
--	---------------------------------	--	-----------------

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

Questionnaires were filled out at the How to Apply Workshop.

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

Those responding stated pressing needs include: a new water system including updated water sources, water tanks, updated meters, and updated water lines.