

## Six County Association of Governments 2017 CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria and Project Score Sheet

Applicant:

Requested CDBG Amount:

Total Score:

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria		Data Range/Score (Mark only one for each criteria)						SCORE
1	<b>Capacity To Carry Out The Grant:</b> (Rated by state staff see Worksheet #1)	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 points	2.5 points	
2	<b>Percent Of Non-CDBG Funds Invested In Total Project Cost.</b>							
2a	<b>Jurisdictions with a population less than 500</b>	>10% 5 points	7.1-10% 4 points	4.1-7% 3 points	1-4% 2 points	<1% 1 point		
2 b	<b>Jurisdictions with a population of 501-1,000</b>	>20% 5 points	15.1-20% 4 points	10.1-15% 3 points	5.1-10% 2 points	1-5% 1 point		
2 c	<b>Jurisdictions with a population of 1,001-5,000</b>	>30% 5 points	25.1-30% 4 points	20.1-25% 3 points	15.1-20% 2 points	1-15% 1 point		
2 d	<b>Jurisdictions with a population greater than 5,000</b>	>40% 5 points	35.1-40% 4 points	30.1-35% 3 points	25.1-30% 2 points	1-25% 1 point		
3	<b>CDBG Funds Requested Per Capita:</b> CDBG funds requested divided by # of beneficiaries.	\$1-100 5 points	\$101-200 4 points	\$201-400 3 points	\$401-800 2 points	\$801 or > 1 point		
4	<b>Jurisdiction's Project Priority:</b> Project rating in Consolidated Capital Improvement List.	High, A 5 points	Medium, B 3 points	Low, C 1 point				
5	<b>Project's Geographical Impact:</b> Projects will be rated on their relative impact in the community both in terms of numbers and relative need.	County 5 points	Community 3 points	Portion of Community 1 point				
6	<b>Jurisdiction's Property Tax Rate:</b> Communities that maintain a currently high tax burden will be given more points for this category. (applicant's tax rate/ceiling=percent ceiling)	>50% 5 points	40.1-50% 4 points	30.1-40% 3 points	20.1-30% 2 points	10.1-20% 1 point	<10% 0 points	
7	<b>LMI Population:</b> Percent of the projects beneficiaries considered 80 percent or less LMI. (based on LMI survey)	>80% 5 points	76-79% 4 points	61-75% 3 points	56-60% 2 points	51-55% 1 points		
8	<b>Extent Of Poverty:</b> Surveys or documentation that show the percentage of Low Income (LI: 50% AMI) and Very Low Income (VLI: 30% AMI) persons directly benefiting from the project.	>20% 5 points	15.1-20% 4 points	10.1-15% 3 points	5.1-10% 2 points	1-5% 1 point		

9	<b>Application Quality:</b> Applicant identifies problem, contains a well-defined scope of work, and is cost effective. Application is complete. See Worksheet #9 for scoring.	Excellent <b>5 points</b>	Very Good <b>4 points</b>	Good <b>3 points</b>	Fair <b>2 points</b>	Acceptable <b>1 points</b>	Poor <b>0 points</b>	
10	<b>Project Maturity:</b> Project demonstrates capacity to be implemented and/or completed in 18 month contract period and is clearly documented. See Worksheet #10 for scoring.	Excellent <b>5 points</b>	Very Good <b>4 points</b>	Good <b>3 points</b>	Fair <b>2 points</b>	Acceptable <b>1 points</b>	Poor <b>0 points</b>	
11	<b>Applicant Funded In Previous Years:</b>	4 or more prior funding cycles <b>4 points</b>	3 prior funding cycles <b>3 points</b>	1-2 prior funding cycles <b>2 points</b>	Received a grant in the last funding cycle <b>1 point</b>			
12	<b>Project Priority:</b> Determined by the CDBG Administrator with consultation of the AOG Executive Board members. This Board comprises of a mayor and commissioner from each county.	Public Utility Infrastructure <b>6 points</b>	Public Health/ Emergency services <b>5 points</b>	Community Facility <b>4 points</b>	Curb and gutter projects <b>3 points</b>	LMI Housing Activities <b>2 points</b>	Parks and Recreation <b>1 point</b>	
14	<b>Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA):</b> Does this project work to remove architectural barriers to persons with disabilities and/or is the project ADA compliant?	Yes <b>2 points</b>	No <b>0 point</b>					
15	<b>Health And Safety:</b> Does the project address serious health and safety threats.	Yes <b>3 points</b>	No <b>0 points</b>					
16	<b>Job Creation:</b> Estimated number of new permanent FTE jobs completed project will create or number of jobs retained that would be lost without this project.	>4 Jobs <b>4 points</b>	3-4 Jobs <b>3 points</b>	2 Jobs <b>2 points</b>	1 Job <b>1 point</b>			
17	<b>LMI Housing Stock:</b> Infrastructure for the units, rehabilitation of units, new units and/or accessibility of units for LMI residents.	>20 units <b>6 points</b>	15 - 20 units <b>5 points</b>	10 - 14 units <b>4 points</b>	5 - 9 units <b>3 points</b>	1 - 4 units <b>2 points</b>		
18	<b>Affordable Housing Plan Implementation:</b> City/County has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project addresses some element of that plan.	Yes <b>2 points</b>	No <b>0 points</b>					
19	<b>Pro-active Planning:</b> Communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities. See Worksheet #19 for scoring.	Very High <b>4 points</b>	High <b>3 points</b>	Fair <b>2 points</b>	Low <b>1 point</b>			

**CRITERIA 1 WORKSHEET**

**STATE OF UTAH DIVISION OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - GRANTEE PERFORMANCE RATING**

<b>STATE OF UTAH DIVISION OF HOUSING &amp; COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - GRANTEE PERFORMANCE RATING</b>					
5	4	3	2	1	<b>Applicant:</b>
Excellent		(Circle One)		Poor	
<b>Person Providing Evaluation: (Circle)</b> Cheryl Brown					
5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good 3 = Good 2 = Fair 1 = Poor					<b>Total Score Given:</b>

**CRITERIA 9 WORKSHEET**

APPLICATION QUALITY			
Criteria	Support Documentation	Other Documentation	Applicant:
1. Problem Identification: Is additional written text provided as an attachment to the Scope of Work?	Yes___ 1 point      No___ 0 points	Detailed Architectural/Engineering Report prepared? Yes___ 2 points      No___ 0 points	
2. Is proposed solution well defined in Scope of Work? In other words, is solution likely to solve problem?	Yes___ 1 point      No___ 0 points		
3. Does the application give a concise description of how the project will be completed in a timely manner?	Yes___ 1 point      No___ 0 points		
4. Does proposed project duplicate any existing services or activities already available and provided to beneficiaries in that jurisdiction through other programs, i.e. those locally or regionally based.	No___ 2 points      Yes___ 0 points <b>(Does not Duplicate)      (Duplicates Services)</b>		
<b>Excellent = 7 Points</b> <b>Very Good = 6 Points</b> <b>Good = 5 Points</b> <b>Fair = 4 Points</b> <b>Acceptable = 3 Points</b> <b>Poor = 2 Points</b>			<b>Total Points: _____</b> <b>Rating: _____</b> <b>(Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Acceptable, Poor)</b>

**CRITERIA 10 WORKSHEET**

PROJECT MATURITY		
Criteria	Status	Applicant:
1. Architect/Engineer already selected and is actively involved in the application process	Yes___ 1 point      No___ 0 points	
2. Is there evidence that the project manager has the capacity to carry out the project in a timely manner?	Yes___ 1 point      No___ 0 points	
3. Is the proposed solution to problem identified in the Scope of Work <b>ready to proceed immediately</b> ?	(Well Defined) Yes___ 2 points      No___ 0 points	
4. Are architectural or engineering design/plans (i.e. blueprints) already completed for the project?	Yes___ 2 points      No___ 0 points	
5. Funding Status (Maturity)	Is CDBG the only funding source for the project? Yes___ 1 point      No___ 0 points <b>(or)</b> All other project funding was applied for but not committed. Yes___ 2 points      No___ 0 points <b>(or)</b> All other project funding is in place for immediate use. Yes___ 3 points      No___ 0 points	
Excellent = 9 Points Very Good = 8 Points Good = 7 Points Fair = 6 Points Acceptable = 5 Points Poor = 4 Points or Less		Total Points: _____ Rating: _____ (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Acceptable, Poor)

**CRITERIA 19 WORKSHEET**

PRO-ACTIVE PLANNING		
Criteria	Support Documentation Provided	Applicant:
1. Has the local jurisdiction provided information demonstrating pro-active planning and land use in their community in coordination and cooperation with other governments?	Yes___ 1 point      No___ 0 points	
2. Has the applicant documented that the project is in accordance with an <u>adopted</u> master plan (i.e., water facilities master plan, etc.)	Yes___ 1 point      No___ 0 points	
3. Has the applicant documented incorporation of housing opportunity and affordability into community planning (i.e. General Plan housing policies, development fee deferral policies, etc.)	Yes___ 1 point      No___ 0 points	
4. Has the applicant documented adopted plans or general plan elements addressing protection and conservation of water, air, critical lands, important agricultural lands and historic resources?	Yes___ 1 point      No___ 0 points	
<b>Very High</b> = <b>4 Points</b> <b>High</b> = <b>3 Points</b> <b>Fair</b> = <b>2 Points</b> <b>Low</b> = <b>1 Point</b>		<b>Total Points:</b> _____ <b>Rating:</b> _____ (Very High, High, Fair, Low)