

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
FY 2011 CDBG RATING AND RANKING CRITERIA and APPLICANT'S PROJECT SCORE SHEET**

The Five County Association of Governments Steering Committee (RRC) has established these criteria for the purpose of rating and ranking fairly and equitably all Community Development Block Grant Pre-Applications received for funding during FY 2011. Only projects which are determined to be threshold eligible will be rated and ranked. Eligibility will be determined following review of the submitted CDBG application with all supporting documentation provided prior to rating and ranking. **Please review the attached Data Sources Sheet for a more detailed explanation of each criteria.**

<b>Applicant:</b>		<b>Requested CDBG \$'s</b>		<b>Ranking:</b>		<b>of</b>		<b>Total Score:</b>	
-------------------	--	----------------------------	--	-----------------	--	-----------	--	---------------------	--

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description Five County Association of Governments		Data	Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)					Score	X Weight	Total Score
1	<b>Capacity to Carry Out The Grant:</b> Performance history of capacity to administer grant. Score comes from Worksheet #1. (First-time & <5-yr grantees: default = Good)		Excellent (9-10 score) <b>4 points</b>	Very Good (7-8 score) <b>3 points</b>	Good (5-6 score) <b>2 points</b>	Fair (3-4 score) <b>1 point</b>	Poor (1-2 score) <b>0 points</b>		.5	
2	<b>Grant Administration:</b> Concerted effort made by grantee to minimize grant administration costs.		100% Other Funds <b>3 points</b>	1 - 5% <b>2 points</b>	5.1 - 10% <b>1 point</b>				1.0	
3	<b>Job Creation:</b> Estimated number of new 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>			1.5	
4	<b>Unemployment:</b> What percentage is applicant County's unemployment percentage rate above State average percentage rate?	%	6% or greater above state average <b>3.5 points</b>	5% above state average <b>3.0 points</b>	4% above state average <b>2.5 points</b>	3% above state average <b>2.0 points</b>	2% above state average <b>1.5 point</b>	Equal to or up to 1% above state avg. <b>1.0 point</b>	Below state average <b>0 points</b>	1.5
5 A	<b>Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (Jurisdiction Population &lt;500)</b> Percent of non-CDBG funds invested in total project cost.	%	> 10% <b>5 points</b>	7.1 % - 10% <b>4 points</b>	4.1% - 7% <b>3 points</b>	1% - 4% <b>2 points</b>	< 1% <b>1 point</b>			2.0
5 B	<b>Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (Jurisdiction Population 501 - 1,000)</b> Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in total project cost.	%	> 20% <b>5 points</b>	15.1 - 20% <b>4 points</b>	10.1 - 15% <b>3 points</b>	5.1 - 10% <b>2 points</b>	1 - 5.0% <b>1 point</b>			2.0
5 C	<b>Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (Jurisdiction Population 1,001 - 5,000)</b> Percentage of Non-CDBG funds invested in total project cost.	%	> 40% <b>5 points</b>	30.1 - 40% <b>4 points</b>	20.1 - 30% <b>3 points</b>	10.1 - 20% <b>2 points</b>	1 - 10% <b>1 point</b>			2.0
5 D	<b>Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (Jurisdiction Population &gt;5,000)</b> Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in total project cost.	%	> 50% <b>5 points</b>	40.1 - 50% <b>4 points</b>	30.1 - 40% <b>3 points</b>	20.1 - 30% <b>2 points</b>	1 - 20% <b>1 point</b>			2.0

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description Five County Association of Governments		Data	Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)						Score	X Weight	Total Score
6	<b>CDBG funds Requested Per Capita:</b> CDBG funds requested divided by population.		\$1 - 100 5 points	\$101-200 4 points	\$201- 400 3 points	\$401 - 800 2 points	\$801 or > 1 point			1.0	
7 T*	<b>Jurisdiction's Project Priority:</b> Project priority rating in Regional Consolidated Plan, ( <u>Capital Investment Plan - One-Year Action Plan</u> )		High # 1 6 points	High # 2 5 points	High # 3 4 points	High # 4 3 points	High # 5 2 points	High # >5 1 point		2.0	
8	<b>County's Project Priority:</b> Prioritization will be determined by the three (3) appointed Steering Committee members representing the county in which the proposed project is located. The three (3) members of the Steering Committee include: one County Commission Representative, one Mayor's Representative, and one School Board Representative. (Note: for AOG application, determination is made by the Steering Committee Chair, in consultation with the AOG Executive Committee.)		# 1 6 points	# 2 5 points	# 3 4 points	# 4 3 points	# 5 2 points	#6 or > 1 point		2.0	
9	<b>Regional Project Priority:</b> Determined by the Executive Director with consultation of the AOG Executive Committee members. The Executive Committee is comprised of one (1) County Commissioner from each of the five counties.		# 1 LMI Housing Activities 6 points	# 2 Community Facilities 5 points	# 3 Public Utility Infrastructure 4 points	# 4 Public Safety Activities 3 points	# 5 Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA) 2 points	#6 or > Parks and Recreation 1 point		2.0	
10	<b>LMI Housing Stock:</b> Number of units constructed, rehabilitated, or made accessible to LMI residents.		> 20 Units 6 points	15 - 20 Units 5 points	10 - 14 Units 4 points	5-9 Units 3 points	3-4 Units 2 points	2 Units 1 point		1.0	
11	<b>Affordable Housing Plan Implementation:</b> City has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project demonstrates implementation of specific policies in the Plan. Towns applying for credit under this criteria may <u>either</u> meet a goal in their adopted Affordable Housing Plan or the project meets a regional affordable housing goal in the Consolidated Plan.		YES 3 points	No 0 points						1.0	
12	<b>Project's Geographical Impact:</b> Area benefitting from project.		Regional 6 points	Multi-county 5 points	County-wide 4 points	Multi-community 3 points	Community 2 points	Portion of Community 1 point		1.5	
13	<b>Applicant's County Per Capita Income (PCI):</b> as compared to State's PCI to target distressed areas from 2000 Census.	%	70% or < 5 points	71 - 80% 4 points	81- 90% 3 points	90 - 100% 2 points	100-110% 1 point	> 110% 0 points		1.0	

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description Five County Association of Governments		Data	Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)						Score	X Weight	Total Score
14	<b>Jurisdiction's Property Tax Rate:</b> In response to higher demand for services, many communities have already raised tax rates to fund citizen needs. The communities that maintain an already high tax burden (as compared to the tax ceiling set by state law) will be given higher points for this category. Property tax rate as a percent of the maximum allowed by law (3 point default for non-taxing jurisdiction).	%	61% or > <b>5 points</b>	51 - 60% <b>4 points</b>	41 - 50% <b>3 points</b>	31 - 40% <b>2 points</b>	21 - 30% <b>1 point</b>	< 20% <b>0 points</b>		1.0	
15	<b>Jurisdiction's LMI Population:</b> Percent of residents considered 80 percent or less LMI (based on 2000 Census Data or Survey).	%	91 - 100% <b>5 points</b>	81 - 90% <b>4 points</b>	71 - 80% <b>3 points</b>	61 - 70% <b>2 points</b>	51 - 60% <b>1 point</b>			1.0	
16	<b>Extent of Poverty:</b> If an applicant satisfactorily documents the percentage of Low Income (LI - 50%) and Very Low Income (VLI - 30%) persons directly benefitting from a project; or can show the percentage of Low Income/Very Low Income of the community as a whole; additional points shall be given in accordance with the following. Percentage of total population of jurisdiction or project area who are low income and very low income.	%	20% or More <b>5 points</b>	15 - 19% <b>4 points</b>	10 - 14% <b>3 points</b>	5 - 9% <b>2 points</b>	1 - 4% <b>1 point</b>			1.0	
17	<b>Presumed LMI Group:</b> Project specifically serves CDBG identified LMI groups, i.e. elderly, disabled, homeless, etc., as stipulated in the state of Utah Small Cities CDBG Application Policies and Procedures.	%	100% <b>5 points</b>	80 - 99% <b>4 points</b>	60 - 79% <b>3 points</b>	51 - 59% <b>2 points</b>				1.0	
18	<b>Pro-active Planning:</b> Reflects on communities who pro-actively plan for growth and needs in their communities; coordination and cooperation with other governments; development of efficient infrastructure; incorporation of housing opportunity and affordability in community planning; and protection and conservation plan for water, air, critical lands, important agricultural lands and historic resources. Score comes from Worksheet #18.		Very High <b>4 points</b>	High <b>3 points</b>	Fair <b>2 points</b>	Low <b>1 point</b>				0.5	
19	<b>Application Quality:</b> Application identifies problem, contains a well-defined scope of work and is cost-effective. Score comes from Worksheet #19.		Excellent <b>5 points</b>	Very Good <b>4 points</b>	Good <b>3 points</b>	Fair <b>2 points</b>	Acceptable <b>1 point</b>	Poor <b>0 points</b>		1.5	
20	<b>Project Maturity:</b> Project demonstrates capacity to be implemented and/or completed in the 18 month contract period and is clearly documented. Score comes from Worksheet #20.		Excellent <b>5 points</b>	Very Good <b>4 points</b>	Good <b>3 points</b>	Fair <b>2 points</b>	Acceptable <b>1 point</b>	Poor <b>0 points</b>		2.0	

**PLEASE NOTE:** Criteria marked with a T\* is a THRESHOLD eligibility requirement for the CDBG Program.

< = Less Than > = More Than

Previously Allocated Pre-Approved Funding:

\$150,000 – Five County AOG (Consolidated Plan Planning, Administration, Rating & Ranking, Direct Planning Assistance, Program Delivery for Housing Programs and ED Technical Assistance Grant)

\$150,000– Beaver City on behalf of Beaver Housing Authority, year 2 of multi-year project; \$150,000– Washington City on behalf of Color Country Community Housing Inc., year 2 of multi-year project;

\$116,727– Cedar City on behalf of Cedar Housing Authority, year 2 of multi-year project (Year two amount less than \$150,000 because grantee was awarded additional funding in year 1).

**CRITERIA 1 WORKSHEET**

STATE OF UTAH DIVISION OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - GRANTEE PERFORMANCE RATING										
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Score (10 Points Total)
Excellent ← _____ <b>(Circle One)</b> _____ → Poor										
Person Providing Evaluation: (Circle)      Keith      Cheryl      Glenna										
Excellent    =    9 to 10 Very Good    =    7 to 8 Good          =    5 to 6 Fair          =    3 to 4 Poor          =    1 to 2										Total Points: _____ Rating: _____ (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor)

**CRITERIA 18 WORKSHEET**

<b>PRO-ACTIVE PLANNING</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Support Documentation Provided</b>	<b>Score (4 Points Total)</b>
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  <b>1 point</b>	
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  <b>1 point</b>	
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  <b>1 point</b>	
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>1 point</b>	
<b>Very High = 4 Points</b> <b>High = 3 Points</b> <b>Fair = 2 Points</b> <b>Low = 1 Point</b>		<b>Total Points: _____</b> <b>Rating: _____</b> <b>(Very High, High, Fair, Low)</b>

**CRITERIA 19 WORKSHEET**

<b>APPLICATION QUALITY</b>			
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Support Documentation</b>	<b>Other Documentation</b>	<b>Score (7 Points Total)</b>
1. Problem Identification	Additional written text provided? Yes ___ 1 point      No ___ 0 points  <b>1 point</b>	Detailed Architectural/Engineering Report prepared? Yes ___ 2 points      No ___ 0 points  <b>2 points</b>	
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  <b>1 point</b>		
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  <b>1 point</b>		
4. Proposed project does <u>not</u> 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.	Yes ___ 2 points <b>(Does not Duplicate)</b> <b>2 points</b>  No ___ 0 points <b>(Duplicates Services)</b> <b>0 points</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 20 WORKSHEET**

<b>PROJECT MATURITY</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Score (8 Points Total)</b>
1. Architect/Engineer already selected at time of application through formal RFP process	Yes___ 2 points      No___ 0 points <b>2 points</b>	
2. Has application identified dedicated and involved project manager?	Yes___ 1 point      No___ 0 points <b>1 point</b>	
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 <b>2 points</b>	
4. Has applicant identified all funding sources?	Yes___ 1 point      No___ 0 points <b>1 point</b>	
5. Funding Status (Maturity)	All other project funding is applied for but not committed. Yes___ 1 point      No___ 0 points <b>1 point</b> <b>(or)</b> All other project funding is in place for immediate use. Yes___ 2 points      No___ 0 points <b>2 points</b> <b>(or)</b> Is CDBG the only funding source for the project? Yes___ 2 points      No___ 0 points <b>2 points</b>	
<b>Excellent = 8 Points</b> <b>Very Good = 7 Points</b> <b>Good = 6 Points</b> <b>Fair = 5 Points</b> <b>Acceptable = 4 Points</b> <b>Poor = 3 Points</b>		<b>Total Points: _____</b> <b>Rating: _____</b> <b>(Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Acceptable, Poor)</b>

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT  
GENERAL POLICIES**

1. **Weighted Value utilized for Rating and Ranking Criteria:** The Rating and Ranking Criteria utilized by the Five County Association of Governments contains a weighted value for each of the criteria. Points values are assessed for each criteria and totaled. In the right hand columns the total points received are then multiplied by a weighted value to obtain the total score. These weighted values may change from year to year based on the region's determination of which criteria have higher priority.
2. Five County AOG staff will visit each applicant on site for an evaluation/review meeting.
3. All applications will be evaluated by the Five County Association of Governments Community and Economic Development staff using criteria approved by the Steering Committee.
4. Staff will present prioritization recommendation to the RRC (Steering Committee) for consideration and approval.
5. Maximum amount per year to a jurisdiction is \$150,000.00.
6. Maximum years for a multi-year project is 2 years at \$150,000 per year.
7. All applications for multi-year funding must contain a complete budget and budget breakdown for each specific year of funding.
8. Applications on behalf of sub-recipients (i.e., special service districts, non-profit organizations, etc.) are encouraged. However, the applicant city or county must understand that even if they name the sub-recipient as project manager the city/county is still responsible for the project's viability and program compliance. The applying entity must be willing to maintain an active oversight of both the project and the sub-recipient's contract performance. An inter-local agreement between the applicant entity and the sub-recipient must accompany the pre-application. The inter-local agreement must detail who will be the project manager and how the sponsoring entity and sub-recipient will coordinate work on the project. A letter from the governing board of the sub-recipient requesting the sponsorship of the project must accompany the pre-application. This letter must be signed by the board chairperson.
9. Projects must be consistent with the District's Consolidated Plan. The project applied for must be included in the prioritized capital improvements list that the entity submitted for inclusion in the Consolidated Plan. Projects sponsored on behalf of an eligible sub-recipient may not necessarily be listed in the jurisdictions capital investment plan, but the sub-recipient's project must meet goals identified in the region's Consolidated Plan.
10. Previously allocated pre-approved funding:
  - \$150,000 Five County AOG (Consolidated Plan Planning, Administration, Rating and Ranking, Direct Planning Assistance, Program Delivery for Housing Programs and ED Technical Assistance Grant)

Adopted by the Five County Association of Governments Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee) August 14, 2002, as amended August 11, 2010.

➤➤➤ \$150,000 Beaver City on behalf of Beaver Housing Authority, 2<sup>nd</sup> year of multi-year project; \$150,000 Washington City, on behalf of Color Country Community Housing Inc., 2<sup>nd</sup> year of multi-year project; \$116,727 Cedar City on behalf of Cedar Housing Authority, 2<sup>nd</sup> year of multi-year project (Second year funding is less than \$150,000 because additional funds were allocated in FY 2010).

11. Set-aside Funding:

➤➤➤ None.

12. Emergency projects may be considered by the Regional Review Committee (FCAOG Steering Committee) at any time. Projects applying for emergency funding must still meet a national objective and regional goals and policies.

Projects may be considered as an emergency application if:

- Funding through the normal application time frame will create an unreasonable risk to health or property.
- An appropriate third party agency has documented a specific risk (or risks) that; in their opinion; needs immediate remediation.

If an applicant wishes to consider applying for emergency funds, they should contact the Five County Association of Governments CDBG Program Specialist as soon as possible to discuss the state required application procedure as well as regional criteria. Emergency funds (distributed statewide) are limited on an annual basis to \$500,000. The amount of any emergency funds distributed during the year will be subtracted from the top of the appropriate regional allocation during the next funding cycle.

13. Public service providers, traditionally non-profit organizations, are encouraged to apply for CDBG funds for capital improvement and major equipment purchases. Examples are delivery trucks, furnishings, fixtures, computer equipment, construction, remodeling, and facility expansion. State policy prohibits use of CDBG funds for operating and maintenance expenses. This includes paying administrative costs, salaries, etc. No more than 15 percent of the state's yearly allocation of funds may be expended for public service activities.

14. State policy has established the minimum project size at \$30,000. Projects less than the minimum size will not be considered for rating and ranking.

15. In accordance with state policy, grantees with open grants from previous years who have not spent 50 percent of their previous grant by January 15, 2011 are not eligible to be rated and ranked, with the exception of housing rehabilitation projects.

16. It is the policy of the Five County Association of Governments RRC (Steering Committee) that CDBG funds in this region be directed to the development of brick and mortar LMI housing projects, or utilized for necessary infrastructure for that housing. CDBG funds in this region shall not be utilized for LMI rental assistance.

Adopted by the Five County Association of Governments Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee) August 14, 2002, as amended August 11, 2010.

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
HOW-TO-APPLY CDBG APPLICATION WORKSHOP  
ATTENDANCE POLICY**

Attendance at one workshop within the region is mandatory by all prospective applicants or an "OFFICIAL" representative of said applicant. [State Policy]

Attendance at the workshop by a county commissioner, mayor, city council member, or county clerk satisfies the above referenced attendance requirement of the prospective applicant's jurisdiction. In addition, attendance by a city manager, town clerk, or county administrator also satisfies this requirement.

Jurisdictions may formally designate a third party representative (i.e., other city/county staff, consultant, engineer, or architect) to attend the workshop on their behalf. Said designation by the jurisdiction shall be in writing. The letter of designation shall be provided to the Five County Association no later than at the beginning of the workshop.

Attendance by prospective eligible "sub-grantees", which may include non-profit agencies, special service districts, housing authorities, etc. is strongly recommended so that they may become familiar with the application procedures. If a city/town or county elects to sponsor a sub-grantee it is the responsibility of that jurisdiction to ensure the timely and accurate preparation of the CDBG application on behalf of the sub-grantee.

Extraordinary circumstances relating to this policy shall be presented to the Executive Director of the Five County Association of Governments for consideration by the Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee).

## FY 2011 Regional Prioritization Criteria and Justification

**Criteria #9: Regional Project Priority** **Project priority rating with regional goals and policies. Regional prioritization is determined by the Executive Director with consultation of the AOG Executive Committee.**

#1 priority	6 points X 2.0 (weighting)	=	12.0 points
#2 priority	5 points X 2.0 (weighting)	=	10.0 points
#3 priority	4 points X 2.0 (weighting)	=	8.0 points
#4 priority	3 points X 2.0 (weighting)	=	6.0 points
#5 priority	2 points X 2.0 (weighting)	=	4.0 points
#6 priority	1 point X 2.0 (weighting)	=	2.0 points

### Regional Prioritization

### Justification

#1	<b>LMI Housing Activities</b>	Projects designed to provide for the housing needs of very low and low-moderate income families. May include the development of infrastructure for LMI housing projects, home buyers assistance programs, or the actual construction of housing units (including transitional, supportive, and/or homeless shelters), and housing rehabilitation. Meets a primary objective of the program: Housing. Traditionally CDBG funds leverage very large matching dollars from other sources.
#2	<b>Community Facilities</b>	Projects that traditionally have no available revenue source to fund them, or have been turned down traditionally by other funding sources, i.e., Permanent Community Impact Fund Board (PCIFB). May also include projects that are categorically eligible for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding, i.e., senior citizens centers, health clinics, food banks, and/or public service activities. Includes community centers that are not primarily recreational in nature.
#3	<b>Public Utility Infrastructure</b>	Projects designed to increase the capacity of water and other utility systems to better serve the customers and/or improve fire flow capacity. Other funding sources usually available. Adjusting water rates are a usual funding source. Other agencies also fund this category. Includes wastewater disposal projects.
#4	<b>Public Safety Activities</b>	Projects related to the protection of property, would include activities such as flood control projects or fire protection improvements in a community. Typically general fund items but most communities cannot fund without additional assistance. Grants help lower indebted costs to jurisdiction. Fire Protection is eligible for other funding i.e., PFCIB and can form Special Service Districts (SSD's) to generate revenue stream.
#5	<b>Projects to remove architectural barriers</b>	Accessibility of public facilities by disabled persons is mandated by federal law but this is an unfunded mandate upon the local government. A liability exists for the jurisdiction because of potential suits brought to enforce requirements. Only CDBG and sometimes PCIFB have stepped up to fund this mandate.
#6	<b>Parks and Recreation</b>	Projects designed to enhance the recreational qualities of a community i.e., new picnic facilities, playgrounds, aquatic centers, etc.

**Note:** The Executive Director in consultation with the Executive Committee reviewed and approved the regional prioritization for ratification by the Steering Committee on August 11, 2010.

**Five County Association of Governments  
CDBG Rating and Ranking Program Year 2011  
Data Sources**

1. **CAPACITY TO CARRY OUT THE GRANT:** The grantee must have a history of successful grant administration in order to receive full points in this category. First time grantees or grantees who have not applied in more than 5 years are presumed to have the capacity to successfully carry out a project and will receive a default score of 2.5 points. To adequately evaluate grantee performance, the RRC must consult with the state staff. State staff will rate performance on a scale of 1-10 (Ten being best). A grantee whose performance in the past was poor must show improved administration capability through third party administration contracts with AOG's or other capable entities to get partial credit. Worksheet #1 used to determine score.
2. **GRANT ADMINISTRATION:** Grant administration costs will be taken from the CDBG pre-application. Those making a concerted effort to minimize grant administration costs taken from CDBG funds will be awarded extra points.
3. **JOB CREATION:** Information provided by applicant prior to rating and ranking. Applicant must be able to adequately support proposed figures for job creation or retention potential. This pertains to permanent jobs created as a result of the project, not jobs utilized in the construction of a project. Two part-time employees = 1 full-time.
4. **UNEMPLOYMENT:** "Utah Economic and Demographic Profiles" (most current issue available prior to rating and ranking), provided by Utah Office of Planning and Budget; or "Utah Labor Market Report" (most current issue with annual averages), provided by Department of Workforce Services.
5. **FINANCIAL COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (Self-Help Financing):** From figures provided by applicant in grant application. Documentation of the source(s) and status (whether already secured or not) of any and all proposed "matching" funds must be provided prior to the rating and ranking of the application by the RRC. Any changes made in the dollar amount of proposed funding, after rating and ranking has taken place, shall require reevaluation of the rating received on this criteria. A determination will then be made as to whether the project's overall ranking and funding prioritization is affected by the score change.

Use of an applicant's local funds and/or leveraging of other matching funds is strongly encouraged in CDBG funded projects in the Five County Region. This allows for a greater number of projects to be accomplished in a given year. Acceptable matches include property, materials available and specifically committed to this project, and cash. Due to federal restrictions unacceptable matches include donated labor, use of equipment, etc. All match proposed must be quantified as cash equivalent through an acceptable process before the match can be used. Documentation on how and by whom the match is quantified is required. "Secured" means that a letter or applications of intent exist to show that other funding sources have been requested as match to the proposed project. If leveraged funds are not received then the points given for that match will be deducted and the project's rating reevaluated.

A jurisdiction's population (most current estimate provided by Utah Office of Planning and Budget) will determine whether they are Category A, B, C or D for the purposes of this criteria.

6. **CDBG DOLLARS REQUESTED PER CAPITA:** Determined by dividing the dollar amount requested in the CDBG application by the population of the jurisdiction, using most current population estimate provided by Utah Office of Planning and Budget.
7. **LOCAL JURISDICTIONS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES: THRESHOLD CRITERIA:** Every applicant is required to document that the project for which they are applying is consistent with that community's and the Five County District Consolidated Plan. The project, or project type, must be a high priority in the investment component (Capital Investment Plan (CIP) One-Year Action Plan). The applicant must include evidence that the community was and continues to be a willing partner in the development of the regional (five-county) consolidated planning process. (See CDBG Application Guide.)
8. **COUNTY'S COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND POLICIES:** Prioritization will be determined by the three (3) appointed Steering Committee members representing the county in which the proposed project is located. The three (3) members of the Steering Committee include: one County Commission Representative, one Mayor's Representative, and one School Board Representative. (Note: for AOG application, determination is made by the Steering Committee Chair, in consultation with the AOG Executive Committee.)
9. **REGIONAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND POLICIES:** Determined by the Executive Director with consultation of the AOG Executive Committee members. The Executive Committee is comprised of one County Commissioner from each of the five counties.
10. **IMPROVEMENTS TO, OR EXPANSION OF, LMI HOUSING STOCK, OR PROVIDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACCESSIBILITY TO LMI RESIDENTS:** Information provided by the applicant. Applicant must be able to adequately explain reasoning which supports proposed figures, for the number of LMI housing units to be constructed or substantially rehabilitated with the assistance of this grant. Or the number of units this grant will make accessible to LMI residents through loan closing or down payment assistance.
11. **AFFORDABLE HOUSING PLAN IMPLEMENTATION:** In January, 1999, the Community and Economic Development State Legislative Committee passed a resolution requiring the Community Impact Fund and the Community Development Block Grant Program to implement rating and ranking criteria that would award jurisdictions that had complied with HB 295 law and had adopted their Affordable Housing Plans when they applied for funding from these two programs. The CDBG State Policy Board adopted the following rating and ranking criteria to be used by each regional rating and ranking system: *"Applications received from communities and counties who have complied with HB 295 by the preparation and adoption of a plan, and who are applying for a project that is intended to address some element of that plan will be given additional points."* Projects which actually demonstrate implementation of a jurisdiction's Affordable Housing Plan policies will be given points. Applicants must provide sufficient documentation to justify their project does, in fact, comply with this criteria. Towns applying for credit under this criteria may either meet a goal in their adopted Affordable Housing Plan or the project meets a regional affordable housing goal in the Consolidated Plan.
12. **GEOGRAPHIC EXTENT OF PROJECT'S IMPACT:** The actual area to be benefitted by the project applied for.

13. **PER CAPITA INCOME OF APPLICANT'S COUNTY RELATIVE TO STATE PER CAPITA INCOME:** Utah Department of Workforce Services; or more current source available prior to rating and ranking.
14. **PROPERTY TAX RATE FOR JURISDICTION:** Base tax rate for community or county, as applicable, will be taken from the "Statistical Review of Government in Utah", or most current source using the most current edition available prior to rating and ranking. Basis for determining percent are the maximum tax rates allowed in the Utah Code: .70% for municipalities, and .32% for counties.
15. **PERCENTAGE OF APPLICANT'S JURISDICTION WHO ARE LOW TO MODERATE INCOME:** Figures from the most current available census data provided by the State Department of Community and Economic Development. If a community or county is not on the DCED provided "HUD Pre-approved List", the figures will be provided from the results of a DCED approved income survey conducted by the applicant of the project benefit area households.
16. **EXTENT OF POVERTY:** Based on information provided by applicant prior to rating and ranking that satisfactorily documents the percentage of Low Income (LI - 50%) and Very Low Income (VLI - 30%) persons directly benefitting from a project.
17. **PRESUMED LMI GROUP:** Applicant will provide information as to what percent of the proposed project will assist a presumed LMI group as defined in the current program year CDBG Application Guide handbook.
18. **PRO-ACTIVE PLANNING:** The State of Utah emphasizes the importance of incorporating planning into the operation of city government. Communities that demonstrate their desire to improve through planning will receive additional points in the rating and ranking process.

In the rating and ranking of CDBG applications, the region will recognize an applicant's accomplishments consistent with these principles by adding additional points when evaluating the following:

- \*\* **Demonstration of local responsibility for planning and land-use in their communities in coordination and cooperation with other governments**
- \*\* **Development of efficient infrastructure including water and energy conservation**
- \*\* **Incorporation of housing opportunity and affordability into community planning**
- \*\* **Protection and conservation plan for water, air, critical lands, important agricultural lands and historic resources**

Worksheet #18 will be used in the rating and ranking process for applicants who have taken the opportunity to provide additional information and documentation in order to receive these additional points.

19. **Application Quality:** Quality of the Pre-Application in terms of project identification, justification, and well-defined scope of work likely to address identified problems.

- 20. Project Maturity:** Funding should be prioritized to those projects which are the most "mature". For the purposes of this process, maturity is defined as those situations where: 1) the applicant has assigned a project manager; 2) has selected an engineer and/or architect through a formal process in accordance with applicable laws and regulations; 3) knows who will administer the grant; 4) proposed solution to problem is identified in the Scope of Work and ready to proceed immediately; and 5) identifies all funding sources and funding maturity status. Projects that are determined to not be sufficiently mature so as to be ready to proceed in a timely manner, may not be rated and ranked.