

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Small Cities Program

WASATCH FRONT REGIONAL COUNCIL

RATING AND RANKING CRITERIA - 2017 PROGRAM YEAR

The Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) staff provides technical assistance to help applicants and grantees throughout the CDBG process. Applicants are encouraged to take advantage of this service to help reduce administrative costs. If you have any questions regarding the CDBG Program or the Rating and Ranking Criteria, please contact [Sam Klemm at sam@wfrc.org](mailto:sam@wfrc.org) or call 801-363-4250 x1116.

GENERAL POLICIES

The Rating and Ranking Criteria are reviewed annually by the Regional Review Committee (RRC) to ensure the available funding promotes the needs of the region and meets the goals of the CDBG program.

1. Minimum grant amount per year is \$30,000.
2. Maximum grant amounts:
 - a. **The RRC will not award more than half of the available funds for any year to any one project.**
 - b. Multiple-Year Projects: The maximum multiple-year grant amount is \$200,000 per year, up to two years (this amount may change based on funding appropriation).
 - c. Infrastructure Projects: Maximum grant amount per year for community infrastructure projects is \$250,000. Community infrastructure projects include, but are not limited to water, sewer, street, sidewalk, curb, and gutter.
 - d. All applicants proposing projects requiring two years of funding must have a cost estimate and/or breakdown for each year.
3. WFRC staff shall visit each applicant on site for a project evaluation/review.
4. All applications will be evaluated by WFRC staff using the criteria approved by the RRC. WFRC staff will present prioritization recommendations to the RRC for consideration and approval at the annual meeting held for that purpose.
5. In the event that two or more projects receive the same rating and ranking score, the RRC will then rank them using the regional priorities identified in Criterion 12. If there is still a tie score, the applicant with the highest percentage of other matching funds shall prevail.

6. If a project has been awarded a two year grant, the second year's grant amount will be taken from the region's appropriation at the beginning of that year's rating and ranking process.
7. Applicants, other than cities or counties, are required to gain sponsorship by an eligible entity no later than the date of the first public hearing. In the Wasatch Front region, only cities and counties are eligible to provide sponsorship. The decision to sponsor non-governmental applicants is up to the city or county that is submitting the application. Sponsoring entities are required to ensure all program requirements are met, ensure that the project is viable, and provide active oversight of the project and contract performance. Sponsors are required to ensure that the project is part of the Consolidated Plan and that a subcontractor's agreement is mutually agreed on and signed by both entities. All information needs to be attached to the Webgrants application.
8. Projects must be consistent with the region's Consolidated Plan and included in a city or county prioritized capital investment list or meet the overall goals identified in the Plan.
9. Emergency projects may be considered by the RRC at any time. An emergency project is one that eliminates or mitigates an imminent threat to health and safety. These projects must meet all CDBG requirements. Applicants must work closely with WFRC staff to ensure program compliance. Emergency projects will be reviewed by the RRC to ensure that a regional goal that has been identified in the Consolidated Plan will be met. Also, emergency projects must be approved by the statewide CDBG Policy Committee. Any funding awarded for emergency projects will be deducted from the subsequent year's annual regional allocation.
10. Applicants are required to attend the region's annual "How to Apply" workshop. The project manager should attend the workshop. If the project manager cannot attend, he or she needs to identify an alternate representative. If sponsorship is required, representatives from the sponsoring grantee and the sub-recipient must also attend.

In compliance with the policies of the State of Utah CDBG program, and to be eligible for funding, all grantees or sub grantees must have drawn down at least 50% of any prior year's CDBG funding before the RRC's rating and ranking meeting.

11. Public service providers are encouraged to apply for capital improvement projects and/or major equipment purchases. Examples include delivery trucks and other public service vehicles, fixtures, computer equipment, construction, remodeling, and facility expansion. State policy prohibits the use of CDBG funds for operating and maintenance expenses. This includes paying administrative costs or salaries and items that can be easily removed from the building such as office supplies, cleaning supplies, etc. No more than 15% of the state's yearly allocation of funds may be expended for public service projects.
12. In order to receive points for any of the evaluation criteria, applicants must state and/or include (as an attachment where required) the pertinent information in Webgrants. The RRC reserves the right to not consider incomplete applications for funding.

13. After fully funding all projects in ranked order, any remaining funds shall be awarded to the next ranked project if it is determined that partial funding is a reasonable option. If partial funding is not an option, then the next ranked project shall be reviewed and funded if possible and so on
14. The members of the Regional Review Committee are listed below along with their respective appointed terms. The RRC consists of six members, two from each of the three counties plus one staff member from WFRC. Each County Council of Governments appoints one elected official and one staff person to represent their county on the RRC. Each member is appointed to a two-year term with no limit upon succession.
15. Prior to RRC adoption, the policies, procedures, and prioritization criteria shall be publically noticed and be available for a 30 day public comment period and a public hearing.

CDBG Regional Review Committee Membership 2015 – 2017:

Jerry Houghton, County Recorder, Tooele County, May 2014 - Dec 2016 – Possible Renewal of Term

Bill Cobabe, Senior Planner, Morgan County, May 2014 - Dec 2016 – Possible Renewal of Term

Myron Bateman, Commissioner, Tooele County, Jan 2015 - Dec 2017

Logan Wilde, Policy Committee Rep., Council Member, Morgan County, Jan 2015 - Dec 2017

Sean Wilkinson, Planning Director, Weber County, May 2014 - Dec 2016 – Possible Renewal of Term

Mark Allen, Mayor Washington Terrace City, Weber County, Jan 2015 - Dec 2017

RATING AND RANKING CRITERIA

CRITERION	POINTS							SCORE ___/82	
Description	Select Up To	1	2	3	4	5	6	Applicant Score	Max Score
<p>1. Grantee Capacity to Carry out the Grant</p> <p>The grantee’s ability to successfully administer a CDBG grant. The HCD staff award points based on historical CDBG grant administration. First time applicants or applicants that have not applied in more than 5 years will receive 2 points.</p>	1	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent	-		5
<p>2. Housing Stock</p> <p>Projects in support of housing units constructed, or made accessible to LMI households as a direct result of the project. The project may include acquisition of property and/or construction of infrastructure in support of the proposed housing units. The score shall be doubled if the project is intended to serve those individuals coming out of homeless situations.</p>	1	2 units	3-4 units	5-6 units	7-8 units	9-10 units	>10 units		6/12
<p>3. Moderate Income Housing Plan</p> <p>The development, update, or implementation of a project in a jurisdiction’s Moderate Income Housing Plan as a direct result of the project.</p> <p>Plans that have a score of “acceptable” or “high” will receive additional points, designations for which are made by Utah State staff.</p> <p>Towns not required to comply will receive 1 point if the project benefits an affordable housing goal identified in the Consolidated Plan.</p>	2	Plan Dev., Update, Implemen tation	Accept.	High	-	-	-		3
Criteria 1 through 3 Subtotal								___/	20

<p>4a. Extent of Poverty – City or County Scoring</p> <p>The number of LMI persons or households that benefit as a direct result of a project. Cities and counties must identify the percentage of very low, low, and moderate income persons the project benefits. Criterion 5a is for the percent of VERY LOW INCOME (30% of area median income (AMI)) beneficiaries.</p>	1	0%	1-4%	5-9%	10-14%	15-19%	=>20%		6	
<p>4b. Extent of Poverty – City or County Scoring Continued</p> <p>The number of LMI persons or households that benefit as a direct result of a project. Cities and counties must identify the percentage of very low, low, and moderate income persons the project benefits. Criterion 5b is for the percent of LOW INCOME (50% of AMI) beneficiaries.</p>	1	1-9%	10-19%	20-29%	30-39%	=>40%	-		5	
<p>4c. Extent of Poverty – City or County Scoring Continued</p> <p>The number of LMI persons or households that benefit as a direct result of a project. Cities and counties must identify the percentage of very low, low, and moderate income persons the project benefits. Criterion 5c is for the percent of MODERATE INCOME (80% of AMI) beneficiaries.</p>	1	15-29%	30-44%	45-59%	=>60%	-	-		4	
<p>5. Extent of Poverty – Sub-Grantee Service Provider Scoring</p> <p>The number of LMI persons or households that benefit as a direct result of the project. Service providers must serve LMI persons.</p> <p>PRESUMED GROUPS: Service providers shall serve the following groups which are presumed to be 51% LMI: the elderly (62+), severely disabled adults, homeless, abused children, battered spouses, migrant farm workers, illiterate adults, and persons living w/AIDS.</p> <p>TARGETED GROUPS: The project targets LMI persons / households that are 100% LMI. Applicants for such projects must generally be income qualified.</p>	1	-	-	-	-	>51% LMI (presumed groups)	100% LMI (targeted groups)		6	
Criteria 4 through 5 Subtotal									____ /	21

<p>6. Financial Commitment</p> <p>The percent of non-CDBG funds the applicant commits toward the total project cost. Percentage is based on jurisdiction size.</p>	1	1	2	3	4	5	6		6
Jurisdiction Population is < 1,000		1-4%	5-8%	9-12%	13-16%	17-20%	>21%		
Jurisdiction Population is 1,001-5,000		5-9%	10-14%	15-19%	20-24%	25-29%	>30%		
Jurisdiction Population is 5,001-10,000		8-13%	14-19%	20-25%	26-31%	32-37%	>38%		
Jurisdiction Population is 10,001-15,000		11-17%	18-24%	25-31%	32-38%	39-45%	>46%		
Jurisdiction Population is >15,001 or Service Providers		14-21%	22-29%	30-37%	38-45%	46-53%	>54%		
<p>7. Project Maturity</p> <p>The project has a (1) dedicated and involved project manager who attended the how to apply workshop, (2) detailed and complete scope of work, (3) detailed cost estimate, map, and photos (if applicable), (4) exhibited that the project can be completed in 18 months, (5) architectural / engineering design has been completed.</p>	1	1 of 5	2 of 5	3 of 5	4 of 5	5 of 5	-		5
<p>8. Regional Planning</p> <p>Jurisdictions recognized as Quality Growth Communities (QGC) will receive 4 points. Jurisdictions can receive 1 point for each of the following planning principles they exhibit up to a maximum of 4. (1) coordinates planning and land use with other governments in accordance with the adopted 2040 Regional Vision, (2) develops efficient infrastructure including water and energy conservation, (3) incorporates fair housing opportunity and affordability into community planning, (4) plan to protect / conserve critical water, air, lands, historic sites, important agricultural lands, (5) removal of barriers such as ADA barriers to allow for accessibility of programs / facilities to all persons. It shall be the duty of the applicant to provide evidence in support of the above criteria.</p>	1	1 of 5	2 of 5	3 of 5	QGC or 4 of 5	-	-		4
Criteria 6 through 8 Subtotal _____ /									15

9. Local Planning The jurisdiction has identified the project as a high priority in their Capital Investment Plan (CIP).	1	Third priority	Second priority	First priority	-	-	-		3
10. Recently Received CDBG Funding The applicant (or sub-applicant when applicable) has not received CDBG funding in recent years (based on CDBG program's Fiscal Year).	1	FY 2015	FY 2014	FY 2013	FY 2012 and older	-	-		4
11. Regional Funding Priority The project meets one more of the following regional priorities identified in the region's Consolidated Plan.	1								2
Water/sewer system upgrades or other public infrastructure or other community facilities such as parks, publically owned or service provider owned emergency service equipment, public service vehicles, etc.		Yes	-	-	-	-	-		
Housing for LMI persons		-	Yes	-	-	-	-		
12. Community Wide Projects The project benefits all of the municipality's residents. Such projects include CITYWIDE parks, water systems, or public safety equipment. Applicants must still comply with the 51% LMI requirement.		-	-	-	-	Yes	-		5
13. Benefit /Cost Ratio The project benefits the most people with the least amount of investment. Points are determined by dividing the total CDBG dollar amount requested by the number of proposed beneficiaries.	1	\$951-1,200	\$701-950	\$451-700	\$201-450	\$1-200	-		5
14. Property Tax Rate Jurisdictions with a higher tax rate will receive additional points. Points awarded based on the jurisdiction's rate as a percent of the maximum rate allowed by law (compared to the tax ceiling set by State Tax Commission). The tax rate noted above shall include the levy for police, fire, sewer and water services that may be assessed by a multi-jurisdictional special service district. For non-taxing entities - the jurisdiction's tax rate applies where the majority of the beneficiaries reside.	1	10.1-20%	20.1-30%	30.1-40%	40.1-50%	>50%	-		5
Criteria 9 through 14 Subtotal									____ / 24

TOTAL POINTS ____ / 80