

**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 may require a visit with each applicant for an onsite 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 recommendations to the RRC (Steering Committee) for consideration and approval. Membership of the Steering Committee includes two elected officials (mayor and commissioner) and a school board representative from each of the five counties. Appointments to the Steering Committee are reviewed and presented annually in February for the two elected officials of each county as well as the county school boards.
5. Maximum amount per year to a jurisdiction is \$200,000.00.
6. Maximum years for a multi-year project is 2 years for a total amount of \$300,000 (year 1 @ \$200,000 and year 2 @ \$100,000).
7. All applications for multi-year funding must contain a complete budget and budget breakdown for each specific year of funding. Depending on available funding, all or part of the second year funding of a multi-year project may be made available in year one.
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 CDBG final 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.
9. Projects must be consistent with the District's Consolidated Plan. The project applied for must be included in the prioritized capital improvements list (CIP) that the entity submitted for inclusion in the Consolidated Plan. Your jurisdictions CIP is due no later than Monday,

January 9, 2017 at 5:00 p.m. If your CIP list containing your project is not submitted by the deadline, your project application will not be rated and ranked. You may not amend your list after the deadline.

10. Previously allocated pre-approved funding:
- \$ 90,000 to Five County AOG (Administration, Consolidated Plan Planning, Rating & Ranking, Planning Assistance, Affordable Housing Planning, and Economic Development TA)

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, may 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 guidelines prohibit the 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 prior to rating and ranking 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 funding of housing related projects shall be directed to the development of infrastructure supporting affordable housing or to the rehabilitation of rental housing managed by a public housing authority. CDBG funds in this region shall not be utilized for LMI rental or direct housing assistance payments.
17. It is the policy of the RRC (Steering Committee) that lots for single family homes may not be procured with CDBG funding in the Five County region, unless the homes remain available as rental units under the auspices of a public housing authority.
18. In the event of a tie for the last funding position, the following will be awarded one (1) point for each criteria item listed below answered affirmatively:
  - The project that has the Highest percentage of LMI;
  - The project that has the most Local funds leveraged;
  - The project with the most Other funds leveraged;
  - The largest Geographical area benefitted;
  - The project with the Largest number of LMI beneficiaries;

If a tie remains unbroken after the above mentioned tie breaker, the members of the RRC will vote and the project that receives the majority vote will be ranked higher.

19. After all projects have been fully funded in the order of their Rating and Ranking prioritization and a balance remains insufficient for the next project in priority to complete a project in the current year, the funds will be first applied to the highest scoring multi-year project. This will prepay the funding to that multi-year project that would have been allocated out of the upcoming program year's funding. If there are no multi-year projects the balance will be divided proportionately to the cost of each funded construction project, and those grantees will be directed to place that amount in their budget as "construction contingency". After completion of those projects, if the dollars are not needed as contingency, they are to be released back to the state to be reallocated in the statewide pool.

**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 2017 Regional Prioritization Criteria and Justification

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

#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 points	X 2.0 (weighting)	=	2.0 points

### Regional Prioritization

### Justification

**#1 Public Safety Activities**

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., PCIFB and entities are encouraged to leverage those with CDBG funds.

**#2 LMI Housing Activities**

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.

**#3 Community Facilities**

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.

**#4 Public Utility Infrastructure**

Projects designed to increase the capacity of water and other utility systems to better serve the customers and/or improve fire flow capacity. Adjusting water rates are a usual funding source. Other agencies also fund this category. Includes wastewater disposal projects.

**#5 Projects to remove architectural barriers**

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.

**#6 Parks and Recreation**

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 Finance Committee members, reviewed and obtained approval of this regional prioritization for the CDBG program for FY2017.

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
CDBG RATING AND RANKING PROGRAM YEAR 2017  
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 The Kem Gardner Policy Institute; 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. For the purposes of this criteria, a jurisdiction is defined as an incorporated city or town, a county, or a defined special service district service area. All public housing authorities shall be considered a 5B jurisdiction for this criteria.

6. **CDBG DOLLARS REQUESTED PER CAPITA:** Determined by dividing the dollar amount requested in the CDBG application by the beneficiary population.
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 applications, 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 Finance Committee members. The Finance 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:** The CDBG State Policy Committee adopted the following rating and ranking criteria to be used by each regional rating and ranking system: *"Applications received from cities and counties which have complied with Utah code regarding the preparation and adoption of an affordable housing plan, and who are applying for a project that is intended to address element(s) 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 that their project complies with this criteria. Towns applying for credit under this criteria may either meet a goal in it’s 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. **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.
14. **PERCENTAGE OF APPLICANT'S JURISDICTION WHO ARE LOW TO MODERATE INCOME:** The figures will be provided from the results of a Housing and Community Development Division (HCDD) approved income survey conducted by the applicant of the project benefit area households.
15. **EXTENT OF POVERTY:** Based on information provided by applicant prior to rating and ranking that satisfactorily documents the percentage of Low Income (LI: 50% of AMI) and Very Low Income (VLI: 30% of AMI) persons directly benefitting from a project. Income survey tabulations for 50% and 30% will also be utilized to determine the number of low income and very low income persons.
16. **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.
17. **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 proactive land use planning in the community;
- \*\* Development of efficient infrastructure including water and energy conservation;
- \*\* Incorporation of housing opportunity and affordability into community planning; and
- \*\* Protection and conservation plan for water, air, critical lands, important agricultural lands and historic resources.

Worksheet #17 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.

18. **Application Quality:** Quality of the Pre-Application is evaluated in terms of project identification, justification, and well-defined scope of work likely to address identified problems.
19. **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 qualified project manager; 2) has selected an engineer and/or architect; 3) proposed solution to problem is identified in the Scope of Work and ready to proceed immediately; 4) has completed architectural/engineering design (blueprints); 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.

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**  
**FY 2017 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 applications received for funding during FY 2017. 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.		0% CDBG 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 permanent 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?	%	4.1% or greater above state average <b>3.0 points</b>	3.1% - 4.0% above state average <b>2.5 points</b>	2.1% - 3.0% above state average <b>2.0 points</b>	1.1% - 2.0% above state average <b>1.5 points</b>	.1% - 1.0% above state average <b>1.0 point</b>	Up to state average  <b>0 points</b>	1.5	
5 A	<b>Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (<u>Jurisdiction Population &lt;500</u>)</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) - (<u>Jurisdiction Population 501 - 1,000</u>)</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	

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
5 C	<b>Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (<u>Jurisdiction Population 1,001 - 5,000</u>)</b> Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in total project cost.	%	> 30% <b>5 points</b>	25.1 - 30% <b>4 points</b>	20.1 - 25% <b>3 points</b>	15.1 - 20% <b>2 points</b>	1 - 15% <b>1 point</b>		<b>2.0</b>	
5 D	<b>Financial Commitment to Community Development (Self-help Financing) - (<u>Jurisdiction Population &gt;5,000</u>)</b> Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in total project cost.	%	> 40% <b>5 points</b>	35.1 - 40% <b>4 points</b>	30.1 - 35% <b>3 points</b>	25.1 - 30% <b>2 points</b>	1 - 25% <b>1 point</b>		<b>2.0</b>	
6	<b>CDBG funds Requested Per Capita:</b> CDBG funds requested divided by # of beneficiaries.		\$1 - 100 <b>5 points</b>	\$101-200 <b>4 points</b>	\$201- 400 <b>3 points</b>	\$401 - 800 <b>2 points</b>	\$801 or > <b>1 point</b>		<b>1.0</b>	
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 <b>6 points</b>	High # 2 <b>5 points</b>	High # 3 <b>4 points</b>	High # 4 <b>3 points</b>	High # 5 <b>2 points</b>	High # >5 <b>1 point</b>	<b>2.0</b>	
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 Finance Committee.)		# 1 <b>6 points</b>	# 2 <b>5 points</b>	# 3 <b>4 points</b>	# 4 <b>3 points</b>	# 5 <b>2 points</b>	#6 or > <b>1 point</b>	<b>2.0</b>	
9	<b>Regional Project Priority:</b> Determined by the Executive Director with consultation of the AOG Finance Committee members. The Finance Committee is comprised of one (1) County Commissioner from each of the five counties.		# 1 Public Safety Activities <b>6 points</b>	# 2 LMI Housing Activities <b>5 points</b>	# 3 Community Facilities <b>4 points</b>	# 4 Public Utility Infrastructure <b>3 points</b>	# 5 Remove Architectural Barriers (ADA) <b>2 points</b>	#6 or > Parks and Recreation <b>1 point</b>	<b>2.0</b>	
10	<b>LMI Housing Stock:</b> Infrastructure for the units, rehabilitation of units, and/or accessibility of units for LMI residents.		> 20 Units <b>8.5 points</b>	15 - 20 Units <b>7 points</b>	10 - 14 Units <b>5.5 points</b>	5-9 Units <b>4 points</b>	3-4 Units <b>2.5 points</b>	1-2 Units <b>1 point</b>	<b>1.0</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
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 either meet a goal in their adopted Affordable Housing Plan or the project meets a regional affordable housing goal in the Consolidated Plan.		YES  <b>3 points</b>	No  <b>0 points</b>						<b>1.0</b>	
12	<b>Project's Geographical Impact:</b> Area benefitting from project.		Regional <b>3.5 points</b>	Multi-county <b>3.0 points</b>	County-wide <b>2.5 points</b>	Multi-community <b>2.0 points</b>	Community <b>1.5 points</b>	Portion of Community <b>1 point</b>		<b>1.5</b>	
13	<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).	%	> 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>	10.1 - 20% <b>1 point</b>	< 10% <b>0 points</b>		<b>1.0</b>	
14	<b>Jurisdiction's LMI Population:</b> Percent of residents considered 80 percent or less LMI (based on LMI 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>			<b>1.0</b>	
15	<b>Extent of Poverty:</b> If an applicant satisfactorily documents the percentage of Low Income (LI: 50% of AMI) and Very Low Income (VLI: 30% of AMI) 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>			<b>1.0</b>	
16	<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>4 points</b>	51% <b>2 points</b>						<b>1.0</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
17	<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 #17.		Very High <b>4 points</b>	High <b>3 points</b>	Fair <b>2 points</b>	Low <b>1 point</b>			<b>0.5</b>	
18	<b>Application Quality:</b> Application identifies problem, contains a well-defined scope of work and is cost-effective. Score comes from Worksheet #18.		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>	<b>1.5</b>	
19	<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 #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>	<b>2.0</b>	

**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: \$90,000 to Five County AOG for Administration, Consolidated Plan, Rating & Ranking, RLF Program Delivery, Economic Development Technical Assistance and Affordable Housing Plan Development and Updates

**CRITERIA 1 WORKSHEET**

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

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	<b>Score (10 Points Total)</b>
----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--------------------------------

Excellent ⇐ \_\_\_\_\_ **(Circle One)** \_\_\_\_\_ ⇒ Poor

**Person Providing Evaluation: (Circle) Cheryl Brown**

<p>Excellent = 9 to 10                  Very Good = 7 to 8                  Good = 5 to 6                  Fair = 3 to 4                  Poor = 1 to 2</p>	<p><b>Total Points:                  Rating:                  (Excellent, Very                  Good, Good, Fair,                  Poor)</b></p>
---	--

## CRITERIA 17 WORKSHEET

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