

CDBG Funding Application Scoresheet

Citizen's Advisory Committee
Cities of Lewiston-Auburn

For applications submitted for the
Fiscal Year of July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020

A. General Instructions

- 1) Applications are compared according to a common set of criteria. For each criterion there is a special narrative within the application that provides the essential information to evaluate the proposal.

Criteria: The program...	Possible Points	Response
... Supports the <i>Consolidated Plan</i> and its goals	0 - 35	A
... Meets a critical or unmet need	0 - 35	B
... Is within the applicant's capacity to carry out	0 - 20	C
... Is cost-effective	0 - 10	D
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	0 - 100	

2. In evaluating the applications, first go through the applications one by one, and score them using the guidelines below. When you are all done, look at the scores for each factor individually. Did you use consistent principles from the first application to the last? Do the relative differences in scores fairly reflect the differences in application quality? Adjust the scores, as needed, until you are comfortable that they accurately reflect actual differences among applications.
3. At the end of the process, you will have a series of applications in a rank order. The City then has several options for making final funding decisions:
 - a. It can set a target amount for public services funding, then start at the top of the list, and allocate each applicant with the full funding they request, until the money is gone.
 - b. It can use the same process as above, except only allocate each applicant with an amount that seems reasonable and defensible (which may be less than is actually applied for), so that more agencies can be funded.
 - c. It can create a cut-off point on the list based on quality and points, and allocate public service funding to all above the cut-off point (so long as the total allocation is within HUD guidelines).

The City's Economic & Community Development Director will decide which of these approaches will be used.

B. Individual factors

FACTOR	Supports the <i>Consolidated Plan</i> and its goals
	Response A
WHAT TO LOOK FOR	Does the applicant cite specific parts of the Plan, or just talk in generalities? Does the activity contribute to more than one goal of the Plan? Does the activity have a high impact on achieving the goal(s), or just an incidental impact? Has the applicant made any adjustments to its “standard” program in order to have a larger impact on community goals?
SCORE LEVELS	30 to 35 – High impact on multiple community goals 24 to 29 – High impact on one community goal 18 to 23 – Moderate impact on multiple community goals 12 to 17 – Moderate impact on one community goal 6 to 11 – Low impact on multiple community goals 0 to 5 – Low impact on one community goal
RECOMMENDED SCORE	
RATIONALE/COMMENT	

FACTOR	Meets a critical or unmet need
	Response B
WHAT TO LOOK FOR	Is the need demonstrated by 3 rd party studies (United Way, state, etc.)? Is the need demonstrated by internal data (waiting lists, surveys, etc.)? Does the proposed program effectively address the need? Is the effectiveness of the activity documented in any way? What if the program didn’t exist? What difference would it make?
SCORE LEVELS	30 to 35 – High unmet need, effective solution 24 to 29 – High impact on one community goal 18 to 23 – Moderate impact on multiple community goals 12 to 17 – Moderate impact on one community goal 6 to 11 – Low impact on multiple community goals 0 to 5 – Low impact on one community goal
RECOMMENDED SCORE	
RATIONALE/COMMENT	

FACTOR	Is within applicant's capacity to carry out
	Response C
WHAT TO LOOK FOR	<p>What is the track record of this organization with the CDBG program? Is it consistently on schedule with spending and reports?</p> <p>Are there external organizations that vouch for this agency's capacity – i.e., awards, recognition, letters, grant success, etc.? If a new agency, is the program/business plan innovative, forward thinking and realistic?</p> <p>Is the staff qualified and capable to carry out the program?</p> <p>Are the record-keeping systems accurate for financial and performance reporting?</p>
SCORE LEVELS	<p>15 to 20 – Exceptional high-performing agency</p> <p>10 to 14 – Good-performing agency</p> <p>5 to 9 – Adequate performing agency</p> <p>0 to 4 – Unproven, evidence for capability not convincing</p>
RECOMMENDED SCORE	
RATIONALE/COMMENT	

FACTOR	Is cost-effective
	Response D
WHAT TO LOOK FOR	<p>Does the agency show creativity in stretching dollars, go the extra mile?</p> <p>Would the proposed CDBG funds leverage other money?</p> <p>Is the agency administratively efficient, with a reasonable overhead rate?</p> <p>Does the agency collaborate with others to reduce rent, administrative costs?</p> <p>Are volunteers used creatively to stretch impacts?</p>
SCORE LEVELS	<p>8 to 10 – Shows creativity, energy, forward-thinking, in stretching the service impacts of their dollars</p> <p>4 to 7 – Shows adequate effort, has some good ideas.</p> <p>0 to 3 – Unexceptional. Makes no special effort in this area.</p>
RECOMMENDED SCORE	
RATIONALE/COMMENT	