



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: October 21, 2015

TO: Honorable Chair Marti Emerald and Members of the Public Safety and Livable Neighborhoods Committee

FROM: Erik Caldwell, Director, Economic Development Department
via David Graham, Deputy Chief Operating Officer, Neighborhood Services Branch

SUBJECT: Update to the FY 2017 CDBG Application Scoring Criteria

Historically, the HUD Programs Administration Section of the Economic Development Department has provided the Public Safety and Livable Neighborhoods Committee with an annual update regarding the City's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Application Review and Scoring Criteria (Scoring Criteria), as established by the Consolidated Plan Advisory Board (CPAB). This memorandum serves as the Scoring Criteria update for the upcoming Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 CDBG application process.

Starting in FY 2012, the CPAB assumed responsibility to review and score applications for the CDBG program. In 2011, the Public Safety and Neighborhood Services (PS & NS) Committee approved the initial set of Scoring Criteria to guide CPAB's review of applications. The Scoring Criteria was revised previously in 2013 and 2014.

The proposed revisions to the Scoring Criteria for the FY 2017 application process are based on the inclusion of Geographic Targeting, previously not defined, and a series of refinements intended to simplify the questions asked of the applicants.

Staff presented a Summary of Findings for the Geographic Targeting initiative at the July 29, 2015 Public Safety and Livable Neighborhoods meeting and indicated more information would be provided related to how this initiative would be utilized within the Scoring Criteria. Additionally, staff presented Geographic Targeting to each of the six Community Planning Areas identified in the Summary of Findings and the Community Planners Committee, to receive additional feedback.

October 21, 2015

In May 2015, the CPAB created an Ad Hoc Committee to review the Scoring Criteria in response to feedback from applicant agencies and CPAB reviewers during the FY 2016 application process. The Ad Hoc Committee included the following CPAB members: Ms. Vicki Granowitz (Chair), Mr. Kenneth Marlborough (Vice-Chair), Ms. Valerie Brown, and Mr. Rich Thesing. The Ad Hoc Committee met five times and their recommendations were presented to the full CPAB at the August 12, 2015 and October 14, 2015 meetings.

The proposed Scoring Criteria retained the six categories previously used, with the following point totals:

1. Project Characteristics (30)
2. Organizational Capacity (15)
3. Budget (20)
4. Project Benefits (13)
5. Project Specifics (22)
6. Performance Indicators (up to -3) – *Applied in FY 2018 only*

Highlights of the changes to the Scoring Criteria and recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee include:

- Three versions based on eligible CDBG categories: (1) Public Service, (2) Community and Economic Development, and (3) Nonprofit Capital Improvement & Housing Rehabilitation
- Up to three sub factors will be confirmed and scored by HUD Programs staff:
 - Section 3. Budget; d. secured funding calculation
 - Section 5. Project Specifics; a. Contract Readiness; ii. Confirmation of Environmental Review (for *Nonprofit Capital Improvement & Housing Rehabilitation only*)
 - Section 5. Project Specifics; b. Project Scope & Schedule; i. Verification of Scope of Work for CDBG eligibility
- Under Section 4. Project Benefits; c. Geographic Targeting: Describe efforts and strategies for targeted outreach to the six Community Planning Areas identified as high need: Barrio Logan, City Heights, Encanto, Linda Vista, San Ysidro, and Southeastern.
- No points awarded for incomplete sections or responses that do not adhere to submittal requirements.
- A summary of past performance (2 years) for former CDBG recipients will be posted on the City's website and provided to CPAB reviewers to use while reviewing Section 2 – Organizational Capacity) in lieu of Performance Indicators (to be used in FY 2018)

The proposed Scoring Criteria will be applied to FY 2017 applications received for Public Services, Community and Economic Development and Non Profit Capital Improvement Projects and Housing Rehabilitation projects and programs (see Attachments 1-3). The Request For

Page 3 of 3

Honorable Chair Marti Emerald and Members of the Public Safety and Livable Neighborhoods Committee
October 21, 2015

Proposals (RFP) will be based on the revised Scoring Criteria and is anticipated to be released in January 2016.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact Sima Thakkar, 619-236-5902 or sthakkar@sandiego.gov.



Erik Caldwell
Economic Development Department Director

ST/mrm

- Attachments:
1. FY 2017 CDBG Scoring Criteria - Public Service
 2. FY 2017 CDBG Scoring Criteria – Community and Economic Development
 3. FY 2017 CDBG Scoring Criteria - Nonprofit CIP and Housing Rehabilitation

cc: Scott Chadwick, Chief Operating Officer
Stacey LoMedico, Assistant Chief Operating Officer
Trisha Tacke, Research Analyst, Independent Budget Analyst
Marisa Berumen, Council Committee Consultant
Vicki Granowitz, Chair, Consolidated Plan Advisory Board
Sima Thakkar, HUD Program Manager, Economic Development

Attachment #1

FY 2017 Scoring Criteria – Public Services

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: PUBLIC SERVICES



Applicant Agency: _____

Project Name: _____

Overall Score:

Reviewer's Name: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____

Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
1. Project Characteristics	a. Applicant provides a clear project summary which includes: i. Brief description of the project including resulting activities and/or services to be provided;		5
	ii. Characteristics of Population(s) to be served; and		5
	iii. The critical need(s) that will be addressed including how other resources are not available to meet the need(s).		5
	b. Applicant clearly explains how the proposed project will result in the provision of a new service or the expansion of an existing service .		5
	c. Applicant clearly identifies the goal(s) of the project and describes how these goals will be met.		5
	d. Applicant clearly identifies the results of the project: i. Number of unduplicated City of San Diego individuals or households to be assisted.		5
	Comments:		
	Total:		Points Possible
			30

Reviewer Initials: _____

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: PUBLIC SERVICES



Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
2. Organizational Capacity	a. Applicant clearly describes their experience in successfully implementing projects of similar scope and of comparable complexity.		5
	b. Applicant has experience in providing services to low and moderate income residents or presumed low and moderate income CDBG beneficiaries such as seniors, illiterate adults, homeless persons, abused children and/or battered spouses.		5
	c. Describe efforts to collaborate with other service agencies including organizations that provide similar services and resources.		5
	Comments:	Total:	Points Possible
			15
3. Budget	a. Applicant identifies alternative future sources of funding to support the proposed project and demonstrates that the project will not rely on CDBG funds for program sustainability.		5
	b. Budget for project clearly identifies all sources of funding for the total project costs.		5
	c. Budget clearly details uses of funds (City of SD CDBG funds and non-City of SD CDBG funds) by eligible budget line items.		5
	d. Budget clearly lists all other funding sources secured for project, submits documentation for each source listed, and percent of funds leveraged (calculated by: other secured funding/total project costs) is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 0%-5% (0 points) ▪ 6%-20% (1 points) ▪ 21%-40% (2 points) ▪ 41%-60% (3 points) ▪ 61%-80% (4 points) ▪ 81%-100% (5 points) 	<i>(HPA confirmed: % & points)</i>	5
	Comments:	Total:	Points Possible
			20

Reviewer Initials: _____

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: PUBLIC SERVICES



Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
4. Project Benefits	<p>Public Services</p> <p><i>(Applicant should answer a. and b.)</i></p> <p>a. Applicant clearly describes how the project will provide services to high need populations and provides the references used for this determination. Public Service projects must be considered a Low and Moderate income Limited Clientele Activity (LMC) by serving one of the following populations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Presumed low income clientele as defined by HUD*; or ii. Direct Benefit to Low Income Persons based on compliance with HUD* income limits through documented family size and income. 		12
	<p>b. Geographic Targeting: Describe efforts and strategies to target within one or more of the six Community Planning areas identified as high need: Barrio Logan, San Ysidro, Linda Vista, Encanto, Southeastern, City Heights.*</p> <p><i>*Please see the Applicant Handbook for further definitions.</i></p>		1
	<p>Comments:</p>		
		Total:	Points Possible
			13

Reviewer Initials: _____

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: PUBLIC SERVICES



Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
5. Project Specifics	a. Applicant provides a listing of the services to be provided and a clear description of each of these services which includes, as applicable, the following details: i. The quantity and duration of each of these services;		2
	ii. The method of delivery;		2
	iii. Details regarding whether each of these services will be provided on an individual basis and/or group settings; and		2
	iv. Explain and justify the total amount of CDBG funds requested in relation to the services provided and any fees charged.		4
	b. Project Scope & Schedule i. The Scope of Work and Budget demonstrates compliance with CDBG eligibility, National Objective and other HUD and City requirements; and	(HPA confirmed points: __)	2
	ii. Applicant has clearly described how the project will be completed within the required 12-month timeline.		10
	Comments:		
		Total:	Points Possible
			22

Reviewer Initials: _____

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: PUBLIC SERVICES



Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
6. Performance Indicators	<p>City of San Diego Track Record: Rating based on past performance of applicant agency on projects previously funded by the City of San Diego under the CDBG program*. <i>These are subtractive points from maximum 100 point score, determined by performance levels:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor deficiencies (-1) • Moderate deficiencies (-2) • Significant deficiencies (-3) <p>Performance Indicator data collected from FY 2015 forward for use in FY 18 Evaluations</p>		-3

Reviewer Initials: _____

Attachment #2

FY 2017 Scoring Criteria – Community and Economic Development

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT



Applicant Agency: _____

Project Name: _____

Overall Score:

Reviewer's Name: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____

Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
1. Project Characteristics	a. Applicant provides a clear project summary which includes: i. Brief description of the project including resulting activities and/or services to be provided;		5
	ii. Characteristics of Population(s) to be served; and		5
	iii. The critical need(s) that will be addressed including how other resources are not available to meet the need(s).		5
	b. Applicant clearly explains how the proposed project will result in the provision of a <u>new program</u> or the expansion/improvement of an <u>existing program</u> .		5
	c. Applicant clearly identifies the goal(s) of the project and describes how these goals will be met.		5
	d. Applicant clearly identifies the results of the project: i. Number of unduplicated City of San Diego individuals or households to be assisted; or ii. Number of unduplicated City of San Diego businesses to be assisted.		5
	Comments:		
	Total:		Points Possible
			30

Reviewer Initials: _____

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT



Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
2. Organizational Capacity	a. Applicant clearly describes their experience in successfully implementing projects of similar scope and of comparable complexity.		5
	b. Applicant has experience in providing services to low and moderate income residents or presumed low and moderate income CDBG beneficiaries such as seniors, illiterate adults, homeless persons, abused children and/or battered spouses.		5
	c. Describe efforts to collaborate with other service agencies, including organizations that provide similar services and resources.		5
	Comments:	Total:	Points Possible
			15
3. Budget	a. Applicant identifies alternative future sources of funding to support the proposed project and demonstrates that the project will not rely on CDBG funds for program sustainability.		5
	b. Budget for project clearly identifies all sources of funding for the total project costs.		5
	c. Budget clearly details uses of funds (City of SD CDBG funds and non-City of SD CDBG funds) by eligible budget line items.		5
	d. Budget clearly lists all other funding sources secured for project, submits documentation for each source listed, and percent of funds leveraged (calculated by: other secured funding/total project costs) is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 0-5% (0 points) ▪ 6%-20% (1 points) ▪ 21%-40% (2 points) ▪ 41%-60% (3 points) ▪ 61%-80% (4 points) ▪ 81%-100% (5 points) 	<i>(HPA confirmed: % & points)</i>	5
	Comments:	Total:	Points Possible
			20

Reviewer Initials: _____

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT



Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
4. Project Benefits	<p>Community & Economic Development</p> <p><i>(Applicant should either answer <u>a. and c.</u> or <u>b. and c.</u>)</i></p> <p>a. Applicant clearly describes how the project will provide services to high need populations and provides the sources used for this determination. CED projects must be considered a Low and Moderate Income limited Clientele Activity (LMC) by serving one of the following populations:</p> <p>i. Presumed Low Income Clientele as defined by HUD* or</p> <p>ii. Direct Benefit to Low Income Persons based on compliance with HUD* income limits through documented family size and income.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>b. Low to Moderate Income Housing (LMH): Units occupied by Low and Moderate Income persons.</p>		12
	<p>c. Geographic Targeting: Describe efforts and strategies to target within one or more of the six Community Planning areas identified as high need: Barrio Logan, San Ysidro, Linda Vista, Encanto, Southeastern, City Heights*.</p> <p><i>*Please see the Applicant Handbook for further definitions.</i></p>		1
	<p>Comments:</p>		
		Total:	Points Possible
			13

Reviewer Initials: _____

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT



Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score	
5. Project Specifics	a. Applicant provides a listing of the services to be provided and a clear description of each of these services which includes, as applicable, the following details:		2	
	i. The quantity and duration;		2	
	ii. The method of delivery;		2	
	iii. Details regarding whether each of these services will be provided on an individual basis and/or group settings ; and		2	
	iv. Explain and justify the total amount of CDBG funds requested in relation to the services provided and any fees charged.		4	
	b. Project Scope & Schedule		<i>(HPA confirmed points: __)</i>	2
	i. The Scope of Work and Budget demonstrates compliance with CDBG eligibility, National Objectives and other HUD and City requirements; and			
ii. Applicant has clearly described how the project will be completed within the required 12-month timeline, including project close out and final reporting.			10	
Comments:				
		Total:	Points Possible	
			22	

Reviewer Initials: _____

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT



Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
6. Performance Indicators	<p>City of San Diego Track Record: Rating based on past performance of applicant agency on projects previously funded by the City of San Diego under the CDBG programs -<i>These are subtractive points from maximum 100 point score, designed by documented performance level:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor deficiencies (-1) • Moderate deficiencies (-2) • Significant deficiencies (-3) <p>Performance Indicator data collected from FY 2015 forward for use in FY 18</p>		-3

Reviewer Initials: _____

Attachment #3

FY 2017 Scoring Criteria – Nonprofit CIP and Housing Rehabilitation

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: NONPROFIT CIP & HOUSING REHABILITATION



Applicant Agency: _____

Project Name: _____

Overall Score:

Reviewer's Name: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____

Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
1. Project Characteristics	a. Applicant provides a clear project summary which includes: i. Brief description of the project including resulting activities and/or services to be provided;		5
	ii. Characteristics of Population(s) to be served; and		5
	iii. The critical need(s) that will be addressed including how other resources are not available to meet the need(s).		5
	b. Applicant clearly explains how the proposed project will result in a new facility, expansion of an existing facility, or improvements to an existing facility or housing: i. Number and type of major improvements to facility; or ii. Housing stabilization improvements.		5
	c. Applicant clearly identifies the goal(s) of the project and describes how these goals will be met.		5
	d. Applicant clearly identifies the results of the project: i. Number of unduplicated City of San Diego individuals or households to be assisted; or ii. Number of unduplicated City of San Diego businesses to be assisted.		5
	Comments:		
	Total:		Points Possible
			30

Reviewer Initials: _____

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: NONPROFIT CIP & HOUSING REHABILITATION



Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
2. Organizational Capacity	a. Applicant clearly describes their experience in successfully implementing projects of similar scope and of comparable complexity.		5
	b. Applicant has experience in providing services to low and moderate income residents or presumed low and moderate income CDBG beneficiaries such as seniors, illiterate adults, homeless persons, abused children and/or battered spouses.		5
	c. Describes efforts to collaborate with other service agencies including organizations that provided similar services and resources.		5
	Comments:	Total:	Points Possible
			15
3. Budget	a. Applicant identifies alternative future sources of funding to support the proposed project and demonstrates that the project will not rely on CDBG funds for maintenance of improvements.		5
	b. Budget for project clearly identifies all sources of funding for the total project costs.		5
	c. Budget clearly details uses of funds (City of SD CDBG funds and non-City of SD CDBG funds) by eligible budget line items.		5
	d. Budget clearly lists all other funding sources secured for project, submits documentation for each source listed, and percent of funds leveraged (calculated by: other secured funding/total project costs) is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 0%-5% (0 points) ▪ 6%-20% (1 points) ▪ 21%-40% (2 points) ▪ 41%-60% (3 points) ▪ 61%-80% (4 points) ▪ 81%-100% (5 points) 	<i>(HPA confirmed: % & points)</i>	5
	Comments:	Total:	Points Possible
			20

Reviewer Initials: _____

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: NONPROFIT CIP & HOUSING REHABILITATION



Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
4. Project Benefits	<p>Non-profit Capital Improvement Projects, including Housing Activities</p> <p><i>(Applicant should either answer a. <u>and d.</u>, b. <u>and d.</u>, or c. <u>and d.</u>)</i></p> <p>a. Applicant clearly describes how the project will provide services to high need populations and provides the references used for this determination. Public Projects must be considered a Low and Moderate Income Limited Clientele Activity (LMC) by serving one of the following populations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Presumed Benefit low income clientele as defined by HUD*; or ii. Direct Benefit to Low Income Persons based on compliance with HUD* income limits through documented family size and income. <p>OR</p> <p>b. Low and Moderate Income Housing (LMH): Units occupied by low and moderate income persons.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>c. Low and Moderate Income Area Benefit (LMA): Facility or improvements will provide activities that are available to benefit all the resident of an area which is primarily residential and that has a service area that qualifies with a majority of HUD eligible census block groups*.</p>		12
	<p>d. Geographic Targeting: Describe any efforts or strategies for targeted outreach to the six Community Planning areas identified as high need: Barrio Logan, San Ysidro, Linda Vista, Encanto, Southeastern, City Heights*.</p> <p><i>*Please see the Applicant Handbook for further definitions.</i></p>		1
	<p>Comments:</p>		<p align="right">Total:</p> <p align="right">Points Possible</p> <p align="right">13</p>

Reviewer Initials: _____

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: NONPROFIT CIP & HOUSING REHABILITATION



Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
5. Project Specifics	a. Applicant clearly describes Contract Execution Readiness: Extent to which a project is ready to proceed by detailing that:		
	i. Total amount of CDBG funds requested is justified by accurate cost estimations; <i>-If the facility has received CDBG funds for improvements/expansions in the past, applicant must explain the outcome and justification for the request of additional CDBG funds.</i>		6
	ii. The level of Environmental Review (City, State and Federal) needed has been identified and planned for, as demonstrated by HUD Programs staff verification; and	<i>(HPA confirmed score: __)</i>	2
	iii. Clearly describe all applicable permits have been identified, planned for, and/or secured. If permits not needed, applicant clearly describes basis of that determination.		2
	b. Project Scope & Schedule		
	i. The CDBG eligible Scope of Work and Budget demonstrates compliance with meeting National Objectives and other HUD requirements, as demonstrated by HUD Programs staff verification;	<i>(HPA confirmed score: __)</i>	2
ii. Applicant has clearly described how the project will be completed and funds expended within the required 18-month timeline (12) specifying key milestones: 1) Project will be released for bid 2) Construction contract awarded 3) Anticipated Construction Timeline 4) 100% expenditure level 5) Project completion, beneficiaries reported (National Objective met), and close out report approved by HUD Programs staff		10	
Comments:			
		Total:	Points Possible
			22

Reviewer Initials: _____

CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD FISCAL YEAR 2017 CDBG APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM
Category: NONPROFIT CIP & HOUSING REHABILITATION



Category	Criteria	Reviewer Score	Maximum Score
6. Performance Indicators	<p>City of San Diego Track Record: Rating based on past performance of applicant agency on projects previously funded by the City of San Diego under the CDBG programs*. <i>These are subtractive points from maximum 100 point score, designed by documented performance levels:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor deficiencies (-1) • Moderate deficiencies (-2) • Significant deficiencies (-3) <p>Performance Indicator data collected from FY 2015 forward for use in FY 18</p>		-3

Reviewer Initials: _____