

CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION OFFICE

Economic Development Department

Community Development Block Grant Program
Applications
REVIEW PANEL HANDBOOK

A Guide for the Consolidated Plan Advisory Board
FY 2016 Applications Review Process
Contact: CDBG@sandiego.gov

City of San Diego - HUD Programs Administration Office

The City of San Diego HUD Programs Administration Office, housed within the Economic Development Department, oversees federally funded entitlement grant programs including the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), the Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG), the HOME Investment Partnerships Program, and the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program.

The Community Development Block Grant Program

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provides funds to local jurisdictions on an annual basis through the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) for local community development, housing activities, and public services. The primary objective of the CDBG Program is the development of viable communities through the provision of decent housing, a suitable living environment, and expanded economic opportunities. In accordance with CDBG standards, these resources are intended to primarily benefit low and moderate income persons and neighborhoods as defined by HUD.

City of San Diego - Consolidated Plan Advisory Board

The Consolidated Plan Advisory Board (CPAB) was established by the City Council via Ordinance No. O-19963 (Sections 26.2101–26.2113 of the Municipal Code) to provide advice and recommendations on certain policy issues related to the City of San Diego HUD grant entitlements inclusive of the CDBG program. Specifically, per §26.2113, the CPAB is charged with performing an open and impartial evaluation of the applications for CDBG funds and provide funding recommendations to the City Council.

Purpose

This *CPAB Panel Handbook* outlines the process and procedures to be followed by the members of the Consolidated Plan Advisory Board (CPAB) in scoring the applications submitted to the City of San Diego for CDBG funding available for projects and programs commencing on July 1, 2016.

For more information please contact the City of San Diego HUD Programs Office at:

City of San Diego – HUD Programs Administration
Economic Development Department
1200 Third Avenue
Suite 1400, MS 56D
San Diego, CA 92101
CDBG@sandiego.gov

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 4

II. Review Panel: Responsibilities and Conduct 4

III. City Staff: Responsibilities..... 5

IV. Schedule..... 6

V. CPAB Conflict of Interest Guidelines 7

VI. Confidentiality..... 8

VII. Review Package 9

VIII. Reviewing & Scoring Applications 11

 1. Preparation: Prior and During the Review..... 11

 2. Reading and Analyzing Applications..... 12

 3. Ad Hoc Committee Meetings 13

 4. Scoring Applications 13

 5. Finalized Scores 14

IX. Reviewers Oral and Written Comments 14

X. CPAB Ratification of Scores 15

XI. Next steps 16

APPENDIX A: Confidentiality Agreement – CPAB Members 17

APPENDIX B: Conflict of Interest Statement..... 19

APPENDIX C: City Council Policy 700-02 20

APPENDIX D: FY 2015 – FY 2019 Consolidated Plan Goals..... 23

APPENDIX E: FY 2016 CDBG Applications Review Criteria 24

I. INTRODUCTION

The *City of San Diego CDBG Panel Handbook* (Handbook) outlines the process the Consolidated Plan Advisory Board (CPAB) will follow in reviewing applications submitted for the FY 2016 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding cycle. The Handbook identifies the roles and responsibilities of the CPAB members as reviewers as well as the procedures they will follow in conducting their review.

The Handbook also provides guidance in regard to the required forms and discusses conflict-of-interest guidelines panel members must take into consideration. Finally, the Handbook identifies the roles and responsibilities of City of San Diego HUD Programs Administration Office staff (*City staff*) and outlines the procedures City staff will follow in order to support the review panel in carrying out its obligations and to ensure a fair and transparent process.

The review of CDBG applications is a vital step in the CDBG funds allocation process. The process is intended to yield an objective evaluation of grant applications through a competitive process which results in funding and subsequently delivering the best projects and programs to City residents.

Reviewers are required to: (1) report any possible conflict of interest; (2) consider only specified evaluation criteria in scoring the applications; (3) maintain confidentiality before, during, and after the review period; and, (4) return all applications and review forms to the City staff at the close of the review. The City of San Diego has developed this Handbook to outline the review process and identify the duties and responsibilities of the review panel members.

II. REVIEW PANEL: RESPONSIBILITIES AND CONDUCT

The review panel members, charged with the responsibility of conducting an independent and objective review of the CDBG applications in accordance with all applicable standards, must be able to fulfill the following responsibilities:

1. Read and become familiar with supplementary review materials provided (inclusive of this Handbook) prior to the commencement of their review;
2. Attend and participate fully in the Ad Hoc Committee meetings;
3. Recuse themselves from the review of applications where an actual or apparent conflict of interest may be present;
4. Consider, review and score each application in relation to the Review and Scoring Criteria approved by the CPAB on September 10, 2014 and presented to the City Council Public Safety and Livable Services Committee on October 29, 2014 (see Appendix A);
5. Refer all applicants' contact to the HUD Programs Office staff;

6. Abide by the review schedule (shown below); and,
7. Complete their review on or before the March 2, 2015 deadline and return all materials to the HUD Programs Administration Office upon completion of the review.

Reviewers must be able to dedicate a significant amount of time to this process within a very limited timeframe. If they find they are unable to fulfill their obligations, they are asked to contact City of San Diego HUD Programs Administration Office staff immediately.

III. CITY STAFF: RESPONSIBILITIES

City of San Diego HUD Programs Administration Office staff (*City staff*), charged with the responsibility of ensuring the CDBG allocation process is impartial and consistent with all applicable standards, are charged with:

1. Delivering all needed materials to reviewers in a timely manner and retrieving the required materials from the reviewers at a place that is convenient to them;
2. Responding to all inquiries from the reviewers promptly in a clear and accurate manner;
3. Consulting with staff from HUD and the City Attorneys' Office and other professionals as may be warranted during the process in order to ensure said process is consistent with all applicable policies and regulations;
4. Facilitating the Ad Hoc meetings, scheduling said meetings working within the time constraints of the participants and providing the space where the meetings take place;
5. Computing the average overall score assigned to each application based on the individual scores assigned to that application by all the participating reviewers;
6. Determining the rankings of the applications (based on their average scores –on descending order) and presenting these average scores and resulting ranking to the CPAB for their ratification during their March meeting. Note that there will be three rankings of applications, one for each type of project that may be pursued by applicant agencies:
 - Public Services (PS);
 - Capital Improvements (CIP); and,
 - Community Economic Development (CED).
7. Presenting said rankings to the City Council along with CPAB members as the order in which CPAB recommends projects are funded (based on available funds);

8. Incorporating the City Council decision for funding in the FY 2016 Annual Action Plan; and,
9. Submitting the FY 2016 Annual Action Plan on or before the federal deadline to HUD.

Finally, City staff is committed to providing opportunities throughout the process to gather input and comments from the public at large, applicant agencies, CPAB members and all other interested parties.

IV. SCHEDULE

Task	Date
FY 2016 CDBG RFP packets due to HUD Programs Administration Office on or before 3:00 PM	01/26/2015
HUD Programs Administration Staff RFP Review	01/27/2015 - 02/04/2015
Hand delivery of Review Binder & Review Reference Binder (as described below) to CPAB	02/05/2015
CPAB February Meeting	Cancelled
Ad Hoc meetings	02/11/2015 – 02/27/2015
CPAB FY 2016 CDBG RFP scoring results due to HUD Programs Office	03/02/2015
CPAB March Meeting: Ratification of Scores/Ranking and approval of recommendations for funding for City Council	03/11/2015
Presentation of CPAB recommendation for funding to City Council	03/23/15 or 03/24/2015
Draft FY 2016 Action Plan released for 30-day public review period	Late March – Early April
Draft FY 2016 Action Plan presented to CPAB	
Presentation of FY 2016 Action Plan to Public Safety and Livable Neighborhoods City Council Committee (PN&LN) & subsequently to City Council	04/15/2015
Presentation of FY 2016 Action Plan to City Council	04/27/2015 or 04//28/2015
Submittal of FY 2016 Action Plan to HUD	No later than 05/15/2015

V. CPAB CONFLICT OF INTEREST GUIDELINES

No member of the CPAB shall make, participate in making or in any way attempt to use his or her official position to influence a governmental decision in which he or she knows or has reason to know he or she has a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest is:

- “A real or seeming incompatibility between one’s private interests and one’s public or fiduciary duties.”

Members of the Board are prohibited from:

- Obtaining a financial interest or benefit from a CDBG activity
- Having a financial interest in any contract with respect to a CDBG activity or its proceeds, either for themselves or those with whom they have business or immediate family ties
- During their tenure or for one year thereafter

Upon written request, exceptions may be granted by HUD on a case-by-case basis, after consideration of the cumulative effect of various factors listed at 24 CFR 570.611(d), and only with:

- a) Full disclosure of the potential conflict; and,
- b) A legal opinion of the grantee’s attorney that there would be no violation of state or local laws in granting the exception.

A member of the CPAB shall resign immediately from the CPAB if he or she becomes an officer, paid employee, consultant, contractor, subcontractor, or member of the Board of Directors of an organization that has applied for, or that has a contract with the City for CDBG or ESG grant funds.

Former members of the CPAB are prohibited from lobbying or otherwise attempting to influence the CPAB or City Council members in connection with the business or operations of the CPAB for a period of no less than one year after any such member leaves the CPAB.

Financial Interest – General Guidelines

A member of the CPAB has a financial interest if:

- It is reasonably foreseeable that the decision will have a material financial effect distinguishable from its effect on the public generally on the member of the CPAB, member of the Board’s immediate family, or on:
 - (a) Any business entity in which the member of the Board has a direct or indirect investment worth two thousand dollars (\$2,000) or more.

- (b) Any real property in which the member of the Board has a direct or indirect interest worth two thousand dollars (\$2,000) or more.
- (c) Any source of income, except gifts or loans by a commercial lending institution made in the regular course of business on terms available to the public without regard to official status, aggregating five hundred dollars (\$500) or more in value provided or promised to, received by, the member of the Board within 12 months prior to the time when the decision is made.
- (d) Any business entity in which the member of the Board is a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or holds any position of management.
- (e) Any donor of, or any intermediary or agent for a donor of, a gift or gifts aggregating two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) or more in value provided to, received by, or promised to the member of the Board within 12 months prior to the time when the decision is made. (Note: The amount of the value of gifts specified by this rule is adjusted biennially. This amount is subject to change.)

An indirect investment or interest means any investment or interest owned by the spouse or dependent child of a public official, by an agent on behalf of a public official, or by a business entity or trust in which the official, the official's agents, spouse, and dependent children own directly, indirectly, or beneficially a 10-percent interest or greater.

Disclosure of Economic Interests

Members of the Board must disclose, in economic disclosure statements:

- Investments and business positions in any business entity located in or doing business with the City of San Diego
- Income and gifts from sources located in or doing business with the City of San Diego
- Interests in real property located in the City of San Diego, including property located within a tow mile radius of any property owned or used by the city

For more information or assistance with questions regarding conflicts of interest or economic disclosures, CPAB members should contact City staff and in turn, City staff will contact the City Attorney's Office as warranted.

VI. CONFIDENTIALITY

Applications and supporting materials are passed on to the review panel members in strict confidence and reviewers must respect that confidentiality. The materials in the *review binders* (as described below) may not be photocopied or reproduced in any manner and must be returned to the City along with the completed scoring forms upon completion of the reviews.

Reviewers are also expected to safeguard these documents once they have received them and use the information strictly for its intended use.

Furthermore, reviewers may only discuss the applications, their contents, and their own assessments of the applications or similar related matters **during** the Ad Hoc meetings with fellow CPAB members and/or with City staff as part of related inquiries.

Completion of a Confidentiality Agreement is required of all reviewers prior to their receipt of the *review binder* (as described below). Reviewers must abide by the provisions of said agreement.

VII. REVIEW PACKAGE

Each Board member participating in the review of the CDBG applications for FY 2016 receives the *following information* on February 5, 2015:

- Review Panel Handbook
- Conflict of Interest Statement: By signing this form, reviewers acknowledge they have read and understood the conflict of interest provisions that apply to the CDBG applications' review process and agree to fully comply with said provisions. Reviewers also identify any applications that they must recuse from reviewing in accordance with the conflict of interest standards.
- Confidentiality Agreement: By signing this form, reviewers agree to comply with a number of provisions which safeguard confidentiality provisions.
- List of Applicants & Projects: Listing of all of the applications submitted sorted on a per-project category (CIP, CED and PS). The information provided includes the name of the applicant agency and the name of the proposed project as identified by the applicant in the application.
- Applications: This material includes the portion of the applications which is subject to the review of the CPAB as part of their scoring, the letters of support submitted as well as the photos/drawing submitted as part of CIP application package.
- FAQs 1 and 2: Responses issued by City staff to *Frequently Asked Questions* (FAQs) submitted by applicants during the RFP process.
- Review & Scoring Criteria: Note that a set of criterion apply to Public Services and Community Economic Development Projects and a set apply to Capital Improvement Projects (see Appendix E).

The Review and Scoring Criteria assigns a specific number of points to each of five categories as shown below (further details regarding what each of these entail is provided in the subject document). The categories listed below are the same for both

PS/CED and CIP applications:

Table 1: Review Criteria Categories		
	Review Criteria Category	Maximum Points
1	Project Characteristics	40
2	Organizational Capacity	10
3	Budget	18
4	Project Benefits to High-Need Areas and/or Populations (Geographic Targeting)	10
5	Project Specifics	22
Total		100

Note the criteria also includes a *City of San Diego Track Record* criteria category (up to 3 points may be deducted from score based on deficiencies on the performance of applicant agencies on previously funded projects). This category will not apply during the review of applications for FY 2016 funds.

It is also worth noting that each of the categories identified above is in turn divided into sub-categories and each of these is assigned a specific number of points (which cumulatively result in the total number of points for the applicable category).

- Scoring Form: Scoring Forms are used by the reviewers in order to record the points awarded to each application reviewed and provide comments in writing regarding the applications. Said comments are optional. These forms are submitted by the reviewers to the HUD Programs Office upon completion of the reviews. The Scoring Forms will be made available to the applicant agencies upon completion of the FY 2016 CDBG allocation process (submittal of the Action Plan to HUD). Prior to their distribution to an applicant agency in response to their request, names and signatures of the reviewers are redacted from the forms.
- Council Policy 700-02: This City Council Policy establishes the general guidelines by which the City selects and implements activities utilizing Community Development Block Grant funds (see Appendix C).
- FY 2015 - FY 2019 Consolidated Plan Goals: The City Council approved the Consolidated Plan Goals for the FY 2015 – FY 2019 period on December 16, 2013 via Resolution No. 308656 (see Appendix D). The goals apply to the CDBG program and are considered as part of the CPAB review of the applications in terms of how proposed projects conform to them.

VIII. REVIEWING & SCORING APPLICATIONS

The following sections provide details regarding the six primary elements of the review process for the CPAB members:

1. Preparation
2. Reading and Analyzing Applications
3. Discussion at Ad Hoc Committee Meetings
4. Scoring Applications
5. Close Up

NOTE 1: Reviewers are encouraged to call on City staff for technical assistance and/or clarifications through the process as they deem necessary. City staff will be readily available to the reviewers during the process via email or phone.

NOTE 2: Reviewers are expected to limit their evaluation to information contained in the *review binders*. Outside knowledge or hearsay is not to be considered. City wants to ensure that applicants are not penalized nor rewarded them based on information not contained within the application.

NOTE 3: Reviewers are asked to refrain from interaction with the applicant agencies and/or intended beneficiaries and/or supporters of any of the proposed projects or applicant agencies.

1. Preparation: Prior and During the Review

Upon receipt of the *review package* as described above, reviewers are required to:

1. Examine the **FY 2016 CDBG List of Applicants and Projects** and identify any proposal and/or applicant agency *where* a conflict of interest may exist; and,
2. Complete the **Conflict of Interest Statement** and return it to City staff signed and dated.
3. Read the **Confidentiality Agreement** and return this form to City staff signed and dated;

In regards to conflict of interest matters, reviewers are reminded that a potential conflict of interest may not be identified until applications are read and examined in detail.

Reviewers must keep conflict of interest matters in mind **throughout** process and report the presence of such conflicts to City staff as soon as these are recognized. Once reviewers receive the review package, reviewers are asked to examine the list of applicants and projects to identify any potential conflicts of interest and report those to City staff. Further, as reviewers proceed with their individual review of applications, they must keep in the mind the conflict of interest guidelines in order to identify other potential conflicts of interests that may not have been identified until then.

Any and all potential conflicts of interest must be reported to City staff and reviewers are required to recuse themselves from reviewing/scoring those applications and refrain from further reading any of the related documents. City staff will promptly retrieve those documents from the appropriate reviewer(s) throughout the process.

2. READING AND ANALYZING APPLICATIONS

Reviewers are instructed to evaluate applications on the basis of the criteria approved by the City Council. Reviewers begin by reading the materials critically with the primary purpose of determining how closely the proposed project conforms to the criteria. Reviewers are expected to fully familiarize themselves with said criteria prior to the reading of the applications.

The review criteria under consideration are divided into five categories (as shown on table no. 1) and each category is composed of several elements that must be considered in order to determine how well the application responds to each criterion. When reading applications, reviewers' attention should be focused on the information that relates to these criteria.

As reviewers identify the most pertinent information in relation to the evaluation criteria, reviewers make a determination regarding the quality of said information. This analysis requires reviewers to conduct an objective appraisal of the information provided by the applicant in order to discern how well it responds to the criteria. As part of this analysis, the reviewer considers the proposed project elements and asks himself/herself questions such as the following:

1. Does the information fully respond to all applicable elements of the respective criterion?
2. Is the information clear and specific (rather than vague and/or open to numerous interpretations)?
3. Do concepts, ideas and/or procedures flow in a logical manner?
4. Are the proposed projects' results measurable? Are they consistent with the project goal(s)?
5. Are the proposed activities and outcomes appropriate in relation to the project objectives?
6. Has the applicant allocated non-CDBG resources to the project as proposed?
7. Is the information presented reasonable and consistent with accepted knowledge and practices?
8. Is the information in any one section consistent with other sections of the application?

Given **each** reviewer must read and score **each** application within a limited timeframe, reviewers are encouraged to consider the number of applications that must be reviewed and allot an appropriate amount of time for each once they have familiarized themselves with the process. Establishing a maximum time for applications reviewed early in the sequence will ensure subsequent applications receive sufficient attention.

Reviewers must keep in mind their obligation to consider individual applications in relation to the evaluation criteria. Applications are not compared to one another as every proposal and its merits and weaknesses stand on their own.

3. AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Prior to scoring any one application at the individual level, the reviewers meet at the Ad Hoc Committee level in order to discuss applications with one another and exchange considerations. Three Ad Hoc Committees will be established for this purpose. No committee has more than four CPAB members and hence no CPAB quorum is achieved at the Ad Hoc committee level. Only CPAB committee members and City staff participate in these meeting.

Each of the three Ad Hoc Committees considers and discusses **all** of the applications but no interactions take place across the committees. Reviewers are also expected to complete their evaluations and score forms independently and do not collaborate with one another during the process.

It is important to note that Ad Hoc Committee meetings are **not** intended to allow members to reach consensus but rather to hear from one another. Such interactions are aimed at expanding the point of view of the individual reviewers and encourage them to consider in their review factors they may have initially overlooked.

It is anticipated that each Ad Hoc Committee will meet twice. Given the volume of applications that must be considered, a predetermined set of applications are discussed during the first Ad Hoc meeting and the remainder of the applications are discussed during the second meeting. This process is repeated for each of the three Ad Hoc committees.

Before attending the initial Ad Hoc meeting, each reviewer should have already thoroughly read the set of applications that will be discussed at that meeting and written preliminary notes as warranted.

The Ad Hoc Committee meetings are facilitated by City staff and take place at City offices. City staff does **not** participate in CPAB's evaluation of the applications in relation to the set criteria nor does staff participate in the scoring, except for the portions of the criteria that include HPA staff confirmation. Staff also provides technical assistance during the Ad Hoc meetings by responding to any questions the reviewers may have, correcting technical inaccuracies that may arise and reminding the reviewers of their responsibilities as warranted.

4. SCORING APPLICATIONS

Reviewers must identify the most significant strengths and weaknesses of the application at hand and consider their relative importance when assigning scores. Once a reviewer has reached a conclusion regarding the appropriate scores for each of the sub-categories that are assigned individual scores, scores are recorded in the *scoring form* after the reviewer writes down the name of the applicant and project under consideration in said form. Reviewers must use **whole** numbers in assigning scores to the individual sub-categories.

After all of the sub-categories' scores are recorded, the reviewer totals these in order to arrive at his/her overall score for that application. Reviewers should also double check scores in order to ensure they have been correctly entered and the sum result is correct. Reviewers are encouraged to provide their comments in the scoring form as these will be made available to the applicant agencies upon their request as a means to provide feedback.

The scoring form is not complete until the reviewer has recorded his/her name on it as well as signed and dated it. The forms will be made available to the applicants (upon their request) following the ratification of the FY 2016 Annual Action Plan by the City Council. The Annual Action plan, in part, constitutes the City of San Diego application for the FY 2016 CDBG funds to HUD. The names and signatures of the individual reviewers are redacted from the scoring forms prior to their distribution to the applicant agencies.

5. FINALIZED SCORES

Upon completion of the review and scoring process, the review panel members submit to City staff the completed scoring forms (wet signatures required) **no later than March 2nd, 2014** and return the *review binders*. All materials can be picked up at a place that is convenient to the reviewers by City staff or special courier. Reviewers have not completed the review process until these materials are received by City staff and/or their representatives.

IX. REVIEWERS ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewers play a critical role in the CDBG funding allocation process. They provide comments orally during the Ad Hoc meetings and they also have the option of recording their comments in writing on scoring forms. Comments concerning the applications provide objective and substantiated information upon which evaluations can be made. Good comments are those that solidly address the quality of the proposal as it relates to the review criteria. The best comments are tactful and well-balanced.

Reviewers do not:

- Penalize an applicant because he/she feels the institution doesn't need the money. Reviewers must keep in mind that any eligible organization may apply for and receive CDBG funding, regardless of need.
- Use prior or outside knowledge of an applicant organization. Comments and scores are based only on the information at hand.
- Impose their own standards –reviewers evaluate the applications in relation to the criteria presented to the Public Safety and Livable Neighborhoods City Council Committee (PN&LN) on October 29, 2014.
- Make sarcastic or derogatory remarks.

- Offer or ask for irrelevant or extraneous information – the comments of the reviewers pertain only to the information required of applicants.

Although each application is unique and deserves its own unique responses, reviewers may find the following sample comments helpful in developing their own.

Sample Comments:

- *Overall, the application does not address the review criteria with sufficient detail.*
- *The application clearly shows this agency has the experience needed to successfully implement the proposed project.*
- *This applicant demonstrates that significant resources have been invested into the proposed project and the project is ready to become a reality in the immediate future.*
- *Objectives/outcomes do not appear to be measurable nor are they clearly stated.*
- *It is not clear how the project as proposed relates to the selected Consolidated Plan goals.*
- *It is not clear how the proposed actions/activities will be implemented.*
- *The project results/outcomes do not appear to be commensurate with the budget.*
- *The information provided demonstrated the quality of the proposed program/project.*

Reviewers must keep in mind that the *scoring forms* are intended to serve as a form of technical assistance to applicant agencies. These forms serve as the mechanism the City uses to provide feedback to the applicant agencies regarding the strengths and/or weaknesses of their applications. Therefore, these written comments should be as detailed as possible and provide specific information about the applications in relation to the specific elements considered as part of the criteria.

Comments should clearly state why a particular issue is a weakness so applicants know where they may be room for improvement for future opportunities. Similarly, statements regarding strengths should indicate where specifically these strengths lie. Useful comments are specific to the individual applications and are directed to applicants for their consideration.

Finally, as appropriate, reviewers are asked to cite applications' sections or page numbers in order to provide clear and thoughtful guidance to the applicants.

X. CPAB RATIFICATION OF SCORES

Upon completion of the reviews and submittal of the scoring forms to the City, staff computes the average score assigned to each application based on the individual scores assigned to that

application by all the reviewers which participated in said review. The applications are then segregated into the three following groups based on the rules which govern the use of CDBG moneys as well as the City of San Diego FY 2015 – FY 2019 Consolidated Plan, approved by the City Council during their April 28, 2014 meeting (see Resolution No. 308904, ratified on April 30, 2014):

1. Capital improvement;
2. Community Economic Development; and,
3. Public Service projects.

The applications in each of these three groups are ranked based on their average scores –on descending order. Once compiled, average scores and resulting rankings are then posted on the City’s HUD Programs’ website and notification of their availability is given to all applications and subscribers of the City’s HUD Programs’ email distribution list. Average scores and resulting rankings will subsequently be presented to the CPAB for their ratification during their March meeting.

XI. Next steps

Following the CPAB March meeting, the three ordered set of rankings are presented to the City Council as the order in which CPAB recommends projects are funded (based on available funds). Staff then incorporates the City Council decision for funding in the FY 2016 Draft Annual Action Plan and releases the Plan for a 30-day public review. The Action Plan must include a description of how CDBG resources will be allocated among all funding categories and, in fact, constitutes the application to HUD for receipt of the City’s 2016 CDBG entitlement. The Annual Action Plan must be submitted to HUD on or before May 15, 2015.

APPENDIX A: Confidentiality Agreement – CPAB MEMBERS
FY 2016 CDBG Funding Review and Scoring Panel

I, _____, have been appointed to serve as member of the Consolidated Plan Advisory Board (CPAB) and will be evaluating and scoring the proposals submitted in response to the FY 2016 Request for Proposal for Community Block Development Grant (CDBG) funding (“FY 2016 CDBG Applications”).

Per the City of San Diego Municipal Code §26.2113, I am charged with performing an open and impartial evaluation of the FY 2016 CDBG Applications and provide funding recommendations to the City Council. Specifically, I will be reviewing the FY 2016 CDBG Applications in relation to a set of criteria presented by staff to the City Council Public Safety and Livable Neighborhoods City Council Committee (PN&LN) on October 30, 2014 and assigning a score to each Application based on said review.

I hereby acknowledge and/or agree to the following in performing this review:

1. I understand that all information I receive during the review process, including but not limited to the name(s) of specific applicants and/or their proposed project names, the contents of specific proposals, my evaluations and those of other evaluators, discussions regarding proposals during the Ad Hoc Committees meetings, and all related information constitutes “Confidential Information.”
2. I understand and I agree to hold all Confidential Information in the strictest confidence.
3. I understand that any unauthorized disclosure of Confidential Information will compromise the fairness of the process and may result in harm to the City of San Diego and/or its constituents.
4. I will use said information strictly for its intended, official and authorized purpose: scoring the FY 2016 CDBG Applications in relation to the applicable set of criteria.
5. I will safeguard all review materials provided to me by City staff as part of the “Review Binder(s)” and promptly return said materials to City staff upon completion of the evaluation process.

Initials

Date

6. I will not use any of the review information for matters that do not pertain to the City of San Diego HUD Programs and at no point will I use said information for my private gain or the private gain of others, either by my direct or indirect action or by giving counsel, recommendation, or suggestions to others.
7. I will not have any direct or indirect contact or discussions with any party who submits a proposal and/or their representatives.
8. I agree to immediately notify City of San Diego HUD Programs Administration Office staff if I obtain information outside of this review process that could impair or could create the appearance of impairing my ability to evaluate proposals fairly and impartially.

Read and accepted by:

Name

Signature

Date

APPENDIX B: Conflict of Interest Statement

I have carefully read the conflict of interest provisions as described in the CDBG Program Applications – Review Panel Handbook and hereby certify the following:

1. I acknowledge that real and apparent conflicts of interest may exist;
2. I will be mindful of the conflict of interest provisions **throughout** the review process;
3. I will identify instances where conflict(s) of interest may exist and promptly report those to City of San Diego HUD Program Administration Office staff via email and/or phone call and subsequently recuse myself from participating in the review process of the affected applications;
4. For any instances where I identify conflicts of interests **throughout** the review process, I will facilitate retrieval of the affected documents by City staff within a reasonable timeframe.

Please check the option below that reflects your status:

___ I have reviewed the list of FY 2016 CDBG applicant agencies and the names of their proposed projects and, based on that review, I have NO conflicts of interest to report at this time.

___ I have reviewed the list of FY 2016 CDBG applicant agencies and the names of their proposed projects and disclose conflicts of interest with the following applicant agencies and/or projects at this time:

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX C: City Council Policy 700-02

CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

SUBJECT: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM
(CDBG)

POLICY NO.: 700-02

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 28, 2012

BACKGROUND:

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 established the Community Development Block Grant Program. The enabling legislation has been reviewed and amended by Congress every three years since 1974. The purpose of the CDBG program is to provide an annual source of funds to local governments for the purpose of implementing activities to develop viable urban communities, including decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities, principally for persons of low and moderate income. Federal administration of the program is the responsibility of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The City of San Diego has participated in the program since its inception.

PURPOSE:

To establish the general guidelines by which the City will select and implement activities utilizing Community Development Block Grant funds.

POLICY:

It is the policy of the City Council to allocate Community Development Block Grant funds in accordance with the following standards.

1. Selection and implementation of program activities that meet the Congressional intent of the program and the specific eligibility requirements as outlined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
2. Funding will be allocated on a Fiscal Year basis (July 1 through June 30) prioritized by the City Council annually.
3. Funding for the repayment of HUD Section 108 loans will be taken from the City's overall annual allocation prior to funding being made available to address other Consolidated Plan goals.
4. Funding in the categories of "Planning and Administration" and "Fair Housing" will be taken from the City's overall annual allocation prior to funding being made available to address other Consolidated Plan goals.

5. Funding in the categories of “Planning and Administration” and “Fair Housing” will be taken from the City’s overall annual allocation prior to funding being made available to address other Consolidated Plan goals.
6. No allocation of CDBG funds will be made to an economic development or non-capital project of less than \$50,000.
7. No allocation of CDBG funds will be made to a capital project of less than \$100,000, unless funding at a lesser amount is necessary to complete a project and the project will be completed within 18 months.
8. Priorities of the City’s Capital Improvements Program will be developed irrespective of whether or not the City is to receive Community Development Block Grant funds. Community Development Block Grant funds if received are to be used to supplement the City’s Capital Improvements Program and not as a substitute for other City funds.
9. No allocation of CDBG funds will be made to projects that are phased over multiple years. (It is the intent of the City Council that this policy serves to ensure that priority be given to projects where the funding will complete the project.)
10. A portion of the funds in the category of “Planning and Administration” will be allocated for the purpose of capacity building in order to ensure that emerging non-profit organizations have the opportunity to qualify for future CDBG funding.
11. No allocation of CDBG funds will be made to a project for which a CDBG application has not been received by the City.
12. A Community Based Development Organization (CBDO) certification process will be conducted in an effort to fund eligible project activities, as defined in the applicable U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development regulations.
13. No allocation of CDBG funds will be made to a subrecipient project in the category of “Planning and Administration,” except for those subrecipients certified by the City as a Community Based Development Organization.
14. All CDBG applicants shall attend mandatory workshops hosted by City staff during the annual CDBG application period.
15. All CDBG funds allocated to projects shall be used within 18 months of the start of the Fiscal Year for which the funds are allocated, or such funds will be subject to reprogramming by the City Council.
16. The public services category of activities shall be open to all eligible applicants, including City programs. A portion of the public service funds shall be set aside for the City’s homeless programs that require funds to match other grants.

17. Beginning with Fiscal Year 2012 allocations, a Consolidated Plan advisory board will review applications and provide recommendations to the Council.

HISTORY:

“Leasing of City-owned Property in Industrial Park”

Adopted by Resolution R-174133 - 01/10/1963

Repealed by Resolution R-208090 - 06/05/1973

“Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)”

Adopted by Resolution R-259072 - 08/15/1983

Amended by Resolution R-281638 - 03/22/1993

Amended by Resolution R-282395 - 07/26/1993

Amended by Resolution R-287559 - 06/25/1996

Amended by Resolution R-303367 - 02/11/2008

Amended by Resolution R-305413 - 11/24/2009

APPENDIX D: FY 2015 – FY 2019 CONSOLIDATED PLAN GOALS

- GOAL 1: Enhance the City’s economic stability and prosperity by increasing opportunities for job readiness and investing in economic development programs.
- GOAL 2: Strengthen neighborhoods by investing in the City’s critical public infrastructure needs.
- GOAL 3: Improve housing opportunities by creating and preserving affordable rental and homeowner housing in close proximity to transit, employment and community services.
- GOAL 4: Assist individuals and families to stabilize in permanent housing after experiencing a housing crisis or homelessness by providing client-appropriate housing and supportive service solutions.
- GOAL 5: Invest in community services and non-profit facilities that maximize impact by providing new or increased access to programs that serve highly vulnerable populations such as youth, seniors and food insecure households.
- GOAL 6: Meet the needs of persons with HIV/AIDS and their families through the provision of housing, health, and support services.

APPENDIX D: FY 2016 CDBG Applications Review Criteria