



## 2017 AAP Project Review Assistance Sheet

This document is to assist the CDBG Team in analyzing and scoring each project submitted for grant funding. The primary ranking criteria are listed below. Further down are examples of questions to ask yourself to assist your scoring decisions.

### CDBG Team Ranking Criteria

- |                                                        |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Overall consistency with the CDBG Consolidated Plan | 40 Points |
| 2. Overall benefit or impact on the community          | 40 Points |
| 3. Agency experience and ability                       | 40 Points |
| 4. Benefit to low- to moderate-income residents        | 40 Points |
| 5. Supplementary funding and leveraging capabilities   | 40 Points |
| 6. Is the Project in an Adopted Plan?                  | 15 Points |

CDBG Team Total Points Available: 215 Points

### Criterion 1 - Overall Consistency with the City's Consolidated Plan: 40 points

- ☐ Meets a priority need of the Consolidated Plan (pp 6-10 & 96-100)
- ☐ Addresses a goal identified in the Consolidated Plan (pp 106-108)
- ☐ Was an activity in a previous Annual Action Plan
- ☐ If a City project, does the City have the project management capacity
- ☐ Does the City have the financial ability
- ☐ Does the CDBG Office have the capacity to administer the project

### Criterion 2 - Overall Benefit or Impact to the City: 40 points

- ☐ Does the project align with City's Councils Goals
  - 1. Develop a balanced & vibrant economy to improve socioeconomic status?
  - 2. Ensure a financially-sound City Government to maintain or improve levels of service
  - 3. Develop & maintain the public infrastructure to improve community appearance and encourage private investment
  - 4. Preserve and nurture a quality community to improve resident health & safety
  - 5. Engage the public to encourage community involvement & communication to build trust
- ☐ Amount of applicant's activities/practice devoted to City residents
- ☐ Soundness of applicant's data
- ☐ Applicant clearly demonstrated the need for the project and how the project will meet the need

- ☐ Personal experience and beliefs about the project benefits/impact
- ☐ History of the need the project is addressing
- ☐ Does the CDBG funding go directly to the client
- ☐ Does the applicant's data support the project
- ☐ Must this project take place before others can be addressed (concrete, work, drainage, training, education, staffing, ...)
- ☐ Is the project ready to go
- ☐ Risks of project delay
- ☐ Risks of project failure

### Criterion 3 - Agency Experience and Ability: 40 points

- ☐ Qualified project manager assigned (experience)
- ☐ Applicant can meet reporting requirements
- ☐ Applicant has capacity to complete the project
- ☐ Has met external approvals (zoning, annexation, permits, inspections...)
- ☐ Financial Stability-does the applicant have financial capability to cover expenses for the project while awaiting CDBG reimbursements?
- ☐ Applicant has experience with Federal, State and local grants
- ☐ Number of prior years the applicant has requested funds for operating expenses
- ☐ Has received and successfully implemented prior CDBG projects
- ☐ Had documented financial records
- ☐ Adequate funding sources identified for project completion
- ☐ Has experience in the community

### Criterion 4 - Benefit to Low- to Moderate- Income Residents: 40 points

| For 2018 | Persons in Family |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|----------|-------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| LMI      | 1                 | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | 6      | 7      | 8      |
| Moderate | 47,000            | 53,700 | 60,400 | 67,100 | 72,500 | 77,850 | 83,250 | 88,600 |
| Low      | 29,400            | 33,600 | 37,800 | 41,950 | 45,350 | 48,700 | 52,050 | 55,400 |
| Very Low | 17,650            | 20,150 | 22,650 | 25,150 | 28,780 | 32,960 | 37,140 | 41,320 |

In 2017, the Denver Area's Medium Family Income was \$83,900 for a family of four.

- ☐ Primarily Benefits low/moderate income families
- ☐ Project impact on the L/M income residents in the City
- ☐ Project location is in Target Area

Criterion 5 – Committed Supplementary Funding and Leveraging Capabilities: 40 points

- ☐ Percentage amount of funds leveraged with other sources
- ☐ Timeliness of leveraged funds
- ☐ Applicant's history of receipt of leverages funds
- ☐ Description and amount of in-kind leveraging provided
- ☐ Proof or documentation of leveraged funds

Criterion 6 - Is the Project in an Adopted Commerce City Plan?: 15 points

- ☐ *Comprehensive Plan*
- ☐ *Walk.Bike.Fit*
- ☐ *Youth Master Plan*
- ☐ *Historic Preservation Plan*
- ☐ *Station Area Master Plan*
- ☐ *Public Art Master Plan*
- ☐ *Mile High Greyhound Park Redevelopment*
- ☐ *Public Works Capital Improvement Plan*
- ☐ *Economic Development Plan*
- ☐ *Park & Recreation Plan*
- ☐ *Transportation Plan*
- ☐ *Infrastructure Plan*
- ☐ *Police Department Plan*
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_