

## 2022 CD PROGRAM APPLICATION -PRIORITY FACTORS SUMMARY RATING SHEET

Each application is evaluated and scored based on how it meets the criteria listed in this document.

	Application Score	Maximum Score
<b>1. Consolidated Plan (ConPlan) Priority</b>		<b>25</b>
ConPlan Community Development Goals		16
Imagine Duluth 2035 Governing Principles		9
<b>2. Project Readiness</b>		<b>15</b>
Timely Completion/Expenditure of funds		10
Additional Actions Needed		5
<b>3. Project Impact and Delivery</b>		<b>30</b>
Achievement of Expected Results		6
Target Clientele		5
Outcome Measurements		10
Number of Persons/Households to Benefit		5
Business/Operations Plan Approach		4
<b>4. Financial Considerations</b>		<b>15</b>
Sufficiency and Leveraging of Resources		3
Financial Support and Viability		8
Project Budget Detail/Use of Funds		4
<b>5. Applicant Attributes</b>		<b>15</b>
Project/Program Management Ability and Capacity		6
Past Performance/Experience		5
Quality of Application		4
Total Score:		<b>100</b>

\* **Note to Applicant:** A high score on the rating sheet is not a guarantee of funding. The City of Duluth Planning and Development Division considers the rating sheet one of many tools to help make funding recommendations to the Community Development Committee, City Council, and Administration. The Planning and Development Division will use other information and sources including but not limited to: consistency with the goals for the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan, supporting the Governing Principles in the Imagine Duluth 2035 plan, implementing Action Steps listed in the Heading Home St. Louis County- A Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness, as well as the availability of limited funds to assist in funding recommendations.

# 2022 APPLICATION RATING CRITERIA

## SECTION 1. Consolidated Plan Priority

---

The project proposal shall be examined in relation to the City's community development goals and funding priorities as presented in the goals for the City of Duluth 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan (ConPlan).

The Consolidated Plan is a five-year plan, developed with community input, studies and assessments, that serves as a key strategic planning tool; providing guidance and direction for Duluth in administering its federal program funds to address its community development goals and priority needs over the ConPlan's five-year period. The goals for the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan are available on the website at <https://duluthmn.gov/planning-development/guiding-documents/consolidated-plan/>. HUD measures the City's performance on its accomplishment of its ConPlan goals. As such, project proposals that are consistent with the City's ConPlan goals shall be rated accordingly. Additionally, incorporation of fair housing principles that reduce segregation and/or discrimination of protected classes and access to safe and affordable housing, as described in the City's Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice 2020 (appendix to ConPlan), will further guide funding administration.

Imagine Duluth 2035 is the City of Duluth's Comprehensive Plan which was completed after extensive community outreach and City Council approval in June 2018. The Imagine Duluth 2035 plan can be viewed here: <https://imagineduluth.com/>

### Con Plan Community Development Goals (16 Points)

- 16 pts    Maximum Impact: Project directly relates to one of the ConPlan goals. Information and supporting documentation provided in the application is comprehensive, and provides a clear indication how the project's outcome will substantially support a ConPlan goal. Strategies to directly reduce impediments to fair housing are incorporated into application, including policies that reduce inequities, including segregation and racialized poverty.
- 8 pts    Substantial Impact: Project is consistent with the ConPlan goals. The information and supporting documentation presented is not as clear and comprehensive as meeting one of the ConPlan goals, but it appears very probable that the project's outcome will support a ConPlan goal. Strategies to indirectly reduce Impediments to Fair Housing are incorporated into application, including policies that reduce inequities, including segregation and racialized poverty.
- 0 pts    No Impact: Project does not meet one of the ConPlan goals.

### Imagine Duluth 2035 Governing Principles (9 Points)

- 9 pts    Maximum Impact: The description of the proposed project shows how the project meets more than one Governing Principles described in the Imagine Duluth 2035 plan and supports one or more of the Policies and Strategies identified in the Imagine Duluth 2035 plan.
- 6 pts    Substantial Impact: The description of the proposed project shows how project meets more than one Governing Principles described in the Imagine Duluth 2035 plan and supports one of the Policies and Strategies identified in the Imagine Duluth 2035 plan.
- 4 pts    Moderate Impact: The description of the proposed project shows how project meets one Governing Principles described in the Imagine Duluth 2035 plan
- 0 pts    Minimal/No Impact: The project does not meet any of the Governing Principles in the Imagine Duluth 2035

## 2022 APPLICATION RATING CRITERIA

Plan.

### SECTION 2. Project Readiness

---

Project readiness assesses the project's ability to start upon receipt of funds and completed in a timely manner. Consideration shall be given to proposals which demonstrate project readiness -projects which exhibit the greatest likelihood to start immediately upon receiving CDBG or HOME funding (hereinafter referred to as "Grant Funds") approval (expected on or about April 01, 2022) and the practicability to expend Grant Funds within or less than a one-year period; and be without factors which would cause undue delays. It is to the applicant's benefit that its project budget clearly demonstrates that Grant Funds will be encumbered (committed) and expended within the desired one-year time frame or less. Factors to be considered in this area include (a) the Project Schedule (start and completion timetable), (b) the availability of resources (including all non-Grant Funds, federal, state, county or private funding sources, and sufficient funds to pay federal and/or state prevailing wages, if applicable), and (c) any additional actions that may affect the timely implementation of the project. In order to satisfy HUD timeliness standards, CDBG projects are intended to be completed in 12 months (March 31, 2023), construction projects may have a longer time period. If project includes HOME funding, it must be committed within two years from the beginning of the program year (April 1, 2022) and must be expended within five years.

#### Timely Completion/Expenditure of Grant Funds (10 Points)

- 10 pts    Maximum Pace: The project schedule is comprehensive and includes evidence/clear documentation that the project is ready to start upon approval/receipt of funding and/or is very likely to be completed in less than one year of project funding. Project milestones (activities) and other critical elements necessary to accomplish the project are identified in the schedule and assigned time periods for each activity appear reasonable and achievable. It is certain or highly probable that the Grant Funds will be fully expended within the first 12 months (from April 2022 to March 2023) of the project's funding or less.
- 8 pts    Substantial Pace: The project schedule is comprehensive. Documentation indicates that the project will be ready to start within one month of approval/receipt of funding (by May 2022) and/or may take 12 months or slightly longer to be completed. Project milestones (activities) and other critical elements necessary to accomplish the project are identified in the schedule and assigned time periods for each activity appear reasonable and achievable. It is somewhat likely the Grant Funds will be fully expended by the end of the first 12 months of the project's funding (March 2023) and very probable that it will be expended within the first 15 months (by June 2023).
- 5 pts    Moderate Pace: The project schedule is comprehensive. Documentation indicates that the project is more likely to start later than one month from approval/receipt of funding and/or not be completed within the first 15 months of funding. Project milestones (activities) and other critical elements necessary to accomplish the project are identified in the schedule and assigned time periods for each activity appear reasonable. It is not likely the Grant funds will be fully expended by the first 15 months of the project's funding and probable that it may take up to 18 months to be fully expended.
- 2 pts    Minimal Pace: The project start date is somewhat uncertain or has not been established and the project schedule is inadequately prepared with key information missing from the schedule and/or time periods are not reasonable. It is likely that the full expenditure of the Grant Funds will extend beyond the first 18 months of the project's funding.
- 0 pts    The project schedule is poorly prepared and/or time periods are unrealistic and/or not achievable. It is highly likely that the expenditure of the Grant Funds will extend beyond the first 24 months of the project.

## 2022 APPLICATION RATING CRITERIA

0 pts Matter(s) were identified as requiring actions and/or potentially requiring actions to address federal review requirements. The applicant does not appear knowledgeable, committed, able to complete the project.

### Additional Actions Needed (5 Points)

Additional actions may have a significant impact on the start-up, progress and completion of the project. Matters that may have a critical impact on the progress of a project include, but are not limited to, site control, land use designation, plans and project design, and community support. These matters shall be considered together, as a whole, to evaluate the impact on the project and its ability to start upon approval and receipt of funding.

5 pts No additional action(s) is needed. The applicant has full and complete site control. There are no issues anticipated with land use designation, zoning, plans, project design, community support or any other issues as of the application date. Therefore, the project will be able to commence as planned.

3 pts The applicant has realistically identified action(s) and/or problem(s) relating to site selection, land use designation, zoning, plans, project designs or other issues may exist, but they appear relatively minor and the applicant exhibits the understanding and capacity to address these concerns. It appears highly probable that the concerns will be resolved before the 30-Day Public Comment Period for the Annual Action Plan (December 2021).

2 pts The applicant has realistically identified action(s) and/or problem(s) relating to site selection, land use designation, zoning, plans, project designs or other issues may exist. The actions are somewhat complicated to resolve. The applicant has developed and implemented a comprehensive plan, and is already in the process of addressing these concerns. The concerns appear to be fully resolvable by the Annual Action Plan Public Hearing (January 2022), but also likely to adversely impact the project's implementation with delays.

1 pts The applicant has realistically identified some action(s) and/or problem(s) relating to site control, land use designation, zoning, plans, project designs or other issues may exist. The actions are complicated to resolve. The applicant has developed a plan to address these concerns. The problems appear to be fully resolvable, but also likely to adversely impact the project's implementation with delays extending beyond the start of the program year (April 1, 2022).

0 pts Extensive additional action and/or problems have been identified or pose a potential significant concern in regards to site control, land use designation, zoning, plans, project designs or other issues. The applicant appears unsure as to how to address the issues and/or the problems do not appear to be fully resolvable without negatively impacting the project's implementation with delays extending beyond the 2022 construction season.

### SECTION 3. Project Impact and Delivery

---

The impact of the project, as presented and described in the application, will be evaluated based on the information presented by the applicant in the narratives explaining the Community Development Need and Project Description. The applicant should clearly explain the merits of the project focusing on the results and benefits to be achieved with the implementation of the project, the clientele that will directly benefit from the project and its long-term strategy and plan to ensure that the project continues to provide and

### Achievement of Expected Results (6 Points)

6 pts Maximum Impact: The applicant clearly and completely describes the significance of the need, and provides supporting documentation and statistics fully substantiating this need. The activity proposed for funding

## 2022 APPLICATION RATING CRITERIA

addresses the described need and successfully resolves the problem completely. The achievement of the results is realistic and reasonable.

- 4 pts Moderate Impact: The applicant explains the significance of the need, and provides some supporting documentation and/or statistics that somewhat relate to the need. The proposed project would have a major impact on addressing the described need, but would not completely resolve the problem. The achievement of the results is somewhat realistic and reasonable.
- 2 pts Minimal Impact: The applicant describes the need, but not clearly or completely and provides minimal or no supporting documentation and/or statistics that relate to the need. The proposed project would have some impact on addressing the described need, but significant areas are not addressed. The achievement of the results is not realistic and reasonable.
- 0 pts No Impact: The need, as described, appears questionable as to its significance and seriousness to the community. The proposed project does not clearly address how the described need would be addressed or the project would be ineffective in resolving the described need.

### Target Clientele (5 Points)

This section will address the impact of the low- income persons served. It will measure the effectiveness of the project in regards to the number of the low- income persons served.

- 5 pts Maximum Impact: Direct benefit of 100% of project restricted to serving low- income persons (includes area-wide benefit). Project will directly reduce policies and practices that create inequalities, including segregation and racialized poverty.
- 3 pts Substantial Impact: Direct benefit of less than 100%, but at least 85% of project restricted to low-income persons. Project has the potential to reduce policies and practices that create inequalities, including segregation and racialized poverty.
- 2 pts Moderate Impact: Direct benefit of less than 85% but at least 70% of project restricted to low-income persons.
- 1 pt Minimal Impact: Direct benefit of less than 70% but at least 51% of project restricted to low-income persons.
- 0 pt No Impact: Direct benefit of less than 51% (HUD required minimum). Project will not reduce policies and practices that create inequalities, including segregation and racialized poverty.

### Outcome Measurements (10 Points)

Outcome measurements and objectives of the previous year's performance were reviewed at the September 2020 Public Hearing. Programs that are meeting or exceeding their outcomes and great community impact are what the City of Duluth strives for.

- 10 pts Maximum Impact: Program met or exceeded the outcome objectives in recent years. The program also had a maximum impact and benefit for the participants it served.
- 8 pts Substantial Impact: Program was close to meeting its outcome objectives in recent years. The program had a substantial impact and benefit for the participants it served.
- 5 pts Moderate Impact: Program did not meet their outcome objectives in recent years. Program still had a

## 2022 APPLICATION RATING CRITERIA

moderate impact on the participants it served.

- 2 pts Minimal Impact: Program met some outcome objectives in recent years. Program had minimal impact on the participants it served.
- 0 pts No Impact: The program met few or none of the outcome objectives in recent years. Program had no impact on the participants it served.

### Number of Persons/Households to Benefit (5 Points)

The per capita cost effectiveness of a proposed project is an important measurement in assessing overall cost-effectiveness. Consider the total cost of the proposed project (not just the Grant Funding request) and the total number of persons served (not just the income eligible beneficiaries) to measure per capita cost effectiveness in its achievement and delivery of project results.

- 5 pts Maximum Impact: Per capita cost of \$1 -\$5,000 per person/household
- 3 pts Substantial Impact: Per capita cost of \$5,001 -\$20,000 per person/household
- 2 pts Moderate Impact: Per capita cost of \$20,001 -\$50,000 per person/household
- 1 pts Minimal Impact: Per capita cost of greater than \$50,001 per person/household

### Business/Operations Plan Approach (4 Points)

- 4 pts The proposal fully and thoroughly identifies the major critical issues and factors to implement and maintain the project objectives over the long term. The proposal addresses how these issues will be resolved to sustain the project results and ensure continued success after the implementation of the project. The approach is sound and reflects a clear understanding of the issues involved and how they will be resolved.
- 3 pts The proposal appears to identify most of the major critical issues and factors to implement and maintain the project objectives over the long term. The proposal somewhat addresses how some of these issues will be resolved to sustain the project results and ensure continued success after the implementation of the project.
- 2 pts The proposal appears to identify some of the major critical issues and factors to implement the project and maintain the project objectives over the long term, but does not address how these issues will be resolved to sustain the project results and ensure continued success after the implementation of the project.
- 0 pts The proposal does not address major issues to implement the project and maintain the project objectives over the long term, nor how these issues will be resolved to sustain the project results and ensure continued success after the implementation of the project.

### SECTION 4. Budget Narrative (Financial Considerations)

---

Financial considerations are vital in assessing a project's ability to be completed successfully and timely. The following factors are essential for projects that involve rehabilitation or new construction of public facilities. Factors to be considered in this area include (a) the availability and sufficiency of resources (including all non-Grant Funds, federal, state, county or private funding sources), (b) the leveraging of resources, (c) fiscal support for the project for its continued viability and (d) the project budget's accuracy, reasonableness and completeness in determining the financial needs of the project.

## 2022 APPLICATION RATING CRITERIA

### Sufficiency and Leveraging of Resources (6 Points)

The sufficiency of resources and leveraging element is intended to ensure that the funding requirements of the proposed project have been thoughtfully considered to ensure the project's successful implementation. This assessment considers the adequacy and availability of the funding needs of the total project to determine its ability to start as planned and ensure that its funding requirements can be met. The evaluation also considers and encourages the use of resources and funds over and above the Grant Funds applied for in the undertaking of the project.

- 3 pts Funding needs are clearly identified to address the total project requirements. Other sources of funds have been **secured and firm** written commitments have been obtained for the project, such that upon approval of the Grant Funds, the project may commence immediately. There are \$2 (or more) of other sources of funds for every \$1 requested in the application. (**>2:1 ratio**)
- 2 pts Funding needs are clearly identified to address the total project requirements, but **not completely secured and confirmed**. Plans to secure other sources of funds are underway and information is presented to conclude that it is very probable that these other sources of funding will be obtained timely such that upon approval of the Grant Funds, the project may commence immediately or within 3 months after funding has been approved. There is at least \$1 of other sources of funds for every \$1 requested. (**2-1:1 ratio**)
- 1 pt Funding needs are clearly identified to address the total project requirements. The project is mostly reliant on requested Grant Funds to finance the project with minimal leveraging. (**<1:1 ratio**)
- 0 pts Funding needs are identified to address the total project requirements. Plans to secure other sources of funds have been developed and/or underway, but it is questionable whether these funds will be secured and/or if they will be available upon approval of the Grant Funds in a timely manner (later than 3 months after funding has been approved).
- 0 pts Funding needs are identified, but incompletely addresses the total project requirements. Grant Funds would have little impact to complete the project and no other resources have been identified.

### Financial Support & Viability (8 Points)

- 8 pts Applicant's audited financials indicate that the applicant appears to have more than sufficient long-term financial resources necessary to ensure the operating viability of the facility/project. Audit report of independent CPA does not reveal any on-going and/or going concerns, risks and/or material weaknesses of entity.
- 6 pts Applicant's audited financials indicate that the applicant appears to have a sufficient amount of the long-term financial resources necessary to ensure the operating viability of the facility/project. Audit report of independent CPA does not reveal any on-going and/or going concerns, risks and/or material weaknesses of entity.
- 3 pts Applicant's audited financials indicate that the applicant does not appear to have the long-term financial resources necessary to ensure the operating viability of the facility/project, but have formalized strategies and firm plans to secure financial resources to ensure the operating viability of the facility/project is sustained relative to the duration of the use restriction required. Audit report of independent CPA does not reveal any on-going and/or going concerns, risks and/or material weaknesses of entity.
- 1 pt Applicant has been in operation less than 2 years and/or is not able to provide audited financial statements. Therefore, an assessment of the financial viability and sustainability of the entity is difficult to perform, if not questionable.

## 2022 APPLICATION RATING CRITERIA

0 pts Applicant has none of the long-term financial resources necessary to ensure the operating viability of the facility/project is sustained relative to the duration of the use restriction required and/or audit report of independent CPA reveal on-going and/or concerns, risks and/or material weaknesses of entity.

### Project Budget Detail/Use of Grant Funds (4 Points)

The project budget element evaluates the reasonableness of the project's cost estimates, assumptions used in determining the cost estimates, attention to detail, the mathematical accuracy of the project budget tables and schedules and the overall cost effective use of funds.

- 4 pts Project budget appears accurate, comprehensive and detailed. Project costs are completely and clearly documented, project activities are itemized in detail and appear reasonable and justified (assumptions are logical and clearly substantiate cost estimates). The project budget schedule is presented logically and is mathematically accurate. The Grant Funds will be used in the most cost-effective manner.
- 2 pts Project activity costs are itemized and appear to be reasonable, but the costs and assumptions are not clear or well documented. The project budget schedule is substantively mathematically accurate (i.e. minor footing errors noted), and/or does not appear complete.
- 0 pts Project costs appear to be questionable and/or unreasonable, assumptions are unclear and/or poorly documented. The project budget schedule is substantively mathematically incorrect and/or the Grant Funds does not appear to be used in a cost-effective manner.

## SECTION 5. Applicant Attributes

---

The applicant evaluation element is intended to ascertain that the applicant (or fiscal sponsor) has the necessary qualifications, ability and resources to effectively and successfully carry out the project. Additionally, as a sub-recipient, the applicant must have the managerial and technical capacity to be able to administer the project in compliance with the CDBG or HOME Programs rules and regulations. Applicants who have received Grant Funds in the past will be evaluated on the basis of their past performance. If the applicant has not received Grant Funds in the past, it will be rated on related information included in its application.

### Project/Program Management Ability and Capacity (6 Points)

- 6 pts The Applicant clearly documents or shows evidence of the necessary competencies, skill set, management capacity, professional experience and qualifications to successfully manage and complete the project. The Applicant also clearly understands its responsibility for income compliance in regards to primarily benefitting low-and moderate-income beneficiaries; the Applicant has clearly described the process and controls the project will utilize for income verification; and the Applicant has the ability and capacity to implement this process successfully. Program staff is knowledgeable and trained in documenting federal objectives, income, and other programmatic policies.
- 4 pts The Applicant appears to have most of the necessary competencies, skill set, management capacity, professional experience and qualifications to successfully manage and implement the project, but it is not well documented. The Applicant also appears to understand its responsibility for income compliance in regards to primarily benefitting low-and moderate-income beneficiaries; but the Applicant has not clearly or fully described the process and controls the project will utilize to ensure compliance; and/or there is some uncertainty whether the Applicant has the ability and capacity to implement such a process. Program staff is knowledgeable and trained in documenting federal objectives, income, and other programmatic policies.



## 2022 APPLICATION RATING CRITERIA

- 2 pts The Applicant appears to have some of the necessary competencies, skill set, management capacity, professional experience and qualifications to successfully manage and complete the project (documentation is unclear). The Applicant also appears to not fully understand its responsibility for income compliance in regards to primarily benefitting low-and moderate-income beneficiaries; the Applicant did not describe the process and controls the project will utilize to ensure compliance; and the Applicant does not appear to have the ability and capacity to implement such a process. Program staff needs additional training in documenting federal objectives, income, and other programmatic policies.
- 0 pts The Applicant appears to have very minimal or none of the necessary competencies, skill set, and capacity to successfully manage the project (documentation is unclear). The Applicant also appears to not fully understand its responsibility for income compliance in regards to primarily benefitting low-and moderate-income beneficiaries; the Applicant did not describe the process and controls the project will utilize to ensure compliance; and the Applicant does not appear to have the ability and capacity to implement such a process.

### Past Performance /Experience (5 Points)

- 5 pts The Applicant has extensive past experience with Grant Funds and/or other federal funding programs. The Applicant has been directly involved in 5 or more federally funded projects within the past five years of which 3 projects involved Grant Funding that were favorably completed. This Applicant has had no problems substantiating low-to moderate-income compliance for past projects (if applicable). This Applicant has been timely, complete and accurate with Grant Funds reporting requirements (if applicable).
- 4 pts The Applicant has adequate past experience with Grant Funds and/or other federal funding programs. The Applicant has been directly involved in 3 or more federally funded projects within the past five years of which 1 project involved Grant Funding that was favorably completed. This Applicant has had no problems substantiating low-to moderate-income compliance for past projects (if applicable). This Applicant has been timely, complete and accurate with Grant Funds reporting requirements (if applicable).
- 3 pts The Applicant has some past experience with federally funded projects. The Applicant has been directly involved in 3 or more federally funded projects within the past five years that involved Grant Funding which were completed. The Applicant may have experienced some problems in implementing past projects timely, but the problems were fully resolved. This Applicant has had minor problems substantiating low-to moderate-income compliance for past projects (if applicable). The Applicant may have difficulty complying with program requirements and/or federal overlay statutes.
- 1 pts The Applicant has little past experience with Grant Funds and/or federally funded projects. The Applicant has had extensive problems in implementing past projects timely and/or substantiating low-to moderate-income compliance and/or meeting Grant Funds reporting requirements and/or other requests for information by the City (if applicable).

- 0 pts This Applicant appears to have no related professional experience with Grant Funds and/or other

### Quality of the Application (4 Points)

- 4 pts The application is logical, clear, well written, accurate and attentive to detail, but also concise with appropriate statistical information and supporting documentation provided to thoroughly support any conclusions provided.
- 3 pts The application is adequately written, but statistics, observation and/or conclusions are not well documented.
- 2 pts The application is adequately written, but statistics, observations and/or conclusions are not well documented and inconsistencies and/or errors were noted.

## 2022 APPLICATION RATING CRITERIA

- 1 pts The application is adequately written, but statistics, observations and/or conclusions are not well documented; inconsistencies and/or errors were noted; and some application instructions were not followed. The credibility of information and statistics provided appear questionable.
- 0 pts The application is poorly written, statistics, observations and conclusions are not documented, and apparent and substantive internal inconsistencies and material errors were noted. A majority of the application instructions were not followed. The credibility of information and statistics provided is questionable.