NORTH TEXAS

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE GUIDEBOOK

2015-2016 TxCDBG PROGRAM

July 10, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 2

II. North Texas RRC Approved Actions 3

III. North Texas Summary of RRC Objective Scoring Criteria 4

IV. North Texas RRC Objective Scoring Criteria 5

PART I - INTRODUCTION

NORTH TEXAS REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

GUIDEBOOK

2015-2016 TEXAS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

The Nortex Regional Review Committee (RRC) Guidebook has been prepared in accordance with the 2015 TxCDBG Action Plan and the 2015-2016 Regional Review Committee Scoring and Training Guidelines for the Community Development Fund. The Guidebook provides eligible applicants from the Nortex region with the application guidelines necessary to be scored under the Nortex RRC scoring criteria.

Any questions regarding the RRC or the Guidebook should be directed in writing after the Nortex RRC Guidebook has been published in the website of the Texas Department of Agriculture to:

Suzanne Barnard, Director
State CDBG Program
Texas Department of Agriculture
P.O. Box 12847
Austin, Texas 78711
e-mail address: Suzanne.Barnard@TexasAgriculture.gov
TDA website: http://texasagriculture.gov/

PART II
NORTH TEXAS RRC
APPROVED ACTIONS

1. The North Texas RRC held its required Public Hearing on July 10, 2014, to hear public comments on the proposed objective scoring criteria, and to approve the RRC Guidebook, project priorities and the objective scoring criteria.

2. The RRC selected the Rio Grande Council of Governments as support staff to develop and disseminate the RRC Guidebook. The RRC selected the Rio Grande Council of Governments as support staff to calculate the RRC scores and provide other administrative RRC support.

3. The RRC established the maximum grant amounts for the region:

   - Single jurisdiction: $275,000.00
   - Multi-jurisdictions: $375,000.00

4. The RRC did not establish set-asides for housing and non-border colonia projects.

PART III
NORTH TEXAS RRC
SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVE SCORING CRITERIA

1. **Project Priorities – 150 Points (Max)** . . . . . 150 Points

2. **Local Match – 60 Points (Max)** . . . . . 60 Points

   What is the match amount?

3. **Percentage of Low to Mod Persons Benefiting – 25 Points (Max)** . . . . . 25 Points

   What is the percentage of low/moderate income persons benefiting from the TxCDBG project?

4. **Not funded in Previous Scoring Cycle – 20 Points (Max)** . . . . . 20 Points

   Did the applicant receive funding in the 2011-2012 CD/CDBG-R and RSF (Rural Sustainability Fund) application cycle?

5. **Leverage of Funds – 10 Points (Max)** . . . . . 10 Points

   Is the applicant or the service provider leveraging funds from other sources?

6. **Date of Last Revenue Source Increase – 20 Points (Max)** . . . . . 20 Points

   Has the applicant or the service provider increased the utility (water or wastewater) rate or the ad valorem tax rate revenue in the last four-year period?

Total Objective Scoring Criteria . . . . . **285 Points**

PART IV
NORTH TEXAS RRC OBJECTIVE SCORING CRITERIA

1. **Project Priorities- 150 Points (Maximum)**

The North Texas Regional Review Committee has determined that some activities are of higher priority in the region than others.

Methodology: Table 1 will be reviewed to determine the appropriate project type category and points will be assigned accordingly. Projects that have multiple activities will be scored based upon which activity is using the most TxCDBG construction dollars. For the purposes of this scoring factor, acquisition costs are applied to the applicable activity to determine which activity is the predominate one.

Project Types:

First Priority – Water, wastewater, septic tank projects, water and wastewater yardlines, roads, street, paving, and drainage projects **150 Points**

Second Priority – All other Eligible Projects **135 Points**

Data Source: As stated below:

a. RRC Guidebook as approved by the North Texas RRC
b. Project Type: CD Application Table 1 Verified by TDA

Information Needed from Application to Score: List of Projects Submitted by Type as Stated in Table 1 (List as many as applicable):

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4._____

2. Local Match – 60 Points (Maximum)

What is the match amount?
(Match Amount / TxCDBG funds Required)

The North Texas Regional Review Committee has determined that higher percentages of match injected into the proposed project will receive a higher score.

Methodology: For purposes of this scoring criterion, only match generated from the applicant jurisdiction or service provider will be considered. Loans and/or grants from States sources and other Federal sources and other sources not generated by the applicant or service provider are excluded and will not be considered match for scoring procedures.

If the project is for beneficiaries for the entire county, the total population of the county is used. If the project is for activities in the unincorporated area of the county with a target area of beneficiaries, the population category is based on the unincorporated residents for the entire county. For county applications addressing water and sewer improvements in unincorporated areas, the population category is based on the actual number of beneficiaries to be served by the project activities. If the project serves beneficiaries for applications submitted by cities, the total city population is used.

Projects that include multiple jurisdictions – the applicant with the largest percentage (%) of beneficiaries will be considered the applicant of record.

The following criteria will be used to award points under this category:

Applicant(s) population equal to or less than 1,500 according to the 2010 Census:

- Match equal to or greater than 5% of grant request . . . . . .60 points
- Match at least 4% but less than 5% of grant request . . . . . 40 points
- Match at least 3%, but less than 4% of grant request . . . . . 20 points
- Match at least 2%, but less than 3% of grant request . . . . . .10 points
- Match less than 2% of grant request . . . . . 0 points

Applicant(s) population equal to or less than 3,000 but over 1,500 according to the 2010 Census:

- Match equal to or greater than 10% of grant request . . . . . 60 points
- Match at least 7.5% but less than 10% of grant request . . . . . 40 points
- Match at least 5%, but less than 7.5% of grant request . . . . . 20 points
- Match at least 2.5%, but less than 5% of grant request . . . . . .10 points
- Match less than 2.5% of grant request . . . . . 0 points

Applicant(s) population equal to or less than 5,000 but over 3,000 according to the 2010 Census:

- Match equal to or greater than 15% of grant request . . . . . 60 points
- Match at least 11.5% but less than 15% of grant request . . . . . 40 points
- Match at least 7.5%, but less than 11.5% of grant request . . . . . 20 points
- Match at least 3.5%, but less than 7.5% of grant request . . . . . 10 points
- Match less than 3.5% of grant request . . . . . 0 points

Applicant(s) population over 5,000 according to the 2010 Census:

- Match equal to or greater than 20% of grant request . . . . . 60 points
- Match at least 15% but less than 20% of grant request . . . . . 40 points
- Match at least 10%, but less than 15% of grant request . . . . . 20 points
- Match at least 5%, but less than 10% of grant request . . . . . 10 points
- Match less than 5% of grant request . . . . . 0 points

Data Source: As Stated Below

a. Applicant Match: SF 424 and Applicant Resolution or 3rd Party Commitment letter
b. Population: 2010 Census Data Summary File 1 Table P1
c. County Unincorporated Water/Sewer Beneficiaries: CD Application Table 1 Verified by TDA

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Application Population: _____
County Unincorporated Water/Sewer Beneficiaries: _____
Applicant TxCDBG Amount: $ _____
Applicant Match from All Sources: $_____

3. Percentage of Low to Moderate Persons Benefiting – 25 Points (Maximum)

What is the percentage of low/moderate income persons benefiting from the TxCDBG project?

The North Texas Regional Review Committee has determined that the higher the percentage of low-to-moderate persons benefiting, the higher the score an applicant will receive in this category.

Methodology: Applicants will be required to submit information to TDA in order for a score to be generated based on the percentage of low-to-moderate income persons benefiting from the proposed project. The CD application Table 1 verified by TDA will be reviewed to determine the total number of beneficiaries and the number of low-to-moderate income beneficiaries. To determine the percentage of low-to moderate-income beneficiaries, the total low to moderate-income beneficiaries in the targeted area is divided by the total number of beneficiaries. Once the percentage of low-to-moderate income beneficiaries percentage is calculated, points will be assigned accordingly.

The following criteria will be used to award points to the applications based upon this criteria

% of low to mod income persons greater/equal to 60%. . . . . 25 points
% of low to mod income persons greater/equal to 58% but less than 60%. . . 20 points
% of low to mod income persons greater/equal to 56% but less than 58%. . . 15 points
% of low to mod income persons greater/equal to 54% but less than 56%. . . 10 points
% of low to mod income persons greater/equal to 51% but less than 54%. . . 05 points

Data Source: Total Project Beneficiaries and Low-to-Moderate Income Project Beneficiaries: CD Application Table 1 Verified By TDA

Information Needed from Application to Score:
Number of Low-to-Moderate Income Beneficiaries: _____
Total Number of Beneficiaries: _____
Percentage of Low-to-Moderate Income Beneficiaries: _____%

4. Not funded in Previous Scoring Cycle – 20 Points (Maximum)

Did the applicant receive funding in the 2013-2014 CD/CDBG-R and RSF (Rural Sustainability Fund) application cycle?

The North Texas Regional Review Committee has determined that applicants not funded in the 2013-2014 CD/ CDBG-R and RSF (Rural Sustainability Fund) application cycle should receive additional consideration for not receiving a grant in that cycle.

Methodology: The TDA tracking system report will be reviewed and points will be assigned accordingly. Applicants that were not fully funded in the last funding cycle, but received partial funding will be considered to have been funded and will not receive the maximum points allotted under this scoring category. For multi-jurisdictions applications, the applicant with the largest percentage (%) of beneficiaries will be considered the applicant of record. Multi-jurisdictions applications will be scored based on whether the same combination of multi-jurisdiction applicants were funded in the CD/CDBG-R and RSF 2013/2014 funding cycles.

Applicant was not funded in the previous funding cycle . . . . . 20 points
Applicant was funded in the previous funding cycle . . . . . .00 points

Data Source: TDA Tracking System Report

Information Needed from Application to Score:
Received funding from 2013-2014 CD/CDBG-R and RSF application cycle (mark as applicable):
Yes_____ No _____

List Contract No: _____

5. Leverage of Funds – 10 Points (Maximum)

Is the applicant or the service provider leveraging funds from other source?

The North Texas Regional Review Committee has determined an applicant should be rewarded if additional revenue sources outside of the local jurisdiction are used to help complete the proposed project.

Methodology: The commitment letters from a State source, Federal Source or other outside sources will be reviewed to determine the amount of leverage of funds injected into the project. In order to receive points under this criterion, the leveraging must be a minimum of 1% of the TxCDBG funds requested. For purposes of this criterion, leveraged funds include equipment, materials, and cash from sources other than the requesting entity. To calculate the leverage minimum, the following formula will be used:

Leveraged Funds/TxCDBG Funds Requested = Percent Leveraged.

Points will be assigned according to the following leveraging categories:

% of leveraging greater/equal to 5% . . . . . 10 points
% of leveraging greater/equal to 2.5% but less than 5% . . . . . 6 points
% of leveraging greater/equal to 1.0% but less than 2.5% . . . . . 2 points
% of leveraging less than 1% . . . . . 0 points

Date Source: Letter of Commitment from State, Federal, or other outside sources.

Information Needed from Applicant to Source:
State Dollars Leveraged: $ _____
Federal Dollars Leveraged: $_____
Other Outside Sources: $ _____
Percent Leveraged: _____%

6. Date of Last Applicable Revenue Sources Rate Increase – 20 Points (Maximum)

Has the applicant or the service provider increased the utility (water or wastewater) rate or the ad valorem tax revenue in the last four-year period?

Applicants will be required to submit information in order for a score to be generated based on when the applicant or the service provider last raised its revenue sources during the last four-year period. The North Texas Regional Review Committee has determined applicants that have increased their revenue source most recently should receive more points than those that have not. The rate increase is not tied to the specific project type, except as described in the methodology for applicants that are at the maximum ad valorem tax rate by law. In order to receive points under this criterion, the applicant must submit documentation, as described in the date source, to show proof of the last increase in the revenue source. The North Texas Regional Review Committee has determined that the following will be used to award points under this criteria:

Maximum Ad Valorem Tax Rate By Law Definition:

Cities:

- Cities of 5,000 or less in population can levy a maximum tax rate of $1.50 per $100 assessed valuation;
- Cities over 5,000 in population can levy up to $2.50 per $100 assessed valuation (for a home rule city, a rate lower than $2.50 per $100 may be prescribed under its charter);
- Type B general law cities can levy a maximum of 25 cents per $100 assessed valuation.

Counties:
$.80 per $100 assessed valuation

Other Than City or County

- Service Provider provides legal citation for maximum ad valor tax rate.

Methodology: City ordinance, resolution, court order, or board action will be reviewed to determine the date of adoption of the last revenue increase or the last increase in water/sewer rates. Points will be assigned accordingly.

For an application that includes multi-service providers, the above information will be based on the predominate service provider with the most financial injection into the project and will be used for scoring purposes.

Any applicant or service provider that is at its maximum ad valorem tax rate by law will receive the maximum points under this category unless it is a water/wastewater related project. In addition, if the request for TxCDBG funding is for multi-activities and the request includes a water or wastewater activity, the water or wastewater rate must have been raised, although the applicant or service provider is at the maximum ad valorem tax rate by law.

Applicants or service providers that have increased their revenue source in several of the following periods will be awarded the combined points in the scoring categories, but in no case will the amount exceed the 20 point maximum.

Increase in revenue source within 10/01/13 – 09/30/14. . . . . .20 Points
Increase in revenue source within 10/01/12 – 09/30/13 . . . . . .15 Points
Increase in revenue source within 10/01/11 – 09/30/12. . . . . .10 Points
Increase in revenue source within 10/01/10 – 09/30/11. . . . . 05 Points
Increase is revenue source prior to 10/01/10 . . . . . .00 Points

Data Source:

a. Rate Increase: Official public record of action of the appropriate governing body (examples: ordinance, resolution, court order, or board action)

b. Ad Valorem Tax Rate Above Revenue Increase: To document the ad valorem tax rate revenue increase for the established periods, newspaper publication reflecting the effective tax rate or the calculation form used to determine the ad valorem tax rate above the effective rate. The information must provide the name of the applicant and appropriate timeframe. The established timeframe is defined in the **Information Needed from Applicant to Score.**

c. Project Submitted: CD Application Table 1 Verified by TDA

d. Applicant is at Maximum Ad Valorem Tax Rate By Law: Certification from Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer stating applicant or service provider is at the maximum.

Information Needed from Applicant to Score:
Name of Service Provider:

If other than City or County, Service Provider Provide Legal Citation for Maximum Ad Valorem Tax Rate: _____

Activity or Activities Applicant is Applying for:
List as Many As Apply: 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

Ad Valorem Tax Rate Is at Maximum Allowed by Law: Yes _____ No _____

<u>Mark Water or Sewer Utility Rate Increase or Ad Valorem Tax Rate for Which Points are Being Sought:</u>
Utility Rate (Water or Wastewater Rate): Yes _____ No _____
Ad Valorem Tax Rate: Yes _____ No_____

Rate Increase Information
Rate Prior To: 10/01/14 _____

Rate Between: 10/01/13 – 09/30/14: _____
Source Documentation: _____
Date of Increase: _____

Rate Prior to: 10/01/12_____
Rate Between: 10/01/12 – 09/30/13_____
Source Documentation: _____
Date of Increase: _____

Rate Prior to: 10/01/11_____
Rate Between: 10/01/11 – 09/30/12_____
Source Documentation: _____
Date of Increase: _____

Rate Prior to: 10/01/10_____
Rate Between: 10/01/10 – 09/30/11_____
Source Documentation: _____
Date of Increase: _____