

HEART OF TEXAS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE GUIDEBOOK (For Applicants) 2017-2018 TxCDBG Program (Final DRAFT 5/31/16)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	3
II.	HOTCOG RRC Approved Actions	4
III.	Summary of HOTCOG RRC Scoring Criteria	5
IV.	HOTCOG RRC Scoring Criteria	7
	a. Need for the Project	7
	b. Local Effort	9
	c. Impact of the Project	15
	d. Community Need/Distress	23
V.	HOTCOG TxCDBG Forms	28
	a. Tax Assessor-Collector Form (HOTCOG TxCDBG 2016-1)	28
	b. Chief Appraiser Certification Form (HOTCOG TxCDBG 2016-2)	29
	c. Engineer/Chief Elected Official Certification Form (HOTCOG TxCDBG 2016-3)	30

PART I – INTRODUCTION

HEART OF TEXAS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE GUIDEBOOK

2017-2018 TEXAS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

The Heart of Texas Regional Review Committee (RRC) Guidebook has been prepared in accordance with the 2016 TxCDBG Action Plan and the 2017-2018 Regional Review Committee Scoring and Training Guidelines for the Community Development Fund. The Guidebook provides eligible applicants from the Heart of Texas Council of Governments (HOTCOG) region with the application guidelines necessary to be scored under the Heart of Texas RRC Scoring Criteria.

After the Heart of Texas RRC Guidebook has been published on the website of the Texas Department of Agriculture (TDA) any questions regarding the RRC or the Guidebook should be directed in writing to:

Suzanne Barnard State Director, Community Development Block Grant Program

Office of Rural Affairs
Texas Department of Agriculture
P.O. Box 12847
Austin, TX 78711
suzanne.barnard@TexasAgriculture.gov | 512.463.6612

PART II HEART OF TEXAS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS RRC APPROVED ACTIONS

- 1. The HOTCOG RRC held its required Public Hearings on April 14, 2016 and on May 31, 2016 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 Heart of Texas Council of Governments as support staff to develop and disseminate the RRC Guidebook, calculate RRC scores and provide other administrative support as needed.
- 3. The RRC established the maximum grant amounts for the region:

Single Jurisdiction: \$300,000Multi-Jurisdiction: \$350,000

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

PART III HEART OF TEXAS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS SUMMARY OF SCORING CRITERIA

Total Points by HOTCOG: 180 points

- 1. Need for the Project: 31 points
 - Excluding Texas Capital Fund, Planning/Capacity Building Fund, Small Towns Environmental Program (STEP) Fund, and Disaster/Urgent Need funding, what is the total amount of TxCDBG funds during the last two-year TxCDBG CD Cycle (2015-2016). (31 Points Maximum)
- 2. Local Effort: 44 points
 - What is the match amount? [Match Amount / TxCDBG Funds Requested] (26 Points Maximum)
 - Has the applicant or the service provider increased the appropriate utility (water or sewer) rate and/or the ad valorem tax rate above the effective tax rate between January 1, 2015 and January 1, 2017 (If a utility rate, must be a rate applying to water if a water project, sewer if a sewer project, water or sewer of a water and sewer project). Projects that include no water and/or sewer component will not be eligible for the full 10 points. (18 Points Maximum)
- 3. Impact of the Project: 62 points
 - Does the project address a target area of a city, county, or service-provider area, or is the project providing city-wide, county-wide, or service-area-wide benefit (hereafter referred to as 'area wide')? (9 Points Maximum)
 - What is the applicant's cost per household of TxCDBG dollars? (9 Points Maximum)
 - What is the cost per low-to-moderate income (LMI) beneficiary for each applicant's jurisdiction in comparison to the average cost per low-to-moderate income beneficiary for all applicants? (18 Points Maximum)
 - What is the activity to be funded? (26 Points Maximum)
- 4. Community Need/Distress: 43 points
 - What is the poverty rate (poverty percentage) of the census geographic area? (15 Points Maximum)
 - What is the per capita income of the census geographic area? (14 Points Maximum)
 - What is the per capita total appraised property value for the applicant's jurisdiction as compared to the average per capita appraised property value of all applicants for the region? (14 Points Maximum)

NEED FOR THE PROJECT 31 POINTS

1. Excluding Texas Capital Fund, Planning/Capacity Building Fund, STEP Fund, and Disaster/Urgent Need funding, what is the total amount of TxCDBG funds awarded during the last two-year TxCDBG Cycle (2015-2016) (31 Points Maximum) SCORE

Methodology: The TDA Tracking System Report will be reviewed to determine the total amount of TxCDBG funds awarded from TxCDBG funds awarded during the period of the last two-year TxCDBG cycle. The TDA Tracking System Report will exclude Planning / Capacity Building Fund, Texas Capital Fund, STEP Fund, and Disaster/Urgent Need funding. Projects that include multiple jurisdictions - the applicant with the largest percentage (%) of beneficiaries will be considered the applicant of record.

Amount is \$0.	31 Points
Amount is greater than \$0 but not more than \$100,000	24 Points
Amount is greater than \$100,000, but not more than \$250,000	16 Points
Amount is greater than \$250,000, but not more than \$350,000	13 Points
Amount is greater than \$350,000, but not more than \$500,000	07 Points
Amount is greater than \$500,000	00 Points

Data Source: TDA Tracking System Report

Information Needed From	Applicant to Score:	Contract no(s) As Ma	ıny As Applicable
PY 2015 Contract No	Start Date:	Amount \$	
PY 2016 Contract No	Start Date:	Amount \$	

LOCAL EFFORT 44 POINTS

1. What is the match amount? [Match Amount / TxCDBG Funds R	tequested] (26 Points Maximum) SCORE
Methodology: If the project serves beneficiaries for applications so for beneficiaries for the entire county, the total population of the course area of the county with a target area of beneficiaries, the population county. For county applications addressing water and sewer improve on the actual number of beneficiaries to be served by the project act applicant with the largest percentage (%) of beneficiaries will be contained to the project act applicant with the largest percentage (%) of beneficiaries will be contained to the project act applicant.	unty is used. If the project is for activities in the unincorporated category is based on the unincorporated residents for the entire ements in unincorporated areas, the population category is based civities. For projects that include multiple jurisdictions, the
Applicant(s) population equal to or less than 1,500 according to the • Match equal to or greater than 5% of grant request 26 points • Match at least 4% but less than 5% of grant request 19 points • Match at least 3%, but less than 4% of grant request 13 points	 2010 Census: Match at least 2%, but less than 3% of grant request 7 points Match less than 2% of grant request 0 points
Applicant(s) population equal to or less than 3,000 but over 1,500 at • Match equal to or greater than 10% of grant request 26 points • Match at least 7.5% but less than 10% of grant request 19 points • Match at least 5%, but less than 7.5% of grant request 13 points	 ccording to the 2010 Census: Match at least 2.5%, but less than 5% of grant request 7 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 at • Match equal to or greater than 15% of grant request 26 points • Match at least 11.5% but less than 15% of grant request 19 points	 ccording to the 2010 Census: Match at least 7.5%, but less than 11.5% of grant request 13 points Match at least 3.5%, but less than 7.5% of grant request 7 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 26 points • Match at least 15% but less than 20% of grant request 19 points • Match at least 10%, but less than 15% of grant request 13 points	 Match at least 5%, but less than 10% of grant request 7 points Match less than 5% of grant request 0 points
Data Source: Applicant Match: <u>SF 424 and Resolution and/or Co</u> <u>Data Summary File 1 Table P1</u> County Unincorporated Water/Sewe	
Information Needed from Applicant to Score: Applicant population Beneficiaries:Applicant TxCDBG Amount: \$	

2. Has the applicant or the service provider increased the appropriate utility (water or sewer) rate and/or the ad valorem tax rate above the effective tax rate between January 1, 2015, and January 1, 2017. (If a utility rate, must be a rate applying to water if a water project, sewer if a sewer project, water or sewer if a water and sewer project.) Projects that include no water and/or sewer component will not be eligible for the full 18 points. (18 Points Maximum) SCORE

	Mark As Applicable: Increase in Utility (Water or Sewer) Rate:	YES	<u>NO</u>
	Increase in Ad Valorem Tax Rate Above the Effective Tax Rate:		
18 Points	Increased both the appropriate utility rate and the ad valorem tax 2015, and January 1, 2017:	rate abov	ve the effective tax rate between January 1,
14 Points	Increased either the appropriate utility rate or the ad valorem tax 2015, and January 1, 2017:	rate abov	e the effective tax rate between January 1,
0 Points	Neither increased the appropriate utility rate nor the ad valorem to 1, 2015, and January 1, 2017:	ax rate ab	pove the effective tax rate between January

EXAMPLE 1	EXAMPLE 2	
<u>Both</u>	<u>Either</u>	
Increased appropriate utility rate YES	Increased appropriate utility rate	YES
Ad valorem tax rate above the effective tax rate YES	Ad valorem tax rate above the effective tax rate	NO
Applicant would receive 18 points	Applicant would receive 14 points	

Methodology: Applicant information related to a utility rate or ad valorem tax rate above the effective tax rate will be reviewed and points will be assigned. Applicant must provide the official public record to document that a utility rate or the ad valorem tax rate above the effective tax rate was higher on the day January 1, 2017 (Day) than it was two years before the Day.

The utility rate increase by the applicant or the service provider must be associated with the project submitted for TxCDBG funding. Example: If the project is water, then the water rates must have been raised during the applicable period. However, if the application for TxCDBG funding is for both water and sewer projects, then the applicant will receive the points according to the appropriate

scoring category if one of the rates was increased. To receive the maximum points, the ad valorem tax rate above the effective tax rate must have also been increased.

If the applicant's request for TxCDBG funding is not for a water or sewer project, then the applicant will be evaluated for scoring purposes based on an increase in the ad valorem tax rate above the effective tax rate. The applicant will not be able to receive the maximum points if funding is being requested for a non-water or non-sewer project. Example: If the request for TxCDBG funding is for road improvements, then the documentation related to an increase in the ad valorem tax rate above the effective tax rate will need to be submitted by the applicant to receive 14 points.

If the application is for multiple projects that includes a water or sewer project and another eligible activity, i.e. street repair and water, documentation must be provided that shows one of the appropriate rates was increased in the last two-year period, i.e. tax rate or water rates to receive 14 points. To receive the maximum points, the water or sewer rate and the ad valorem tax rate above the effective tax rate must have been increased during the specified period.

Rate Increase: Official public record of action of the appropriate governing body (examples: ordinance or resolution, not minutes)

Data Source:

Project Submitted: CD Application Table 1 Verified by TDA	
Ad Valorem Tax Rate Above Effective Tax Rate: Form HOTCOG TxCDBG 2016-1, filled out, signed/attested by Tax Assessor-Co	ollector.
Information Needed From Applicant to Score:	
Project(s) request for TxCDBG funding is for (mark as many as applicable): WaterSewerAll Other Eligible Activities	
Rate Increase:	
Utility Rates as of two years and January 1, 2017:	_ Utility
Rates as of January 1, 2017:	
Ad Valorem Tax Rate Increase over Effective Tax Rate:	
Effective Ad Valorem Tax Rate for 2016, based on tax rate in 2015, if 2015 rate adopted after December 31, 2014:	
Ad Valorem Tax Rate adopted for 2016, if adopted after December 31, 2015:	
Effective Ad Valorem Tax Rate for 2016, based on tax rate in 2015:	
Ad Valorem Tax Rate adopted for 2017:	
Effective Ad Valorem Tax Rate for 2017, based on tax rate in 2016:	
Ad Valorem Tax Rate adopted for 2016, if adopted before January 1, 2017:	

IMPACT OF PROJECT 62 POINTS

1. Does the project address a target area of a city, county, or service-provider area, or is the project providing city-wide, county-wide, or service-area-wide benefit (hereafter referred to as 'area wide')? (9 Points Maximum) SCORE
(number of beneficiaries) / (total population of city, county, or service-provider area) $x = SCORE$
Methodology: CD Application National Objective Data Form verified by TDA will be reviewed and points will be assigned. If the application addresses a combination of target area project(s) and 'area wide' project(s), then the points will be assigned based on the largest number of beneficiaries for either the target area project(s) or 'area wide' project(s) (beneficiaries for multiple target areas will be combined.)
For example: A city and county submit a multi-jurisdictional application for both county multiple target area benefit projects and a city-wide benefit project. The city-wide project service 3,000 beneficiaries. If the total number of beneficiaries from the target areas is greater than 3,000, the application is treated as an application for a target area. If the total number of beneficiaries from the target areas is less than 3,000, the application is treated as an application for 'area wide' benefit.
Projects that have scattered beneficiaries throughout the city or county or entire area of a service provider where a specific target area is not identified the project(s) will be considered 'area-wide'. Examples of these types of projects: a septic tank replacement project that will serve beneficiaries throughout the county or housing rehabilitation that will provide benefit to low-to-moderate income persons located throughout a city.
Data Source: Total Population, Cities and Counties: <u>CD Application National Objective Data Form Verified By TDA and 2010 census data table showing applicant's total population.</u> Total Population, Service Provider Area: <u>Clear Map of the Entire Service Area of a Service Provider, census map showing applicable census places or tracts, and 2010 census data table showing total population of all applicable census places or tracts, 2010 Census Summary File, P1. Number of Beneficiaries: <u>CD Application Table 1 Verified by TDA</u></u>
Information Needed From Applicant to Score: Target area:YesNo 'Area wide' Entire city, county, or service-provider area:YesNo

2. What is the applicant's cost per household of TxCDBG dollars? (9 Points Maximum) SCORE

Methodology: This score is determined by comparing the applicant's cost per household (CPH) to the average CPH for all applicants. The calculation considers the difference in the applicant's CPH to the average CPH for all applicants. The applicant's CPH is determined by dividing the total TxCDBG project amount by the total number of households (Project Amount / Total households) covered by the project. The percent "% of CPH" is then determined by dividing the applicant's project CPH by the sum of the CPH of all applicants (CPH / Sum of CPH). The %CPH is then multiplied by 100. The resulting number will fall within one of the following ranges and receive the appropriate number of points.

Scoring Range	Score
Less than 1	9
Less than 2	7
Less than 5	4
Less than 10	2

Example

Applicant	Project Amount	Households	СРН	% CPH	%CPH x 100	Scoring Range	Score
Applicant A	\$250,000.00	3,500	\$71.43	0.0123	1.231	Less than 2	7
Applicant B	\$250,000.00	1,200	\$208.33	0.0359	3.591	Less than 5	4
Applicant C	\$250,000.00	1,000	\$250.00	0.0538	5.387	Less than 10	2
Sum 25 Other Applicants	\$6,250,000.00	30,00 0	\$5,208.33				
		SUM:	\$5,800.60				

(project amount / Total households)= CPH (CPH / sum of CPH) = %CPH (%CPH * 100) = Scoring Range

Definition for Household:

For the purposes of this question, a household is defined according to the 2010 Census, if beneficiaries are documented using census data; CD Fund survey used to document beneficiaries; or a dwelling place that includes a kitchen. To be considered as a dwelling with a kitchen, the kitchen must contain a sink, refrigerator and a food heating/preparation appliance(s). The kitchen must be independently functional without the need for a resident to rely on a central kitchen to provide meals. For example, nursing homes constitute a single household; apartments constitute multiple households. Assisted living facilities, or assisted living units attached to

other types of facilities, may have one or many households depending on the number of dwelling places that include a kitchen. For example, an assisted-living facility with four apartment-style units and fourteen nursing-home style units would count as five households.

Data Source: CD Application National Objective Data Form Verified by TDA; Letter from assisted-living facility stating number of residences with and without kitchens.

Information Needed From Applic	Information Needed From Applicant to Score: No. of households served Requested Total TxCDBG \$ Cost per household \$									
No. of households served	Requested Total TxCDBG	\$	Cost per household \$							
Information Needed From Appli	cant to Score:									
No. of households served	Requested Total TxCDBG	\$	Cost per household \$							

3. What is the cost per low-to-moderate income (LMI) beneficiary for each applicant's jurisdiction in comparison to the average cost per low-to-moderate income beneficiary for all applicants? (18 Points Maximum) SCORE _____

Methodology: This score is determined by comparing the applicant's cost per LMI beneficiary (CPLMIB) to the average CPLMIB for all applicants. The calculation considers the difference in the applicant's CPLMIB to the average CPLMIB for all applicants. The applicant's CPLMIB is determined by dividing the total TxCDBG project amount by the total number of LMI beneficiaries (Project Amount / Total LMI Benes) covered by the project. The percent "% of CPLMIB" is then determined by dividing the applicant's project CPLMIB by the sum of the CPB of all applicants (CPLMIB / Sum of CPLMIB). Next, using one (1) as a base value, subtract the % CPLMIB from one to determine the Absolute Beneficiary Score (ABS CPB = 1 – "% of CPLMIB"). Finally, multiply the ABS CPB by the maximum score (18) to determine the final score for each applicant ((ABS CPB * 18). Any applicants exceeding the total allowed points will be capped at the maximum.

EXAMPLE:

CPLMIB

Total Points Available: 18

Applicant	Project Amount	Tot LMI Benes	CPLMIB	% CPLMIB	ABS CPB	ABS CPB Spread
Applicant A	\$300,000.00	4,804	\$62.45	0.0058	0.9942	17.8953
Applicant B	\$300,000.00	243	\$1,234.57	0.1150	0.8850	15.93
Applicant C	\$300,000.00	399	\$751.88	0.0700	0.9300	16.74
Applicant D	\$300,000.00	713	\$420.76	0.0392	0.9608	17.2944
Sum 25 Other Applicants	\$7,196,795.00	87187	\$8,267.25			

Sums \$10,736.90 1.0000

(Project Amount / Total LMI Benes) | (CPLIMB / Sum of CPLIMB) | (1 - % of CPLIMB) | (ABS CPB * 18)

Data Source: As Stated Below

CD Application Table 1 Verified By TDA

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

No. of Low-to-Moderate Income Beneficiaries:

Total Project Amount TxCDBG Only: \$_____

4. What is the activity to be funded? (26 Points Maximum) SCORE

WATER PROJECTS

•	First-time public water service to an area that includes more than 25 low to moderate income new residential connections <u>as evidenced</u> <u>by approved TDA Survey Tabulation Form</u>	26
•	Applicant is addressing deficiencies cited in an <u>active Agreed Order/Enforcement Order</u> between January 1, 2015 and January 1, 2017 (30 calendar days prior to the application due date of February 1, 2017) with fines included, <u>documented through Form HOTCOG TxCDBG 2016-3</u>	26
•	Applicant is addressing deficiencies cited in an <u>active Agreed Order/Enforcement Order</u> between January 1, 2015, and January 1, 2017 (30 calendar days prior to the application due date of February 1, 2017) without fines included, <u>documented through Form HOTCOG TxCDBG 2016-3</u>	24
•	First-time public water service to an area that includes 11 to 25 low to moderate income new residential connections <u>as evidenced</u> <u>by approved TDA Survey Tabulation Form</u>	23
•	First-time public water service to an area that includes 10 or fewer new low to moderate income new residential connections <u>as evidenced by approved TDA Survey Tabulation Form</u>	21
•	Applicant is addressing deficiencies cited in the most recent <u>Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)</u> water system notice of violations letter between January 1, 2015, and January 1, 2017 (30 calendar days prior to the application due date of February 1, 2017), <u>documented through Form HOTCOG TxCDBG 2016-3</u>	19
•	Water improvements that are still needed to meet state minimum standards cited in the most current <u>TCEQ water system</u> <u>inspection</u> <u>letter</u> and the conditions cited still exist, <u>documented through Form HOTCOG TxCDBG 2016-3</u>	17
•	Water improvements to meet state minimum standards, and the conditions still exist, <u>documented through Form HOTCOG</u> <u>TxCDBG</u> <u>2016-3</u>	16
•	Other eligible water activities	14
(m	nore on next page)	

SEWER PROJECTS

•	First-time public sewer service to an area that includes more than 25 low to moderate income new residential connections <u>as evidenced</u> <u>by approved TDA Survey Tabulation Form</u>	26
•	Applicant is addressing deficiencies cited in an <u>active Agreed Order/Enforcement Order</u> between January 1, 2015, and January 1, 2017 (30 calendar days prior to the application due date of February 1, 2017) with fines included, <u>documented through Form HOTCOG TxCDBG 2015/16-3</u>	26
•	Applicant is addressing deficiencies cited in an <u>active Agreed Order/Enforcement Order</u> between January 1, 2015, and January 1, 2017 (30 calendar days prior to the application due date of February 1, 2017) without fines included, <u>documented through Form HOTCOG TxCDBG 2016-3</u>	24
•	First-time public sewer service to an area that includes 11 to 25 low to moderate income new residential connections <u>as evidenced</u> <u>by approved TDA Survey Tabulation Form</u>	23
•	First-time public sewer service to an area that includes 10 or fewer low to moderate income new residential connections <u>as evidenced</u> <u>by approved TDA Survey Tabulation Form</u>	21
•	Applicant is addressing deficiencies cited in a <u>Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)</u> sewer system notice of <u>violations letter</u> between January 1, 2015, and January 1, 2017 (30 calendar days prior to the application due date of February 1, 2017) and the conditions cited still exist, <u>documented through Form HOTCOG TxCDBG 2016-3</u>	17
•	Wastewater improvements to meet state minimum standards, <u>documented through independent quantifiable information</u> , <u>such as engineering study or engineering letter</u> , and the conditions still exist	16
•	Wastewater system improvements to address sewer system overflows, blocked sewer lines, unauthorized discharges, or inflow and infiltration problems documented through Form HOTCOG TxCDBG 2016-3	14
•	Other eligible sewer activities	12
<u>O</u>	THER PROJECTS	
Ot	her eligible activities	0

Methodology: Data source information will be reviewed to determine if the project submitted is for water or sewer first-time service. For multiple project activities, the points will be assigned based on the criteria below, even if some of the activities are non-water and non-sewer activities.

Data Source: <u>Underlined text indicates Data Source(s) required to document scoring category; TDA Project Summary</u>

Information Needed from Applicant to Score: <u>Underlined text indicates Data Source(s) required to document scoring category</u>

COMMUNITY NEED / DISTRESS 43 POINTS

. What is the poverty rate (poverty percentage) of the census geographic area? (15 Points Waxinium) SCORE
Methodology: Poverty rate may be determined by reviewing the American Community Survey Census data for the census geographic
area. Once this information is obtained for each applicant, the poverty rate for each applicant is calculated by dividing the population
from which poverty persons was determined by the total number of persons at or below the designated poverty level. Once this has
been determined, the average poverty rate of the applicants is determined by dividing the sum of all poverty rates by the number of
applicants. Next, a base is determined by multiplying the average poverty rate by a constant such as 1.25 to represent 125%. The
poverty rate is then divided by the base for each applicant to determine their poverty factor. Finally, to determine scores the poverty
factor for each applicant is multiplied by the total maximum allowable points. Any applicants exceeding the total allowed points will
pe capped at the maximum.

For example, a region has five applicants. The average rate of the five applicants is .2647. A constant of 1.25 is multiplied by the average poverty rate to determine the base. The poverty rate of each applicant is then divided by the base to determine their poverty factor. Finally, scores for each applicant are determined by multiplying the poverty factor by the maximum available points for this scoring criterion.

If the target area(s) encompasses more than one census geographic area (such as two or more Census Tracts, the poverty rate shall be calculated as follows: sum of the total number of persons at or below the designated poverty level of all census geographic areas in the target area divided by the sum of the total population from which poverty persons was determined of all census geographic areas in the target area.

Data Source: As Stated Below

Population and Poverty Rate: 2014 US Census American Communities Survey 5 Year Estimate Table B17021

Census Geographic Area: 2010 Census map(s)

Total Population of the Census Geographic Area:

Target area(s) Identification Census Maps (attach Maps)

Census Geographic Area Poverty Rate:

Methodology: Per capita income may be determined by reviewing the US Census American Communities Survey (ACS) 5-year estimate. Once this information is obtained for each applicant and the target area identified on the census map, the average annual per capita income is calculated by dividing the sum of all annual per capita incomes by the total number of applicants.
Next, a base is set to provide a constant for the equation. The base is calculated by multiplying the average per capita income by a set number such as .75 to represent 75%. The base is then divided by the annual per capita income for each applicant. This number is referred to as the annual per capita income factor.
Finally to determine the score for each applicant, the annual per capita income factor is multiplied by the total maximum allowable points. Any applicants exceeding the total allowed points will be capped at the maximum.
If the target area(s) encompasses more than one census geographic area (such as 2 or more census tracts), the per capita income shall be calculated as follows: Sum of aggregate income in 5 year estimate (B19313) of all census geographic areas in the target are divided by the sum of the total population (SF 1 P1) of all census geographic areas in the target area.
For example, a region has five applicants. The average annual per capita income of the five applicants is \$34,200. A constant of .75 is multiplied by the annual average per capita income to determine the base (25,650). The base is then divided by the annual per capita income of each applicant to determine their per capita income factor. Finally, scores for each applicant are determined by multiplying the per capita income factor by the maximum available points for this scoring criterion.
Data Source: 2014 ACS 5 year Table B19301 <i>OR</i> If geographic area contains more than one Census Tract: SF1 P1 and 2014 ACS 5 year Table B19313
Information Needed From Applicant to Score: Per Capita Income for Census Geographic Area: Target area(s) Identification Census Maps (attach Maps)

2. What is the per capita income of the census geographic area? (14 Points Maximum) SCORE

3. What is the per capita total appraised property value for the applicant's jurisdiction (* see data source below) as compared to the average per capita appraised property value of all applicants for the region? (14 Points Maximum) SCORE _____

Methodology: This score is determined by comparing the applicant's per capita total appraised property value to the average per capita appraised property value of all applicants, in the case of cities, or to the average total per capita appraised property value of the region's six counties, in the case of counties. The calculation considers the difference in the applicant's per capita total appraised property value to the average per capita total appraised property value of all applicants. The applicant's total appraised property value is derived from the applicant's County Chief Appraiser Certified tax rolls as of 8/31/16. The applicant's per capita total appraised property value is reached by dividing the applicant's appraised property value by the applicant's population. The average per capita total appraised property value is determined by totaling the appraised property value of all applicants and then dividing by the total population of all applicants. The applicant's percentage of the regional per capita average is determined by dividing the applicant's per capita appraised property value by the average region appraised property value. Next, subtracting the applicant's percentage of the region average from 100% determines the applicant's percentage below the region average. (Cities will be compared to cities and counties will be compared to counties.) For projects that include multiple jurisdictions, the applicant with the largest percentage (%) of beneficiaries will be considered the applicant of record. Cities will be compared to other applicant cities. Counties will be compared to the region, whether the other counties have applied for funds or not.

<u>Cities:</u>		<u>Counties:</u>	
a. Equal to or above region average	<u> 0 Points</u>	a. Equal to or above region average	0 Points
c. Below region average by up to 20%	4 Points	c. Below region average by up to 20%	4 Points
d. Below region average by up to 40%.	<u>7 Points</u>	d. Below region average by up to 40%.	7 Points
e. Below region average by up to 60%	10 Points	e. Below region average by up to 60%.	10 Points
f. Below region average by more than 60%	14 Points	f. Below region average by more than 60%.	14 Points

Data Source: Appraised Property Value: <u>Certification from the applicant's Chief Appraiser as of August 31, 2016.</u> Population: <u>2010</u> <u>Census</u>

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

HOTCOG TxCDBG Form 2016-2 signed and attested by Chief Appraiser(s.) If a jurisdiction located in multiple counties, one form is needed for each appraisal roll.

Form HOTCOG TxCDBG 2016-1: Tax Assessor-Collector Form

Tax Assessor-Collector

Jurisdiction: (City or	r County)		
<u> </u>	e Tax Assessor-Collector for the juris option for that jurisdiction.	diction named above, and that the	e following are the correct ad valorem tax
	Effective rate	Adopted rate	Date adopted
2014		•	•
2015			
2016			

Form HOTCOG TxCDBG 2016-2: Chief Appraiser Certification

Jurisdiction:(city or county)			
Total Market Value of Property in (Jurisdiction) 2016		\$	
(less) Productivity Loss	-	\$	
Total Appraised Value (HOTCOG definition)	=	\$	
I certify that I am the Chief Appraiser forthe ent certify these figures to be correct and taken from the 2016 a	• —	 a portion of the above-named jur	risdiction, and I further
Chief Appraiser	-		

Form HOTCOG TxCDBG 2016-3: Engineer / Chief Elected Official Certification

Chief Elected Official	Date	Engineer	Date
In witness whereof, I have affixed	my signature and seal.		
the entire population of (c	city/county		
a target area of (city/coun	ty)		
I further certify that the proposed a	ctivities will directly im	pact the services received by	
I recognize that this information, a	long with the project des	scription, will be forwarded to TCE	Q for their review and concurrence.
TCEQ State Minimum St	andards for Wastewater	Systems (please attach and highlig	ht applicable portion)
TCEQ State Minimum St	andards for Water Syste	ems (please attach and highlight app	olicable portion)
TCEQ Notice of Violatio	n (please attach)		
	,		
TCEQ Notice of Enforce	ment (nlease attach)		
TCEQ Agreed Order (ple	ase attach)		
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	1.1	tion for funding under the TxCDBC eficient conditions which persist as	G Community Development Program in of the time of this writing: