



MIDDLE RIO GRANDE
REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE GUIDEBOOK
2017-2018 TxCDBG PROGRAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I - INTRODUCTION 2
PART II - MRGDC RRC APPROVED ACTIONS 3
PART III - MRGDC RRC SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVE SCORING CRITERIA..... 4
PART IV - MRGDC RRC Objective Scoring Criteria 5

PART I - INTRODUCTION

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE Guidebook

2017-2018 TEXAS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

The Middle Rio Grande Regional Review Committee (RRC) Guidebook has been prepared in accordance with the 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 Middle Rio Grande Development Council (MRGDC) region with the application guidelines necessary to be scored under the Middle Rio Grande RRC scoring criteria.

Any questions regarding the RRC or the Guidebook should be directed in writing after the Middle Rio Grande Area RRC Guidebook has been published in the website of the Texas Department of Agriculture (TDA) to:

Suzanne Barnard, Director
Community Development
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 - MRGDC RRC APPROVED ACTIONS

1. The MRGDC RRC held its required Public Hearing on June 22, 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 Texas Department of Agriculture (TDA) as support staff to develop and disseminate the RRC Guidebook.
3. The RRC established the maximum grant amounts for the region based upon the population of a county. Applicants can apply up to the following grant amounts associated with the population of the county in which they are located:

County Population	Maximum Grant Amount
>45,000	\$450,000
>20,000 and ≤45,000	\$350,000
≤20,000	\$275,000

**Per 2010 Census Data

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

PART III - MRGDC RRC SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVE SCORING CRITERIA

Total MRGDC RRC Points: 180 points

1. Project Type: **Total points 90**

- First priority - **70 points**
- Second priority - **50 points**
- Third priority - **45 points**
- Fourth Priority – **30 points**

2. Local Effort: **Total points 30**

- What is the applicant's match amount?
Maximum points 30

3. Merits of the Project: **Total points 30**

- What is the low-to-moderate income percentage for the beneficiaries submitted in the 2015-2016 CD application?
Maximum points 30

4. Was the applicant been funded in the previous Community Development Fund application cycle? **Maximum points 30**

PART IV - MRGDC RRC Objective Scoring Criteria

MAXIMUM TOTAL OBJECTIVE SCORE POSSIBLE: 180

- * PROJECTS THAT INCLUDE MULTIPLE PRIORITY LEVELS MUST BE PRORATED BASED ON PERCENTAGE OF ALL TXCDBG DOLLARS.
- * PROJECTS THAT INCLUDE MULTIPLE JURISDICTIONS – THE APPLICANT WITH THE LARGEST PERCENTAGE (%) OF BENEFICIARIES WILL BE CONSIDERED THE APPLICANT OF RECORD

PROJECT PRIORITY – Total Points 90

1. Is the project categorized as a first priority, second priority, third priority or fourth priority?
(Maximum 60 Points) SCORE: _____

Priority Levels	Activity	90 Points Possible
First Priority	Water, Wastewater, Yard Lines, Roads, Streets, Drainage, Septic Tanks	90
Second Priority	Fire Protection Facilities and Equipment, Emergency Medical Equipment	70
Third Priority	Community Centers, Senior Centers, Parks and Recreation	45
Fourth Priority	All Other Projects	30

METHODOLOGY:

Table 1 will be reviewed to determine the appropriate project type category and points will be assigned. Projects that include multiple priority levels must be prorated based on percentage of TXCDBG dollars. Using as a base figure the TXCDBG funds requested minus the TXCDBG funds requested for administration, a percentage of the total TXCDBG construction and engineering dollars of each activity is calculated. (Engineering dollars will be assigned either on a pro-rata basis or on the actual dollars applicable to each activity) Administration dollars requested is applied on a pro-rata basis to these amounts. The percentage of the total TXCDBG dollars for each activity is then multiplied by the appropriate score and the sum of the calculations determines the score. Related acquisition costs are applied to the associated activity.

EXAMPLE: *The Emerald City is applying for construction funds totaling \$500,000.00 of which \$250,000 will be used for sewer system improvement (First Priority) and \$250,000.00 will be used for building a community center (Second Priority). Engineering and administrative costs will be prorated as provided in the methodology above. The related acquisition costs are applied to the associated activity. The maximum points allowed are as follows:*

- *Sewer project (First Priority) = \$250,000.00 = 50% Total Funding
Therefore, 50% of 90 Maximum points are allowed for this portion of the project of $90 \times .50 = 45$ maximum points can be given.*
- *Community Center (Second Priority) = \$250,000.00 or 50% of Total Funding. Therefore, 50% of 45 Maximum points are allowed for this portion of the project of $45 \times .50 = 22.5$ maximum points can be given.*
- *Total maximum points that can be scored for this project are:
 $45+22.5 = 67.5$ Total Points*

Data Source: As Stated Below

CD Application Table 1 Verified By TDA

Information Needed From Applicant To Score:

List of Projects Submitted By Type As Stated in Table 1 (list as many as applicable)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

LOCAL EFFORT – Total Points 30

2. What is the applicant’s match amount?
[Match Amount / TxCDBG Funds Requested]

(Maximum 30 Points)

SCORE: _____

METHODOLOGY:

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 of 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.

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 30 points
- Match at least 4% but less than 5% of grant request 24 points
- Match at least 3%, but less than 4% of grant request 18 points
- Match at least 2%, but less than 3% of grant request 12 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 30 points
- Match at least 7.5% but less than 10% of grant request 24 points
- Match at least 5%, but less than 7.5% of grant request 18 points
- Match at least 2.5%, but less than 5% of grant request 12 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 30 points
- Match at least 11.5% but less than 15% of grant request 24 points
- Match at least 7.5%, but less than 11.5% of grant request 18 points
- Match at least 3.5%, but less than 7.5% of grant request 12 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 30 points
- Match at least 15% but less than 20% of grant request 24 points
- Match at least 10%, but less than 15% of grant request 18 points
- Match at least 5%, but less than 10% of grant request 12 points
- Match less than 5% of grant request 0 points

Data Source: As Stated Below

Applicant Match: SF 424, and Applicant's Resolution or 3rd Party Commitment Letter

Population: 2010 Census Data Summary File 1 Table P1

County Unincorporated Water/Sewer Beneficiaries:
CD Application Table 1 Verified By TDA

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Applicant Population: _____

County Unincorporated Water/Sewer Beneficiaries: _____

Applicant TXCDBG Amount: \$ _____

Applicant Match From All Sources: \$ _____

MERITS OF THE PROJECT - 30 Points

3. What is the low-to-moderate income percentage for the beneficiaries submitted in the 2017-2018 CD application?

(Maximum 30 Points)

Score: _____

METHODOLOGY:

Applicants are required to meet the 51% low/moderate income benefit for each activity as a threshold requirement. This score is determined by dividing the number of low/moderate income project beneficiaries submitted in the 2017-2018 CD application by the total number of project beneficiaries.

Projects will be awarded points as follows:

- = to 51% 0 Points
- > than 51% or < than 60% 15 Points
- = to or > than 60% 30 Points

Data Source: As Stated Below

CD Application Table 1 Verified By TDA

Information Needed From Applicant To Score:

Total No. Beneficiaries: _____

No. of Low/Moderate Income Beneficiaries: _____

PREVIOUS FUNDING - 30 Points

4 Was the applicant been funded in the previous Community Development Fund application cycle?

(Maximum 30 Points)

SCORE: _____

- a. The applicant received full or partial funding in the 2015-2016 CD cycle: 0 points
- b. The applicant did NOT receive funding in the 2015-2016 CD cycle: 30 points

Methodology:

Data source documentation will be reviewed and points will be assigned. Projects that include multiple jurisdictions - the applicant who would score the highest on this criteria will be considered the applicant of record.

Data Source: TDA Tracking System Report

Information Needed From Applicant to Score: Funded in Previous CD application cycles:

Funded in 2015-2016 CD application cycle? YES_____ NO_____