



Annette Gutierrez, Executive Director

**UPPER RIO GRANDE
REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE GUIDEBOOK
2019-2020 TxCDBG PROGRAM**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....2

II. Upper Rio Grande RRC Approved Actions.....3

III. Summary of Upper Rio Grande RRC Objective Scoring Criteria.....4

IV. Upper Rio Grande RRC Objective Scoring Criteria.....5

PART I - INTRODUCTION

UPPER RIO GRANDE REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE GUIDEBOOK

2019-2020 TEXAS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

The Upper Rio Grande Regional Review Committee (RRC) Guidebook has been prepared in accordance with the TxCDBG Action Plan and the 2019-2020 Regional Review Committee Scoring and Training Guidelines for the Community Development Fund. The Guidebook provides eligible applicants from the Upper Rio Grande region with the application guidelines necessary to be scored under the Upper Rio Grande RRC scoring criteria.

Any questions regarding the RRC or the Guidebook should be directed in writing after the Upper Rio Grande 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://www.texasagriculture.gov/>

PART II
UPPER RIO GRANDE
RRC APPROVED ACTIONS

1. The URG RRC held its required Public Hearing on June 12, 2018, 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 URG 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 URG RRC has established minimum/maximum grant amounts to be as follows:
Single jurisdiction applications- \$275,000
Multi-jurisdiction applications- \$350,000
4. The URG RRC did not establish set-asides for housing and non-border colonia projects.

**PART III
UPPER RIO GRANDE RRC
SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVE SCORING CRITERIA**

Total points by URG RRC **180 points**

1. Project Priorities: **Total points 70**
 - First priority - **70 points**
 - Second priority - **63 points**
 - Third priority - **49 points**
 - Fourth Priority - **42 points**

2. Need/Distress: **Total points 50**
 - What is the beneficiaries' low-to-moderate income percentage for the applicant's project as compared to the average low-to-moderate income percentage of all applicants?
Maximum points 50

3. Match/Leverage: **Total points 20**
 - What is the match amount?
Maximum points 20

4. Previous Funding **Total points 40**
 - Was applicant previously funded in the last CDBG biennium? (CD FY2017/2018)?
Maximum points 40

PART IV

**UPPER RIO GRANDE
RRC OBJECTIVE SCORING CRITERIA**

MAXIMUM TOTAL OBJECTIVE SCORE POSSIBLE: 180

PROJECT TYPE/PRIORITY – Total Points 70

1. Is the project categorized as one of the first priority activities for the region?
(70 Points Maximum)

Project is for Priority Activities as Listed Below:

- Water/Wastewater/Septic Tanks/Yard lines **70 Points**
- Streets/Drainage/Roads **63 Points**
- Basic Utilities **49 Points**
- All Other Activities **42 Points**

Projects that include multiple priority levels must be prorated based on percentage of TxCDBG dollars.

Data Source: Table 1 from TxCDBG application. The CD Application Table 1 verified by TDA will be reviewed to determine the appropriate project type category based on TxCDBG funds requested 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 for 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 pro-rata 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.

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. _____

NEED/DISTRESS - Total Points 50

1. What is the beneficiaries’ low-to-moderate income percentage for the applicant’s project as compared to the average low-to-moderate income percentage of all applicants? **(50 Points Maximum)**

Beneficiaries’ Low-to-Moderate Income Percentage (LMIP) may be determined by reviewing Table I – Benefit to Low and Moderate Income Persons from the CDBG application. Once this information is obtained for each applicant, the LMIP for each applicant is calculated by dividing the low/mod beneficiaries by the total number of beneficiaries. Once this has been determined, the average LMIP of the applicants is determined by dividing the sum of all LMIP’s by the number of applicants.

Next, a base is determined by multiplying the average LMIP by a constant such as 1.25 to represent 125%. The LMIP for each applicant is then divided by the base to determine the Factor.

Finally, to determine scores the Factor for each applicant is multiplied by the total maximum allowable points. Any applicants exceeding the total allowed points will be capped at the maximum.

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Table 1 - Number of low-to-moderate income beneficiaries: _____

Total number of beneficiaries: _____

Low-to-moderate income percentage: _____

The following example is based on 2009’s TxCDBG applications:

- The average LMIP of the applicants is calculated once the LMIP has been determined for each applicant (13.05/17 = .7676).
- A constant of 1.25 is then multiplied by the average LMIP to determine the base (.7676 * 1.25 = .9596).
- The LMIP of each applicant is then divided by the base to determine their Factor.
- Finally, scores for each applicant are determined by multiplying each applicant’s Factor by the maximum available points for this scoring criterion.

| City/County | Total Benes | LMI Benes | LMIP | Factor | Score |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------|--------|
| Alpine | 44 | 39 | 0.89 | 0.9275 | 46.375 |
| Anthony | 2,389 | 1,271 | 0.53 | 0.5523 | 27.615 |
| Brewster County | 254 | 223 | 0.89 | 0.9275 | 46.375 |
| Clint | 37 | 23 | 0.62 | 0.6461 | 32.305 |
| Culberson County | 3,309 | 1,933 | 0.58 | 0.6044 | 30.220 |
| Dell City | 315 | 203 | 0.64 | 0.6670 | 33.350 |
| El Paso County | 166 | 166 | 1.00 | 1.0421 | 50.000 |
| Horizon City | 1,768 | 1,510 | 0.87 | 0.9067 | 45.335 |
| Hudspeth County | 45 | 42 | 0.93 | 0.9692 | 48.460 |
| Jeff Davis County | 788 | 577 | 0.73 | 0.7608 | 38.040 |
| Marfa | 1,807 | 1,091 | 0.60 | 0.6253 | 31.265 |
| Presidio City | 124 | 92 | 0.74 | 0.7712 | 38.560 |
| Presidio County | 338 | 336 | 0.99 | 1.0317 | 50.000 |
| Socorro | 2,711 | 1,616 | 0.67 | 0.6982 | 34.910 |
| Valentine | 152 | 122 | 0.80 | 0.8337 | 41.685 |
| Van Horn | 2,435 | 1,347 | 0.57 | 0.5940 | 29.70 |
| Vinton | 47 | 47 | 1.00 | 1.0421 | 50.000 |
| TOTALS | 16,729 | 10,638 | 13.0500 | | |
| Average (13.05/17): | | | 0.7676 | | |
| Base (1.25*Average): | | | 0.9596 | | |

Data Source: As Stated Below

Beneficiaries LMIP: CD Application Table 1 As Verified by TDA

MATCH/LEVERAGE – Total Points 20

3. What is the match amount? [Match Amount / TxCDBG Funds Requested]
(20 Points Maximum)

If the project is for beneficiaries for the entire city/county, the total population of the city/county is used. For city/county applications stating project activities for a target population, the category is based on the actual verified number of beneficiaries to be served by the project activities.

Applicant(s) actual number of beneficiaries is equal to or less than 1,000:

- Match equal to or greater than 5% of grant request 20 points
- Match at least 4% but less than 5% of grant request 14 points
- Match at least 3%, but less than 4% of grant request 7 points
- Match at least 2%, but less than 3% of grant request 4 points
- Match less than 2% of grant request 0 points

Applicant(s) actual number of beneficiaries is equal to or less than 2,000 but over 1,000:

- Match equal to or greater than 10% of grant request 20 points
- Match at least 7.5% but less than 10% of grant request 14 points
- Match at least 5%, but less than 7.5% of grant request 7 points
- Match at least 2.5%, but less than 5% of grant request 4 points
- Match less than 2.5% of grant request 0 points

Applicant(s) actual number of beneficiaries is greater than 2,000:

- Match equal to or greater than 15% of grant request 20 points
- Match at least 11.5% but less than 15% of grant request 14 points
- Match at least 7.5%, but less than 11.5% of grant request 7 points
- Match at least 3.5%, but less than 7.5% of grant request 4 points
- Match less than 3.5% of grant request 0 points

Data Source: As Stated Below

Applicant Match: SF 424, Resolution, and 3rd Party Letter of Commitment

Beneficiaries: CD Application Table 1 Verified By TDA

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Number of Beneficiaries: _____

Applicant TxCDBG Funds Requested: \$ _____

Applicant Match Amount from All Sources: \$ _____

Previously Funded– Total Points 40

4. Was applicant previously funding in the last CDBG biennium (FY2017/2018)?
(40 Points Maximum)

Funded in the 2017/2018 cycle?

Yes **0 points**

No **40 points**

List Contract No. _____