

Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council

Regional Review Committee Guidebook 2015-2016 TxCDBG Program



301 W. Railroad St. Weslaco, Texas 78596
tel: (956)682-3481 fax: (956)682-3295

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	3
II.	RRC Approved Actions	4
III.	Summary of Objective Scoring Criteria	5
IV.	Objective Scoring Criteria	6
V.	Attachment - Resolution	11

PART I - INTRODUCTION

Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council Regional Review Committee Guidebook

2015-2016 Texas Community Development Block Grant Program

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

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

Suzanne Barnard, State Director
Community Development
Texas Department of Agriculture
P.O. Box 12877
Austin, TX 78711

E-mail address: Suzanne.Barnard@TexasAgriculture.gov

TDA website: www.texasagriculture.gov

PART II
LRGVDC
RRC APPROVED ACTIONS

- 1) The LRGVDC RRC held its required Public Hearing on Thursday, July 10, 2014, to hear public comments on the proposed objective scoring criteria and to adopt regional priorities, scoring factors, procedures and other matters under the 2015/2016 TxCDBG Community Development (CD) Fund.

- 2) The RRC authorized the Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council as staff support to compile and distribute a guidebook concerning the 2015/2016 Regional Review Committee Role and Requirements. (See Attached Resolution). The LRGVDC RRC selected the LRGVDC staff to calculate the LRGVDC scores and to provide other RRC administrative support.

- 3) RRC actions for single and multi-jurisdiction applications are addressed in question 3 (Regional Funding Agreement) of the Scoring Criteria.

- 4) The LRGVDC RRC did not establish a housing set-aside.

**PART III
LRGVDC RRC
SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVE SCORING CRITERIA**

Total points by the LRGVDC: 110 points

1. Project Type/Priority – Total points 50

First Priority - Water & Sewer, Septic System & Yardlines	50 points
Second Priority – Housing Rehabilitation, Drainage, Street & Fire Protection	45 Points
Third Priority – Community Centers, Parks & Neighborhood Centers	20 Points
Fourth Priority – All Other Projects	10 Points

2. Cost Per Beneficiary (CBP) – Total points 15

- What is the cost per beneficiary for each applicant’s jurisdiction in comparison to the average cost per beneficiary for all applicants?

3. Regional Funding Agreement – Total points 25

- Is the applicant applying for less than or equal to the estimated regional CD Fund grant maximum amount per eligible LRGVDC local government as notified by staff support or RRC?

4. Applicant’s Match Amount – Total points 20

- What is the applicant’s match amount?
 - If the applicant’s match is 20% or more of the total grant **20 points**
 - If the applicant’s match is 15% but less than 20% of the total grant **10 points**
 - If the applicant’s match is 10% but less than 15% of the total grant **5 points**
 - If the applicant’s match is less than 10% of the total grant **0 points**

**PART IV
LRGVDC RRC
OBJECTIVE SCORING CRITERIA**

**Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council
2015/2016 Texas Community Development Program
Scoring Criteria**

Project Type/Priority – Total Points 50

1. Is the project categorized as a first priority, second priority, third or fourth RRC priority?
(Maximum 50 Points)

Methodology: Table 1 of the CD Application will be reviewed to determine the appropriate project priority type category for each activity identified.

Table 1 will then be reviewed to identify construction dollars per project priority type. The appropriate project priority type points will be assigned based on the percentage of construction dollars to the TxCDBG funds requested. The percentage is calculated by dividing the construction dollars per activity by the total TxCDBG funds requested. (Related acquisition costs are applied to the associated activity.) The following formula will be used: $\text{construction dollars per activity} / \text{total TxCDBG funds requested} = \text{percent construction dollars per activity to the TxCDBG funds requested}$. The percentage of the construction dollars per activity to the total TxCDBG dollars is then multiplied by the appropriate priority points and points are assigned.

Projects that include multiple priority levels, the percentage of the construction dollars per activity to the total TxCDBG dollars for each activity is multiplied by the appropriate priority points and the sum of the calculations determines the score.

Project Types:

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. First Priority – Water & Sewer, Septic System & Yardlines
(Portion of line that goes from meter to the household) | 1. First Priority Projects | <u>50 Points</u> |
| 2. Second Priority – Housing Rehabilitation, Drainage, Street
& Fire Protection (Fire truck, fire house & equipment) | 2. Second Priority Projects | <u>45 Points</u> |
| 3. Third Priority - Community Centers, Parks &
Neighborhood Centers | 3. Third Priority Projects | <u>20 Points</u> |
| 4. Fourth Priority - All Other Projects | 4. Fourth Priority Projects | <u>10 Points</u> |

Data Source: As stated below

RRC Project Priorities: RRC Guidebook

Project Type: 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. _____
4. _____

EXAMPLE

Applicant	Project Amount	Adm/Engineering Cost	1st Priority	2nd Priority	% of 1st Priority	% of 2nd Priority	1st Priority Score	2nd Priority Score	Total Score
Applicant A	289,860	-----	289,860.	-----	100%	-----	-----	-----	50
Applicant B	289,860	-----	200,000.	89,860	69%	31%	34.5	13.9	48.4
Applicant C	289,860	24,000	265,860.	-----	92%	-----	46	-----	46

Cost Per Beneficiary (CPB) – Total Points 15

2. What is the cost per beneficiary for each applicant’s jurisdiction in comparison to the cost per beneficiary for all applicants? **(Maximum Points 15)**

Methodology: This score is determined by comparing the applicant’s cost per beneficiary (CPB) to the cost per beneficiary for all applicants. The calculation considers the difference in the applicant’s cost per beneficiary to the average cost per beneficiary for all applicants. The CPB is determined by dividing the total TxCDBG project amount by the total number of beneficiaries (Project Amount / Total Benes) covered by the project. The percent “% of CPB” is then determined by dividing the applicant’s project CPB by the sum of the CPB of all applicants (Cost Per Bene / Sum of Cost Per Benes). Next, using one (1) as a base value, subtract the % CPB from one to determine the Absolute Beneficiary Score (ABS CPB = 1 – “% of CPB”).

Finally, the ABS CPB can be used as a final score per applicant if using this scoring criteria as a tie breaker question only; or if this criteria is to be used as a weighted scoring criteria, multiply the ABS CPB by the total maximum score for this question to determine the final score for each applicant (ABS CPB * Total Points Available for this question).

EXAMPLE – Any applicants exceeding the total allowed points will be capped at the maximum points.

<i>Cost Per Beneficiary</i>	Maximum Total Points Available: 15
-----------------------------	---

Applicant	Project Amount	Total Benes	Cost Per Bene	% of CPB	ABS CPB	Tot Score
Applicant A	\$289,860	3,500	\$82.82	.0297	.9703	14.55
Applicant B	\$289,860	120	\$2415.5	.8663	.1337	2.0
Applicant C	\$289,860	1000	\$289.86	.1039	.8961	13.44

Sums	\$2,788.18 1.0000
------	------------------------

*(Project Amount / Total Benes) | (Cost Per Bene / Sum of Cost Per Benes) | (1 - % of CPB) | (ABS CPB * Total Points Available)*

Data Source: As Stated Below

CD Application Table 1 Verified By TDA

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Total No. of Beneficiaries: _____

Total Project Amount TxCDBG Only: \$_____

Regional Funding Agreement – Total Points 25

3. Is the applicant applying for less than or equal to the estimated regional CD Fund grant maximum amount per eligible LRGVDC local government as notified by staff support or RRC?
(Mark As Appropriate): Yes _____ No _____ **(Maximum Points 25)**

Definition: Eligible LRGVDC local government (to include multi-jurisdictions) – A local government located in the LRGVDC region that is eligible to apply under the TxCDBG Program, either as a single applicant or as a participating jurisdiction in a multi-jurisdiction application.

Methodology: The regional CD Fund grant maximum amount per eligible LRGVDC local government is determined by estimating the 2015-2016 CD Fund regional allocation for the region and then dividing the estimated 2015-2016 CD Fund regional allocation by the number of eligible local governments in the LRGVDC region. (Formula: estimated 2015-2016 regional CD Fund regional allocation/number of eligible LRGDC local governments = estimated regional CD Fund grant maximum amount per eligible LRGVDC local government). The estimated 2015-2016 CD Fund regional allocation is based on the 2013 and 2014 CD LRGVDC regional allocation. The RRC support staff will distribute the estimated regional CD Fund grant maximum amount per eligible local government as soon as regional allocation figures are released by TDA. The estimated amount and calculations will also be posted on the LRGVDC’s website at www.lrgvdc.org.

Yes 25 points No 0 points

Data Source: SF 424

Information Needed From Applicant to Score

CD Fund Application Grant Request Amount: \$_____

Applicant’s Match Amount – Total Points 20

4. What is the applicant’s match amount? **(Maximum 20 points)**

Methodology: The applicant’s match percentage of the total CD Fund grant request is calculated by dividing the applicant’s match by the CD Fund grant request (applicant match/CD Fund grant request = applicant match percentage). Then points are assigned based on the appropriate scoring category.

- If the applicant’s match is 20% or more of the total grant 20 points
- If the applicant’s match is 15% but less than 20% of total grant 10 points
- If the applicant’s match is 10% but less than 15% of total grant 5 points
- If the applicant’s match is less than 10% of total grant 0 points

Data Source: As Stated Below

Applicant Match: SF 424 and Applicant Resolution or 3rd Party Commitment letter

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Applicant TxCDBG Amount: \$_____

Applicant Match From All Sources: \$_____

EXAMPLE

Applicant	Total Amount	Grant Request	Applicant’s Match	Percentage Match	Total Score
Applicant A	347,832	289,860	57,972	20%	20
Applicant B	319,860	289,860	30,000	10.3%	5

TOTAL RRC POINTS 110

Attachment – Resolution

RESOLUTION

A Resolution of the Regional Review Committee (RRC) designating the Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council (LRGVDC) Staff as the Staff Support for the 2015/2016 Texas Community Development Program.

WHEREAS, the Regional Review Committee is responsible for establishing scoring procedures for the review of applications for the Community Development Fund and the Community Development Supplement Fund;

WHEREAS, the Regional Review Committee is responsible for hearing appeals which result at the regional level; and,

WHEREAS, the Regional Review Committee may also review and comment on applications for other TDA Funds.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Lower Rio Grande Valley Development Council (LRGVDC) will serve as the designated staff support for all Regional Review Committee Activities.

Adopted by the Regional Review Committee at its Regional Review Committee Meeting held on this 10th day of July, 2014.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Steve Brewer". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Steve Brewer, Chairman