



MIDDLE RIO GRANDE
REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE GUIDEBOOK
2015-2016 TxCDBG PROGRAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Introduction..... 2
- II. MRGDC RRC Approved Actions 3
- III. Summary of MRGDC RRC Objective Scoring Criteria 4
- IV. MRGDC RRC Objective Scoring Criteria..... 5

PART I - INTRODUCTION

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE GUIDEBOOK

2015-2016 TEXAS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

The Middle Rio Grande 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 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.Barndard@TexasAgriculture.gov
TDA website: <http://texasagriculture.gov/>**

PART II
MRGDC
RRC APPROVED ACTIONS

1. The MRGDC RRC held its required Public Hearing on July 16, 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 Texas Department of Agriculture (TDA) as support staff to develop and disseminate the RRC Guidebook. The RRC selected Concho Valley Council of Governments as support staff to calculate the RRC scores and provide other administrative RRC support for Program Year 2015.

3. The RRC established the maximum grant amounts for the region:
 - Based on the regional 2014 allocation per county (geographical area not government entity).

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: 120 points

1. Project Type: Total points 50

- First priority - **50 points**
- Second priority - **35 points**
- Third priority - **20 points**
- Fourth Priority – **10 points**

2. Local Effort: Total points 10

- What is the applicant's match amount?
Maximum points 10

3. Merits of the Project: Total points 10

- What is the low-to-moderate income percentage for the beneficiaries submitted in the 2015-2016 CD application?
Maximum points 10

4. Regional Funding Agreement: Total points 50

- Is the applicant jurisdiction applying under the 2015-2016 CD Fund biennial competition for an amount that is less than or equal to the maximum amount allocated to each county (geographical area not government entity) by the regional county allocation formula?
Maximum points 50

**PART IV
MRGDC
RRC Objective Scoring Criteria**

MAXIMUM TOTAL OBJECTIVE SCORE POSSIBLE: 120

- * **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 50

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

Priority Levels	Activity	50 Points Possible
First Priority	Water, Wastewater, Yard Lines, Roads, Streets, Drainage, Septic Tanks	50
Second Priority	Fire Protection Facilities and Equipment, Emergency Medical Equipment	35
Third Priority	Community Centers, Senior Centers, Parks and Recreation	20
Fourth Priority	All Other Projects	10

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 50 Maximum points are allowed for this portion of the project of $50 \times .50 = 25$ maximum points can be given.*
- *Community Center (Second Priority) = \$250,000.00 or 50% of Total Funding. Therefore, 50% of 35 Maximum points are allowed for this portion of the project of $35 \times .50 = 17.5$ maximum points can be given.*
- *Total maximum points that can be scored for this project are:
 $25 + 17.5 = 42.5$ 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 10

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

(Maximum 10 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 10 points
- Match at least 4% but less than 5% of grant request 8 points
- Match at least 3%, but less than 4% of grant request 6 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) 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 10 points
- Match at least 7.5% but less than 10% of grant request 8 points
- Match at least 5%, but less than 7.5% of grant request 6 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) 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 10 points
- Match at least 11.5% but less than 15% of grant request 8 points
- Match at least 7.5%, but less than 11.5% of grant request 6 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

Applicant(s) population over 5,000 according to the 2000 Census:

- Match equal to or greater than 20% of grant request 10 points
- Match at least 15% but less than 20% of grant request 8 points
- Match at least 10%, but less than 15% of grant request 6 points
- Match at least 5%, but less than 10% of grant request 4 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 1Table 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 - 10 Points

3. What is the low-to-moderate income percentage for the beneficiaries submitted in the 2015-2016 CD application?

(Maximum 10 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 2015-2016 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% 5 Points
- = to or > than 60% 10 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: _____

REGIONAL FUNDING AGREEMENT - 50 Points

4. Is the applicant jurisdiction applying under the 2015-2016 CD Fund biennial competition for an amount that is less than or equal to the maximum amount allocated to each county (geographical area not government entity) by the regional county allocation formula?

(Maximum 50 Points)

SCORE: _____

Yes: 50 Points

No: 0 Points

METHODOLOGY:

The 2015-2016 CD Fund estimated regional amount allocation by county is based on the MRGDC's 2014 TxCDBG regional allocation dollars. The RRC support staff will be responsible for distributing the estimated 2015-2016 CD Fund regional amount by county (geographical area not governmental entity) prior to November 10, 2014. To determine the 2015-2016 estimated regional allocation by county (geographical area not governmental entity), the following regional county allocation formula will be used:

- 25% of the region's funds will be allocated on the basis of each county's pro rata share of the number of persons below the poverty level
- 25% of the region's funds will be allocated on the basis of each county's pro rata share of the percentage of persons below the poverty level
- 25% of the region's funds will be allocated on the basis of each county's pro rata share of the number of persons unemployed
- 25% of the region's funds will be allocated on the basis of each county's pro rata share of the percentage of persons unemployed

The RRC support staff will distribute the estimated 2015-2016 CD Fund regional amount no later than November 10, 2014.

Data Source: As Stated Below

Amount Applied For: Standard Form 424 and Resolution

Poverty Persons and Population: 2010 Census Data and the American Community

Survey 2012 5-year Estimate B17001

Unemployment Figures: TWC Tracer for 2013 Annual Data

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Amount of TXCDBG Funds Requested: \$ _____