Staff will use the following criteria to score each CDBG/ESG/HOME application. It will be worth a max of 70 pts. out of 100 pts. possible, with a max of 30 pts. coming from the Housing & Community Development Advisory Boards (HCDAB) score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score (Total possible score of 70 points)

Overall Comments:

Date: Rater Name:
1. MESA CITY COUNCIL STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

Annually the Mayor and City Council share their vision and goals for Mesa which are a guide for aligning resources. Applications should align with and address with one or more of the City’s Strategic Priorities.

5 pts  **Maximum Impact:** The project is consistent with and responds to three of the identified Strategic Priorities.

3-4 pts  **Substantial Impact:** The project is consistent with the City Council’s Strategic Priorities and responds to two of the identified Priorities.

1-2 pts  **Moderate Impact:** The project is consistent with the City Council’s Strategic Priorities and responds to one of the identified Priorities.

0 pts  **No Impact:** The project is not consistent with the City Council’s Strategic Priorities and does not respond to one or more of the Priorities.

**Comments:**

2. PROJECT READINESS

Projects are evaluated for timely implementation and funds expended. Projects must be capable of expending the Grant Funds within 18 months. Factors considered include (a) Project Timeline (b) availability of all resources (including gap funding from other sources). Special note: HOME projects must be committed within two years from the program year start (July 1st) and must be expended within five years.

16-20 pts  **Maximum Pace:** The project schedule is comprehensive and appears to indicate that the project is ready to start upon contract execution and is likely to be completed 12 months.

11-15 pts  **Substantial Pace:** The project schedule shows the project is ready to start within one month after contract execution and appears to show 12 month or longer to completed.

6-10 pts  **Moderate Pace:** The project schedule appears to show the project will not be completed within the first 18 month of contract execution.

1-5 pts.  **Minimal Pace:** The project start date appears unclear and the schedule is inadequate due to key information is missing.

0 pts  Project schedule is inadequate and/or time periods are unrealistic or not achievable.

**Comments:**
3. RESULTS / OUTCOMES

The project impact will be evaluated based on the Community Development Need and Project Description narratives. Applications should clearly describe the project results and services to the target population.

12-15 pts  **Maximum Impact:** The application clearly describes the significance of the need and substantiating this need.

8-11 pts  **Moderate Impact:** The application explains the need and provides statistics data related to the need. The proposed activity would have a major impact on addressing the described need but would not completely resolve the problem.

3-7 pts  **Minimal Impact:** The application describes the need, but not clearly or completely and provides minimal or no supporting evidence related to the need. The proposed project would have some impact on addressing the described need.

0-2 pts  **Unknown Impact:** The proposed project does not clearly address how the described need would be addressed or the project would be ineffective in resolving the described need.

**Comments:**

3.1 Low/Moderate Income Persons Served

This section evaluates the effectiveness of the described services to low- and moderate-income persons.

5 pts  **Maximum Impact:** 100% of project targeted to serving low- and moderate-income persons.

4 pts  **Substantial Impact:** At least 85% of project targeted to serve low- and moderate-income persons.

3 pts  **Moderate Impact:** At least 70% targeted to serve low- and moderate-income persons.

2 pts  **Minimal Impact:** At least 51% of targeted to serve low- and moderate-income persons.

**Comments:**

4. CONSOLIDATED PLAN

5 pts  **Maximum Impact:** Project is consistent with the ConPlan. It supports a strategic goal, addresses the problem/need, and is an activity identified in the ConPlan. Information and supporting documentation provided in the application is comprehensive and provides reasonable and clear indication that the project is expected to completely satisfy an unmet HUD strategic goal and activity and will fully generate the expected outcome(s) as identified in the ConPlan.

4 pts  **Substantial Impact:** Project is consistent with the ConPlan. It supports a strategic goal, addresses the problem/need, and is an activity identified in the ConPlan. The information and supporting
documentation presented is not as clear and comprehensive, but it appears very probable that the project is expected to completely satisfy an unmet strategic goal and activity and will generate the expected outcome(s) as identified in the ConPlan.

3 pts  Moderate Impact: Project is consistent with the ConPlan. It supports a strategic goal, addresses the problem/need, and is an activity identified in the ConPlan. The information and supporting documentation presented is minimally sufficient; however, it also appears that it will only somewhat address and it is unclear as to the degree of which the project will satisfy an unmet HUD strategic goal and activity, and generate the expected outcome(s) as identified in the ConPlan.

2 pts  Minimal Impact: Project is consistent with the ConPlan. It supports a strategic goal, addresses the problem/need, and is an activity identified in the ConPlan. The information and supporting documentation presented is incomplete, inaccurate or contradictory to the need it proposes to address OR the ConPlan goal and expected outcome has already been fulfilled and/or the problem/need has already been addressed.

0 pts  No Impact: Project is inconsistent with the ConPlan (does not address a strategic goal, problem/need or activity identified in the ConPlan).

Comments:

5. PROPOSED BUDGET

Evaluating all project financial resources to ensure that the funding need to successfully complete the proposed project have been thoughtfully considered. Public Facilities rehabilitation or new construction budget factors include (a) availability and sufficiency of project resources from all sources, (b) financial support for the project in future years, (c) mathematical accuracy, cost reasonableness and other financial considerations. HOME regulations require a 25% match for every dollar in program funds awarded to a project.

9-10 pts  Budget appears complete, accurate, budget with detail and directly relate to the proposed activity. Other financial resources are needed and clearly identified. Those other financial resources are confirmed and secured with written commitments.

6-8 pts  Other financial resources are NOT needed to complete the project. The proposed project will be 100% funded with Mesa federal funds.

3-5 pts  Additional financial resources are needed and clearly identified in the application. However, these financial resources are NOT secured with written commitments. The applicant estimates they anticipate receiving written confirmation between application due date and funding availability July 1, 2021.

1-2 pts  Additional financial resources are needed and clearly identified in the application. However, these financial resources are NOT secured with written commitments. It’s unclear whether the applicant will obtain written confirmation by funding availability July 1, 2021.
### APPLICATION SCORING SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td>Budget appears <strong>incomplete</strong>, contains mathematical errors and costs are questionable or unclear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

### 6. AGENCY EXPERIENCE AND CAPACITY

Does the applicant have the managerial and technical capacity to administer the project in compliance with the CDBG, ESG or HOME Programs rules and regulations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-10 pts</td>
<td>Applicant appears to <strong>have the background and management capacity</strong>, professional experience and qualifications to successfully manage and complete the project. Applicant appears to document compliance with HUD requirements. Applicant has been in operation for <strong>10 or more</strong> years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 pts</td>
<td>Applicant appears to <strong>have the background and management capacity</strong>, professional experience and qualifications to successfully manage and complete the project. Applicant appears to document compliance with HUD requirements. Applicant has been in operation for <strong>5 or more</strong> years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 pts</td>
<td>Applicant appears to <strong>have some background</strong> and management capacity, professional experience and qualifications to successfully manage and complete the project. The applicant did NOT adequately describe how it will ensure the proposed project will comply with HUD requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1 pts</td>
<td>Applicant appears to <strong>have minimal background</strong> and management of federally funded activities and it’s unclear whether the activity would comply with HUD requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**