



State of Texas CDBG-MIT Action Plan: Supplemental Material

2015 Floods State Mitigation Competition

Applicant Eligibility and Scoring Criteria





Table of Contents

A) Eligible Applicants	1
B) Eligible Applicant Areas	2
C) 2015 Floods State Mitigation Competition Scoring Criteria	3
1) County Composite Disaster Index.....	5
2) Social Vulnerability Index.....	7
3) Per Capita Market Value	10
4) LMI National Objective	12
5) Project Type Identified in Local Adopted Plan.....	13
6) Management Capacity	14
7) Project Impact.....	20
8) Leverage	22
9) Tie-breaker: Higher Poverty Rate	23
D) 2015 Floods State Mitigation Competition Eligible Activities.....	25
E) 2015 Floods State Mitigation Competition Ineligible Activities	26
F) Application Selection Process Example.....	28



A) Eligible Applicants

2015 Floods State Competition Eligible Applicants
Cities
Counties
Indian Tribes
Council of Governments

Entities may coordinate activities and submit a joint project that crosses jurisdictional boundaries. Each applicant may submit a total of two applications, whether applying as the lone applicant or jointly with another jurisdiction(s). The city of Houston and the city of San Marcos are ineligible to apply for the 2015 Floods State Mitigation Competition as they each received a direct HUD CDBG-MIT allocation related to the 2015 flooding events.



B) Eligible Applicant Areas

2015 Floods State Mitigation Competition					
HUD MID Counties	State MID Counties				
Harris	Angelina	Coryell	Hall	McLennan	Starr
Hays	Archer	Dallas	Hardin	Milam	Tarrant
Hidalgo	Atascosa	Delta	Harrison	Montague	Throckmorton
Travis	Austin	Denton	Hartley	Montgomery	Tom Green
	Bastrop	DeWitt	Henderson	Nacogdoches	Trinity
	Baylor	Dickens	Hill	Navarro	Tyler
	Blanco	Duval	Hood	Newton	Uvalde
	Bosque	Eastland	Hopkins	Nueces	Van Zandt
	Bowie	Edwards	Houston	Orange	Victoria
	Brazoria	Ellis	Jack	Palo Pinto	Walker
	Brown	Erath	Jasper	Parker	Waller
	Burleson	Fannin	Jim Wells	Polk	Washington
	Caldwell	Fayette	Johnson	Real	Wharton
	Callahan	Fort Bend	Jones	Red River	Wichita
	Cameron	Frio	Kaufman	Refugio	Willacy
	Cass	Gaines	Kendall	Robertson	Williamson
	Cherokee	Galveston	Lamar	Rusk	Wilson
	Clay	Garza	Lee	Sabine	Wise
	Collingsworth	Gillespie	Leon	San Augustine	Young
	Colorado	Gonzales	Liberty	San Jacinto	Zavala
	Comal	Grayson	Lubbock	Shelby	
	Comanche	Grimes	Lynn	Smith	
	Cook	Guadalupe	Madison	Somervell	



C) 2015 Floods State Mitigation Competition Scoring Criteria

Question(s)	Criteria	Maximum Points	Self-Score
What is the project service area's Composite Disaster Index?	County Composite Disaster Index	10 Points Possible	
	<i>Top 10%</i>	<i>10 Points</i>	
	<i>Top 25%</i>	<i>8 Points</i>	
	<i>Top 75%</i>	<i>5 Points</i>	
	<i>Bottom 25%</i>	<i>2 Points</i>	
	<i>Bottom 10%</i>	<i>0 Points</i>	
	<i>Prorated CDI Rank</i>	<i>Calculated Points</i>	
What is the project service area's Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI)?	Social Vulnerability Index	10 Points Possible	
	<i>High</i>	<i>10 Points</i>	
	<i>Medium High</i>	<i>8 Points</i>	
	<i>Medium</i>	<i>5 Points</i>	
	<i>Medium Low</i>	<i>2 Points</i>	
	<i>Low</i>	<i>0 Points</i>	
	<i>Prorated SoVI Rank</i>	<i>Calculated Points</i>	
What is the project service area's Per Capita Market Value?	Per Capita Market Value	10 Points Possible	
	<i>Less than \$40,000.00</i>	<i>10 Points</i>	
	<i>\$40,000.01 - \$65,000.00</i>	<i>8 Points</i>	
	<i>\$65,000.01 - \$100,000.00</i>	<i>5 Points</i>	
	<i>\$100,000.01 - \$250,000.00</i>	<i>2 Points</i>	
	<i>\$250,000.01 or greater</i>	<i>0 Points</i>	
Does the project meet the low-to moderate-income (LMI) HUD National Objective?	LMI National Objective	20 Points Possible	
	Project meets LMI national objective	<i>20 Points</i>	
	Project does not meet LMI national objective	<i>0 Points</i>	
Is the project type identified in a Local Adopted Plan?	Project type Identified in Local Adopted Plan	5 Points Possible	
	Project type identified in local adopted plan	<i>5 Points</i>	
	Project type not identified	<i>0 Points</i>	
What is the applicant's management capacity?	Management Capacity	15 Points Possible	
	No CDBG-DR contracts with GLO (management capacity assessment)	<i>Up to 15 Points</i>	



Question(s)	Criteria	Maximum Points	Self-Score
	Performance on GLO CDBG-DR contract(s), programs and/or projects	<i>Up to 15 Points</i>	
What is the total project application amount per total project beneficiaries?	Project Impact	25 Points Possible	
	Total project application amount per total project beneficiaries	<i>15 Points</i>	
What is the percentage of project beneficiaries out of the total population within the applying jurisdiction(s)?	Percentage of total project beneficiaries out of the total population within a jurisdiction(s)	<i>10 Points</i>	
What percentage of project costs being requested are coming from non-CDBG funding sources?	Leverage	5 Points Possible	
	Non-CDBG Leverage (a minimum value of 1% of the CDBG-MIT funds requested)	<i>5 Points</i>	
Total Possible Points		100 Possible Points	
Tie Breaker: Higher Poverty Rate			

*Applications that do not score a minimum of 65 points will only be considered after all applications scoring greater than this amount have been funded.



1) County Composite Disaster Index

Data Source: Composite Disaster Index (CDI) Score by County.

Maximum Points: 10 Points

Rank 5	Top 10%	10 Points
Rank 4	Top 25%	8 Points
Rank 3	Top 75%	5 Points
Rank 2	Bottom 25%	2 Points
Rank 1	Bottom 10%	0 Points
Multi-County Project	Prorated CDI rank	Calculated Points

A county placed in the “Top 10%” (Rank 5) of the Composite Disaster Index indicates that this location is in the most vulnerable area(s) for natural hazards within Texas.

Methodology:

Method 1.

- If the proposed project service area is in one (1) county, the CDI rank will be that of the county where the project service area is located.
- If the proposed project service area is in multiple counties and have the same CDI rank, the CDI rank will be that of the counties.

Steps for Method 1:

1. Identify which county or counties the project beneficiaries are located.
2. If the project beneficiaries are in one county use the county’s CDI rank.
3. If the project beneficiaries are located in more than one county but all the counties CDI ranks are the same use the same CDI rank.

Method 2.

- If the proposed project service area is within multiple counties with different CDI ranks, the overall project CDI rank will be calculated as a multi-county prorated CDI rank based on project beneficiaries between the multiple county area.

Steps for Method 2:

1. Identify which counties the project beneficiaries are located in.
2. Identify the CDI rank for each county.
3. Identify the total project beneficiaries.
4. Identify the number of beneficiaries located in each county.
5. Multiply each county’s CDI rank by the county project beneficiaries.
6. Sum the products of each county’s CDI rank by county project beneficiaries.
7. Divide the sum of the products of each county’s CDI rank by county project beneficiaries by the total project beneficiaries.
8. The quotient is the calculated score rounded to the nearest hundredth place.



Method 1. Project Service Area is in One (1) County or Multiple Counties with the Same CDI

Example 1: (Individual or Joint Application, One Eligible County): City A is submitting a project that will have project beneficiaries in one eligible county (County A), and County A is in the Top 10% (Rank 5, 10 Points). The applicable CDI rank will be calculated as seen below:

- 1) Top 10% = Rank 5
- 2) **Rank 5 = 10 Points**

Method 2. Project Service Area is in Multiple Counties with Different CDIs

Example 2: (Individual or Joint Application, Multiple Eligible Counties): Council of Governments A is submitting a project that will have project beneficiaries in three eligible counties (County A, County B, and County C).

	CDI Rank	Points	Project Beneficiaries
County A	Top 75%	5	10,000
County B	Top 25%	8	15,000
County C	Bottom 25%	2	13,000
Total Project Beneficiaries			38,000

The applicable CDI rank will be calculated as seen below:

- 1) 5 (County A Rank Points) X 10,000 (County A Project Beneficiaries) = 50,000
- 2) 8 (County B Rank Points) X 15,000 (County B Project Beneficiaries) = 120,000
- 3) 2 (County C Rank Points) X 13,000 (County C Project Beneficiaries) = 26,000
- 4) 50,000 + 120,000 + 26,000 = **196,000**
- 5) 10,000 (County A Project Beneficiaries) + 15,000 (County B Project Beneficiaries) + 13,000 (County C Project Beneficiaries) = **38,000**
- 6) **196,000** (Total of Respective Points X County Project Beneficiaries) / **38,000** (Total Project Beneficiaries) = **5.16 points**



2) Social Vulnerability Index

Data Source: Social Vulnerability Index (SoVI) Score (County or City Level Data).

Maximum Points: 10 Points

Rank 5	High	10 Points
Rank 4	Medium High	8 Points
Rank 3	Medium	5 Points
Rank 2	Medium Low	2 Points
Rank 1	Low	0 Points
Multi-County Project	Prorated SoVI rank	Calculated Points

An area that is placed in the “High” ranking of the Social Vulnerability Index indicates that this location is in the most socially vulnerable; in particular, vulnerable to natural hazards.

Methodology:

Method 1:

- If the proposed project service area is wholly within one (1) city, then the city SoVI rank will be used.
- If the proposed project service area is wholly within one (1) county (either in the unincorporated areas or both the unincorporated areas and incorporated areas), then the county SoVI rank will be used.
- If city level SoVI data is not available for an applicable city, then the county SoVI rank in which the city is located will be used.

Steps for Method 1:

1. Identify which city, cities, county or counties the project beneficiaries are located.
2. Identify which Method 1 scenario applies.
3. Use the SoVI rank for the applicable scenario.

Method 2:

- If the proposed project service area is wholly within multiple cities, then the overall project SoVI rank will be calculated as a multi-city prorated SoVI rank based on project beneficiaries between the multiple cities.
- If the proposed project service area is in multiple counties (either in the unincorporated areas or both the unincorporated areas and incorporated areas), then the overall project SoVI rank will be calculated as a multi-county prorated SoVI rank based on project beneficiaries between the multiple county areas.



Steps for Method 2:

1. Identify which counties or cities the project beneficiaries are located in.
2. Identify which Method 2 scenario applies.
3. Identify the SoVI rank for each county or city.
4. Identify the total project beneficiaries.
5. Identify the number of beneficiaries located in each county or city.
6. Multiply each county’s or city’s SoVI rank by the county or city project beneficiaries.
7. Sum the products of each county’s or city’s SoVI rank by county or city project beneficiaries.
8. Divide the sum of the products of each county’s or city’s SoVI rank by county or city project beneficiaries by the total project beneficiaries.
9. The quotient is the calculated score rounded to the nearest hundredth place.

Method 1.

Example 1: (Individual or Joint Applicant, One Eligible City): City A is submitting a project that will have project beneficiaries in both the incorporated areas of City A and the unincorporated areas of County A. City A is located with County A. County A SoVI rank will be used. County A has a “High” SoVI score (Rank 5, 10 Points). The applicable SoVI score will be calculated as seen below:

- 1) High = Rank 5
- 2) **Rank 5 = 10 Points**

Method 2.

Example 2: (Individual or Joint Applicant, Multiple Eligible Cities or Counties): Council of Governments A is submitting a project that will have project beneficiaries in a total of five eligible counties in both the incorporated and unincorporated areas of County A, County B, County C, County D, and County E.

	SoVI Rank	Points	Project Beneficiaries
County A	Low	0	9,000
County B	Medium	5	4,000
County C	Medium Low	2	12,000
County D	Medium	5	2,000
County E	Medium High	8	6,000
Total Project Beneficiaries			33,000



- 1) $0 \text{ (County A Rank Points)} \times 9,000 \text{ (County A Project Beneficiaries)} = \mathbf{0}$
- 2) $5 \text{ (County B Rank Points)} \times 4,000 \text{ (County B Project Beneficiaries)} = \mathbf{20,000}$
- 3) $2 \text{ (County C Rank Points)} \times 12,000 \text{ (County C Project Beneficiaries)} = \mathbf{24,000}$
- 4) $5 \text{ (County D Rank Points)} \times 2,000 \text{ (County D Project Beneficiaries)} = \mathbf{10,000}$
- 5) $8 \text{ (County E Rank Points)} \times 6,000 \text{ (County E Project Beneficiaries)} = \mathbf{48,000}$
- 6) $0 + 20,000 + 24,000 + 10,000 + 48,000 = \mathbf{102,000}$
- 7) $9,000 \text{ (County A Project Beneficiaries)} + 4,000 \text{ (County B Project Beneficiaries)} + 12,000 \text{ (County C Project Beneficiaries)} + 2,000 \text{ (County D Project Beneficiaries)} + 6,000 \text{ (County E Project Beneficiaries)} = \mathbf{33,000}$
- 8) $\mathbf{102,000 / 33,000 = 3.09 \text{ Points}}$



3) Per Capita Market Value

Data Source: Most recently available American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates Table B01003 and most recently available County/City Tax Rates and Levies dataset from the Texas Comptroller’s Office (see also GLO-CDR’s supplemental data table).

Maximum Points: 10 Points

Rank 5	Less than \$40,000.00	10 Points
Rank 4	\$40,000.01 - \$65,000.00	8 Points
Rank 3	\$65,000.01 - \$100,000.00	5 Points
Rank 2	\$100,000.01 - \$250,000.00	2 Points
Rank 1	\$250,000.01 or greater	0 Points

Methodology: Per Capita Market Value (PCMV) is calculated by dividing a jurisdiction’s Market Value by the jurisdiction’s total population.

Method 1:

- If the proposed project service area is wholly within one (1) city, then city’s PCMV rank will be used.
- If the proposed project service area is wholly within one (1) county (either in the unincorporated areas or both the unincorporated areas and incorporated areas), then the county’s PCMV rank will be used.

Method 2:

- If the proposed project service area is wholly within multiple cities, then the aggregate PCMV rank of the cities will be calculated.
- If the proposed project service area is in multiple counties (either in the unincorporated areas or both the unincorporated areas and incorporated areas), then the aggregate PCMV rank of the counties will be calculated.

Steps for Method 2:

1. Identify which counties or cities the project beneficiaries are located in.
2. Identify which Method 2 scenario applies.
3. Identify the market value for each county or city.
4. Identify the population for each county or city.
5. Identify the number of project beneficiaries located in each county or city.
6. Sum the counties’ or cities’ market value.
7. Sum the counties’ or cities’ populations.
8. Divide the sum of counties’ or cities’ market value by counties’ or cities’ total populations.



Method 1.

Example 1: (Individual or Joint Application, One Eligible Jurisdiction): City A is submitting a project where the project service area is solely within their jurisdiction. City A has a Market Value of \$11,844,012,976 and a population of 120,000.

The applicable PCMV rank will be calculated as seen below:

- 1) $(\$11,844,012,976 \text{ (Total Market Value)} / 120,000 \text{ (Total Population)}) = \$98,700.11 \text{ (Per Capita Market Value)}$
- 2) $\$98,700.11 = \text{Rank 3}$
- 3) **Rank 3 = 5 Points**

Method 2.

Example 2: (Individual or Joint Application, Multiple Eligible Jurisdictions): Council of Governments A is submitting a project where the project service area is partially within County A, County B, and County C. The applicable PCMV score for the project will be calculated as seen below:

	Market Value	Population
County A	\$46,196,173,154	350,000
County B	\$28,449,181,011	280,000
County C	\$6,165,749,284	72,000
Total	\$80,811,103,449	702,000

- 1) $\$80,811,103,449 \text{ (Total Market Value)} / 702,000 \text{ (Total Population)} = \$115,115.53 \text{ (Aggregate Per Capita Market Value)}$
- 2) **\$115,115.53 = Rank 2 (2 Points)**



4) LMI National Objective

Data Source: Application.

Maximum Points: 20 Points

Project meets LMI National Objective	20 Points
Project does not meet LMI National Objective	0 Points

Methodology: The activity will be reviewed to identify if the proposed project meets the low- to moderate- income (LMI) HUD National Objective. Project beneficiary information will be reviewed to determine this HUD National Objective. This will be verified during the application review process according to the guidance in the application guide.



5) Project Type Identified in Local Adopted Plan

Data Source: Adopted Local Plan.

Maximum Points: 5 Points

Project Type identified in Local Adopted Plan	5 Points
Project Type not identified in Local Adopted Plan	0 Points

Methodology:

1. Applicants must cite where the proposed project type or activity is identified and detailed in any current and locally adopted plan for the area(s) where the project is seeking to be implemented.
2. For this criterion, “current” means a plan that has been adopted less than five (5) years before the submission of the application for this competition. If a plan was developed but not formally adopted, the plan is not eligible to be utilized for this criterion. For this criterion, “local” means any adopted plan that covers the boundaries of the proposed project service area(s).
3. If multiple entities are submitting a joint project that crosses jurisdictional boundaries, the proposed project type or activity must be identified within a plan, or multiple plans, that cover the multijurisdictional area where the project is being implemented.
4. Applicants must provide the title of the adopted plan(s) being referenced, a PDF of the adopted plan(s) with the adoption date(s), the page number(s) of where the proposed project type(s) is within the adopted plan(s), and a documentation from the applicable city council, commissioners court, or other representative body which formally adopted the plan. The plan(s) must have been adopted before the CDBG-MIT competition application deadline.

No matter if an entity is submitting a single or joint project, the required plan can be any plan adopted by the applicant or the applicable city, county, council of governments, or other governing entity where the proposed project is located. For example, if the applicant is a council of governments, plan documentation can come from a city level, county level, state level, or any governmental plan which covers the project area.



6) Management Capacity

Data Source: CDBG contracts with GLO and applicable management capacity documentation.

Maximum Points: 15 Points

No CDBG contracts with GLO (management capacity assessment)	Up to 15 Points
Performance on GLO CDBG contract(s), programs, and/or projects	Up to 15 Points

Up to 15 Points: Performance on GLO CDBG contract(s), programs, and/or projects

Methodology: Applicants that do not have a 2015 Floods, 2016 Floods, or Hurricane Harvey CDBG-DR contract with GLO will be scored by the following method.

If multiple entities are submitting a joint project, a “Lead Applicant” must be identified and will be responsible for the applicable management capacity questions.

1. Did the applicant submit its adopted procurement policy and procedures with <i>2 CFR 200.318 – 200.326 and Appendix II to Part 200</i> incorporated?	3 Points
Yes	3 Points
No	0 Points
2. Did the applicant submit its most recent, fiscal year-end audit report?	6 Points
Single Audit Report	6 Points
Comprehensive Annual Financial Audit Report without a Single Audit	4 Points
Any other financial review	2 Points
No Audit Report	0 Points
3. Has the applicant received federal or state grants for construction projects within last 10 years?	6 Points
3 years or less	6 Points
Over 3 to 6 years	4 Points
Over 6 to 10 years	2 Points
Over 10 years or no prior grants	0 Points



1. Did the applicant submit its adopted procurement policy and procedures with 2 CFR 200.318 – 200.326 and Appendix II to Part 200 incorporated?

Yes: The applicant’s procurement policy and procedures have been incorporated 2 CFR 200.318 – 200.326 and Appendix II to Part 200 requirements. The GLO will review the procurement policy and procedures the applicant submitted using GLO procurement review checklist.

No: The applicant did not submit its adopted procurement policy and procedures with its application.

or

The applicant’s procurement policy and procedures have not incorporated 2 CFR 200.318 – 200.326 and Appendix II to Part 200 requirements. The GLO will review the procurement policy and procedures the applicant submitted using procurement review checklist.

2. Did the applicant submit its most recent, fiscal year-end audit report?

6 Points: The applicant submitted its most recent, fiscal year-end single audit report.

or

4 Points: The applicant submitted its most recent, fiscal year-end comprehensive annual financial audit report without a single audit report.

or

2 Points: The applicant submitted another financial review based on the Standards for Attestation Engagements (SSAEs).

or

0 Points: The applicant did not submit its most recent, fiscal year-end audit report or another financial review.

3. Has the applicant received federal or state grants for construction projects within last 10 years? The timeframe will be assessed based the date of the competition deadline.

Applicants must submit documentation to verify a grant for a construction project. The applicant must submit list a of grant(s) with the following description:



- a. What entity funded the grant?
- b. What were the contract terms (Start and End Date)?
- c. Grant contract amount
- d. Provide a brief project description.

Grants may include, but not limited to, funding for construction projects from the HUD's CDBG Entitlement Program, Texas Department of Agriculture's CDBG program, Texas Water Development Board, Texas Division of Emergency Management, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Texas Department of Transportation, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, International Boundary and Water Commission, and U.S. Economic Development Administration.

The timeframe will be access based on contract start date, if no contract start date available, the grant award date will be used. Applicant must provide evidence of contract date or award date.

- 6 Points: The applicant received federal or state grants for construction projects 3 years or less ago.
- 4 Points: The applicant received federal or state grants for construction projects over 3 years and less than 6 years ago.
- 2 Points: The applicant received federal or state grants for construction projects over 6 years and less than 10 years ago.
- 0 Points: The applicant received federal or state grants for construction projects over 10 years ago or no prior grants.

Up to 15 Points: Performance on GLO CDBG contract(s), programs, and/or projects:

Methodology: Contract, project or program status, and contract project or program expenditure are determined by reviewing CDBG-DR contracts that the applicant has with the GLO. CDBG-DR contracts will be those associated with the 2015 Floods, 2016 Floods, and Hurricane Harvey. If multiple entities are submitting a joint project, a "Lead Applicant" must be identified and will be responsible for the applicable management capacity questions. The contract status, contract expenditure and assignment of applicable points will be assessed as of the date of the competition deadline.

Each contract will be assessed according to the methodology describe below. Points are divided by applicant's the number of contracts. The points per contracts are divided by each scoring question. Additional points will be awarded for 2015 and 2016 Floods contracts that have submitted the Grant Completion Report no later than 60 days after contract termination or at the conclusion of all contract activities, whichever occurs first, not to exceed the maximum 15 points available.



Example:

Applicant A has a 2016 Floods Infrastructure Contract, a Hurricane Harvey Local Buyout and Acquisition Contract, and a Hurricane Harvey Infrastructure Contract.

- Total Points Available: 15
- Total Contracts: 3
- Total Points per Contract: 15 points / 3 contracts = 5 points per contract

Applicant B has a 2015 Floods Infrastructure Contract, a 2015 Floods Housing Contract, a 2016 Floods Infrastructure Contract, a Hurricane Harvey Local Buyout and Acquisition Contract, and a Hurricane Harvey Infrastructure Contract.

- Total Points Available: 15
- Total Contracts: 5
- Total Points per Contract: 15 points / 5 contracts = 3 points per contract

Note: The applicant will not be penalized for GLO administration delays. However, insufficient and/or rejected documentation and draw requests submitted by the subrecipient to the GLO will not be accepted by the GLO for scoring purposes.

2015 Floods, 2016 Contracts, and/or Hurricane Harvey \$57.8 million

		% of Points
1. Timely Expenditure (25% of Points per Contract)	Have <u>NOT</u> received a GLO Timely Expenditure Letter	Full Points
	Have <u>NOT</u> received a GLO Timely Expenditure Letter since February 2020	½ Points
	Have received a GLO Timely Expenditure Letter since February 2020	0 Points
2. Did the applicant submit procurement policy and procedures with 2 CFR 200.318 – 200.326 and Appendix II to Part 200 incorporated? (25% of Points per Contract)	Yes	Full Points
	No	0 Points
3. Monthly Activity Status Reports (25% of Points per Contract)	No Delinquent Reports	Full Points
	No Delinquent Reports since February 2020	½ Points
	Delinquent Reports since February 2020	0 Points



4. Project Milestones and Expenditures (25% of Points per Contract)	Completed project milestones and percentage of expenditures are in line	Full Points
	Completed project milestones and percentage of expenditures are NOT in line	0 Points
5. Grant Completion Report Submitted (+10% of Points per Contract)	Submitted no later than 60 days after contract termination or at the conclusion of all contract activities, whichever occurs first.	+10% of Points per Contract
	Delinquent Report	0 points

Hurricane Harvey Local Buyout and Acquisition Program Contract

		% of Points
1. Timely Expenditure (20% of Points Per Contract)	Have <u>NOT</u> received a GLO Timely Expenditure Letter	Full Points
	Have received a GLO Timely Expenditure Letter	0 Points
2. Did the applicant submit procurement policy and procedures with 2 CFR 200.318 – 200.326 and Appendix II to Part 200 incorporated? (20% of Points Per Contract)	Yes	Full Points
	No	0 Points
3. Program Guidelines (20% of Points Per Contract)	Guidelines submitted no later than the close of business sixty (60) days subsequent to the effective date of Contract	Full Points
	Delinquent Guidelines	0 Points
4. Monthly Activity Status Reports (20% of Points Per Contract)	No Delinquent Reports	Full Points
	Delinquent Reports	0 Points
5. Project Milestones and Expenditures (20% of Points Per Contract)	Completed project milestones and percentage of expenditures are in line	Full
	Completed project milestones and percentage of expenditures are NOT in line	0 Points



Hurricane Harvey Local Infrastructure Program

		% of Points
1. Timely Expenditure (20% of Points Per Contract)	Have <u>NOT</u> received a GLO Timely Expenditure Letter	Full Points
	Have received a GLO Timely Expenditure Letter	0 Points
2. Did the applicant submit procurement policy and procedures with 2 CFR 200.318 – 200.326 and Appendix II to Part 200 incorporated? (20% of Points Per Contract)	Yes	Full Points
	No	0 Points
3. Start-Up Documentation (20% of Points Per Contract)	Start-up documentation submitted no later than the close of business sixty (60) days subsequent to the effective date of Contract	Full Points
	Delinquent Start Up Documentation	0 Points
4. Monthly Activity Status Reports (20% of Points Per Contract)	No Delinquent Reports	Full Points
	Delinquent Reports	0 Points
5. Project Milestones and Expenditures (20% of Points Per Contract)	Completed project milestones and percentage of expenditures are in line	Full Points
	Completed project milestones and percentage of expenditures are NOT in line	0 Points

Harris County Hurricane Harvey Contract

Points for Harris County Hurricane Harvey contract will be assessed by the GLO based on the current performance of executed contract.



7) Project Impact

The Project Impact criteria will consider cost per persons benefiting and percentage of persons benefiting within jurisdiction(s).

A. Total project application amount per total project beneficiaries

Data Source: CDBG-MIT project application amount and total project beneficiaries

Maximum Points: 15 Points

Rank 6	< \$100.01	15 Points
Rank 5	\$100.01 – \$500.00	12 Points
Rank 4	\$500.01 – \$1,500.00	9 Points
Rank 3	\$1,500.01 – \$5,000.00	6 Points
Rank 2	\$5,000.01 – \$10,000.00	3 Points
Rank 1	> \$10,000.01	0 Points

Methodology: The cost per person ratio is determined by dividing the CDBG-MIT project application amount by the number of project beneficiaries.

Example 1: City A has submitted a project application amount of \$5,000,000. The total project beneficiaries are 10,000.

- 1) $\$5,000,000$ (project application amount) / $10,000$ (total project beneficiaries) = **\$500 per project beneficiary (Rank 5, 12 Points)**

Example 2: County A and City B are submitting a joint project. The project application amount of the joint project is \$8,000,000. The total project beneficiaries are 6,500.

- 1) $\$8,000,000$ (project application amount) / $6,500$ (total project beneficiaries) = **\$1,230.77 per person benefiting (Rank 4, 9 Points)**

B. Percentage of total project beneficiaries out of the total population within a jurisdiction(s)

Data Source: Most recently available American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates Table B01003 and total project beneficiaries

Maximum Points: 10 Points

Percentage to raw score conversions will be rounded to the nearest hundredth place.

Methodology: The percentage of persons benefitting within a jurisdiction(s) is determined dividing the total project of beneficiaries by the total population of the jurisdiction(s).



Method 1:

- If the proposed project service area is in one (1) county (unincorporated areas only), then the county total population will be used.
- If the proposed project service area is in one (1) city (the incorporated area only), then the city total population will be used.
- If the proposed project service area is in both the unincorporated areas and incorporated areas of one (1) county, then the county total population will be used.

Method 2:

- If the proposed project service area is in multiple counties (unincorporated areas only), then the total population for each county will be used.
- If the proposed project service area is in multiple cities (incorporated areas only), the total population for each city will be used.
- If the proposed project service area is in both the unincorporated areas and incorporated areas of multiple counties, then the total population for each county will be used.

Steps for Method 2:

1. Identify the total project beneficiaries.
2. Identify which jurisdictions the project beneficiaries are located in.
3. Identify which Method 2 scenario applies.
4. Identify total population for each jurisdiction.
5. Sum the total population for each jurisdiction.
6. Divide the total project beneficiaries by total populations of all jurisdictions.
7. The quotient of the equation is then multiplied by 10 to get the total number of points earned (rounded to two decimal places, or hundredths).

Method 1.

Example 1: County A has a population of 89,174. The total project beneficiaries in County A are 12,775.

- 1) $12,775$ (project beneficiaries) / $89,174$ (total population) = $.1433$
- 2) $.1433 \times 10$ points = **1.43 points**

Method 2.

Example 2: City A and City B are submitting a joint project application with the project service area within both cities. City A has a population of 25,265. City B has a population of 13,947. The total project beneficiaries are 8,775.

- 1) $25,265$ (City A population) + $13,947$ (City B population) = $39,212$ (total population)
- 2) $8,775$ (project beneficiaries) / $39,212$ (total population) = $.2238$
- 3) $.2238 \times 10$ points = **2.24 points**



8) Leverage

Data Source: CDBG-MIT project application amount and Letter(s) of Commitment from state, federal, local, nonprofit, or private funding sources.

Maximum Points: 5 Points

Non-CDBG Leverage (a minimum value of 1% of the CDBG-MIT funds requested)	5 Points
Non-CDBG Leverage (a value less than 1% of the CDBG-MIT funds requested)	0 Points

Methodology: The commitment letters from a federal, state, local, nonprofit, or private funding source will be reviewed to determine the amount of leveraged funds utilized for the proposed project. In order to receive points under this criterion, the leveraging must have a minimum value of 1% of the CDBG-MIT funds requested. For purposes of this criterion, leveraged funds include equipment, materials, and cash from the applicant and/or sources from other than the requesting entity or entities if the application contains a joint project that crosses jurisdictional boundaries. CDBG-DR and CDBG-MIT funds used as leverage are ineligible for scoring purposes.



9) Tie-breaker: Higher Poverty Rate

Data Source: Most recently available American Community Survey (ACS) 5- year estimates Table S1701.

Methodology: The poverty rate within a jurisdiction(s) is determined by reviewing the “Percent Below Poverty Level” column of ACS 5- year estimates Table S1701 and if necessary, reviewing the “Total” column and “Below Poverty Level” column of ACS Table S1701 to calculate the percent below poverty level for a multiple jurisdictional area.

Method 1:

- If the proposed project service area is wholly within one (1) city, then the city “Percent Below Poverty Level” information will be used.
- If the proposed project service area is wholly within one (1) county (either in the unincorporated areas or both the unincorporated areas and incorporated areas), then the county “Percent Below Poverty Level” information will be used.

Method 2:

- If the proposed project service area is wholly within multiple cities, then the “Total” population and total amount of people “Below Poverty Level” for each city will be used. A calculation will then be applied to determine the percent below poverty level for the applying jurisdictions.
- If the proposed project service area is in multiple counties (either in the unincorporated areas or both the unincorporated areas and incorporated areas), then the “Total” population and total amount of people “Below Poverty Level” for each county will be used. A calculation will then be applied to determine the percent below poverty level for the applying jurisdictions.

Steps for Method 2:

1. Identify which jurisdictions the project service area is located in.
2. Identify which Method 2 scenario applies.
3. Identify the applicable “Below Poverty Level” populations for each jurisdiction.
4. Sum the “Below Poverty Level” populations totals for each jurisdiction.
5. Identify the applicable “Total” populations for each jurisdiction.
6. Sum the applicable “Total” populations for each jurisdiction.
7. Divide the sum of the calculated “Below Poverty Level” population by the sum of the calculated “Total” population for the applicable jurisdictions.
8. The quotient of the equation is then the rate to be used to determine the higher rate in the case of a tie breaker.



Method 1.

Example 1: County A has a “percent below poverty level” of 15.5% as seen in ACS 5- year estimates Table S1701.

- 1) 15.5% (County A percent below poverty level)

Method 2.

Example 2: City A and City B are submitting a joint project application with a project service area within both cities.

	Population Below Poverty Level	Total Population
City A	6,392	27,695
City B	4,810	18,174
Total	11,202	45,869

- 1) $6,392$ (City A “Below Poverty Level” population) + $4,810$ (City B “Below Poverty Level” population) = $11,202$ (Sum of “Below Poverty Level”)
- 2) $27,695$ (City A “Total” population) + $18,174$ (City B “Total” population) = $45,869$ (Sum of “Total” population)
- 3) $11,202$ (Sum of “Below Poverty Level”) / $45,869$ (Sum of “Total” population) = 0.244
- 4) $0.244 = 24.4\%$



D) 2015 Floods State Mitigation Competition Eligible Activities

- i. Flood control and drainage improvements, including the construction or rehabilitation of stormwater management system;
- ii. Infrastructure improvements (such as water and sewer facilities, streets, provision of generators, removal of debris, bridges, etc.);
- iii. Natural or green infrastructure;
- iv. Communications infrastructure;
- v. Public Facilities;
- vi. Buyouts or Acquisition with or without relocation assistance, down payment assistance, housing incentives, and demolition;
- vii. Housing incentives;
- viii. Activities designed to relocate families outside of floodplains;
- ix. Public service within the 15 percent cap (e.g., housing counseling, legal counseling, job training, mental health, and general health services);
- x. FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) cost share for CDBG-MIT eligible project;
- xi. Economic development (assistance to businesses for the installation of disaster mitigation improvements and technologies; financing to support the development of technologies, systems and other measures to mitigate future disaster impacts; “hardening” of commercial areas and facilities; and financing critical infrastructure sectors to allow continued commercial operations during and after disasters);
- xii. Nonresidential structures must be elevated to the standards described in this paragraph or floodproofed, in accordance with FEMA floodproofing standards at 44 CFR 60.3(c)(3)(ii) or successor standard, up to at least two feet above the 100-year (or 1 percent annual chance) floodplain. All Critical Actions, as defined at 24 CFR 55.2(b)(3), within the 500-year (or 0.2 percent annual chance) floodplain must be elevated or floodproofed (in accordance with the FEMA standards) to the higher of the 500-year floodplain elevation or 3 feet above the 100-year floodplain elevation. If the 500-year floodplain or elevation is unavailable, and the Critical Action is in the 100-year floodplain, then the structure must be elevated or floodproofed at least 3 feet above the 100-year floodplain elevation. Critical Actions are defined as an “activity for which even a slight chance of flooding would be too great, because such flooding might result in loss of life, injury to persons or damage to property.” For example, Critical Actions include hospitals, nursing homes, police stations, fire stations and principal utility lines; and
- xiii. Rehabilitation, reconstruction, and new construction of affordable multi-family housing.



E) 2015 Floods State Mitigation Competition Ineligible Activities

- i. Emergency response services. Emergency response services shall mean those services that are carried out in the immediate response to a disaster or other emergency in order to limit the loss of life and damage to assets by state and local governmental and nongovernmental emergency public safety, fire, law enforcement, emergency response, emergency medical (including hospital emergency facilities), and related personnel, agencies, and authorities;
- ii. CDBG-MIT funds may not be used to enlarge a dam or levee beyond the original footprint of the structure that existed prior to the disaster event. CDBG-MIT funds for levees and dams are required to:
 - a. Register and maintain entries regarding such structures with the USACE National Levee Database or National Inventory of Dams;
 - b. Ensure that the structure is admitted in the USACE PL 84-99 Rehabilitation Program (Rehabilitation Assistance for Non-Federal Flood Control Projects);
 - c. Ensure the structure is accredited under the FEMA NFIP; and
 - d. Maintain file documentation demonstrating a risk assessment prior to funding the flood control structure and documentation that the investment includes risk reduction measures.
- iii. Funds may not be used to assist a privately-owned utility for any purpose. A private utility, also referred to as an investor-owned utility, is owned by private investors and is for-profit as opposed to being owned by a public trust or agency (e.g., a coop or municipally owned utility);
- iv. Buildings and facilities used for the general conduct of government (e.g., city halls, courthouses, and emergency operation centers);
- v. By law, (codified in the HCD Act as a note to 105(a)), the amount of CDBG-MIT funds that may be contributed to a USACE project is \$250,000 or less;
- vi. Section 582 of the National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994, as amended, (42 U.S.C. 5154a) prohibits flood disaster assistance in certain circumstances. In general, it provides that no federal disaster relief assistance made available in a flood disaster area may be used to make a payment (including any loan assistance payment) to a person for “repair, replacement, or restoration” for damage to any personal, residential, or commercial property if that person at any time has received federal flood disaster assistance that was conditioned on the person first having obtained flood insurance under applicable federal law and the person has subsequently failed to obtain and maintain flood insurance as required under applicable federal law on such property. No disaster assistance may be provided for the repair, replacement, or restoration of a property to a person who has failed to meet this requirement;



- vii. Funding shall not be used to reimburse homeowners, businesses or entities (other than grantees, local governments, and subrecipients described above) for mitigation activities completed prior to the applicability date of the federal register notice;
- viii. If the property is purchased through the use of eminent domain, the ultimate use of that property may not benefit a particular private party and must be for a public use; eminent domain can be used for public use, but public use shall not be construed to include economic development that primarily benefits private entities; and
- ix. Incentive payments to households that move to disaster-impacted floodplains.



F) Application Selection Process Example

Each applicant may submit a total of two applications, whether applying as the lone applicant or jointly with another jurisdiction(s). Depending on demand, no applicant will be awarded for their second application until all successful eligible applicants have been awarded funding at least once. Applications that do not score a minimum of 65 points will only be considered after all applications scoring greater than this amount have been funded.

Applications			
Applicant	Application Type	Application Score	Awarded
Council of Governments A Application	Individual	99.4	Yes
City A Application	Individual	98.5	Yes
City B and City C Application	Joint	95.1	Yes
County A Application	Individual	94	Yes
Council of Governments B Application	Individual	92.9	Yes
County A and County B Application	Joint	91.8	Queued
City B Application	Individual	87.4	Queued
County C Application	Individual	84.1	Yes
Indian Tribe A Application	Individual	83	Yes
Council of Governments A Application	Individual	81.9	Queued
County B Application	Individual	79.7	Yes
Council of Governments C Application	Individual	76.4	Yes
County D and County E Application	Joint	75.3	Yes
City C Application	Individual	70.9	Queued
County C and City A Application	Joint	68.7	Queued
Applications Below 65 Point Threshold			
City D Application	Individual	64.3	No
County D and County E Application	Joint	62.1	No
Council of Governments B Application	Individual	61	No
Application Queue			
Applicant	Application Type	Application Score	Awarded
County A and County B Application	Joint	91.8	Yes
City B Application	Individual	87.4	Yes
Council of Governments A Application	Individual	81.9	Yes
FUNDING DEPLETED			
City C Application	Individual	70.9	No
County C and City A Application	Joint	68.7	No