

WEST CENTRAL TEXAS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE GUIDEBOOK
2009-2010 TxCDBG PROGRAM

REVISED: July 7, 2008

Summary of Questions, Responses and Revisions

Question #1

Receipt Date: June 5, 2008 and June 11, 2008

Submitted By: Steve Kerbow, Kerbow and Associates Consulting, Inc.

Question (Pages 8, #1):

Several RRC's require the applicant to provide past TxCDBG funding documentation, which is to be obtained from an ORCA Tracking System Report.

How do we access this system or request the documentation?

Several RRC's require ORCA Tracking System Report for documenting previous CD grant awards.

Can we access the ORCA Tracking System Report or do we need to make specific requests for each applying entity?

Response:

Response Date: July 1, 2008

By July 30, 2008, ORCA will post on the agency's website preliminary ORCA Tracking System Reports for regions that have identified these reports as a data source. Specific requests for each entity do not have to be submitted to ORCA. ORCA has already identified regions with this data source.

The final ORCA Tracking System Reports containing 2008 CD/CDS funding awards up to August 29, 2008 will be posted by September 2, 2008. This will allow 2008 CD/CDS funding awards made up to that date to be included in the 2009-2010 CD Fund application due on September 30, 2008. ORCA has determined that any 2008 CD/CDS funding awards made to applicants after August 29, 2008 will not be considered in scoring and assigning of points. A cut-off date for 2008 CD/CDS funding needs to be established to allow applicants to provide a response to the Information Needed From Applicant to Score as requested in the 2009-2010 CD application.

Requires RRC Guidebook Revision: No

RRC Support Staff Concurrence: W. Stovall

Date: July 3, 2008

Question #1

Receipt Date: June 9, 2008

Submitted By: Mary Alice Smith, Grantworks

Question (Pages 6 & 7, #1):

Project Type

1. Is the project categorized as a first

Data Source: As stated below:

RRC Project Priorities: RRC Guidebook

Project Type: CD Application Table 1 verified by ORCA

How much of the guidebook to include with the application?

Should we include as part of the question in the application the Project types from the Guidebook?

RRC Guidebook Page 6 OR should we include an attachment of page 6 of the Guidebook?

Response:

Response Date: June 27, 2008

No information or section of the RRC Guidebook needs to be submitted to satisfy this data source to identify the project priority/type. The RRC Guidebook for this scoring factor lists the project priorities and is self-explanatory. Table 1 will need to be submitted with Part I of the CD application guide. The Information Needed From Applicant to Score should be submitted as requested for this scoring factor.

Requires RRC Guidebook Revision: No

RRC Support Staff Concurrence: W. Stovall

Date: June 30, 2008

Question #2

Receipt Date: June 11, 2008

Submitted By: Mary Alice Smith, Grantworks

Question (Page 15, #2):

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

To me the average CPB for all applicants would be \$1m/4,720 (Total sum of the grant amounts/total number of beneficiaries), or \$211.86.

The formula as stated appears to be using the Total CPB (\$4,904.76).

Response:

Response Date: June 30, 2008

The methodology and the formula provided describe how each applicant's cost per beneficiary will be calculated and compared to other applicants of the region. To provide an accurate description of the scoring question and methodology, the scoring question and methodology will be revised by deleting the word average as follows:

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

Methodology: This score is determined by comparing the applicant's cost per beneficiary (CPB) to the cost per beneficiary for all applicants.

Requires RRC Guidebook Revision: Yes

RRC Support Staff Concurrence: W. Stovall

Date: July 3, 2008

Question #2 & #3

Receipt Date: June 11, 2008

Submitted By: Eric Hartzell, Grantworks

Question (Page 9, #2 & 10, #3):

NEED/DISTRESS

(Poverty) and (Per Capita Income)

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Total Population of the Census Geographic Area:

Census Geographic Area Poverty Rate:

Should not the applicant also provide a map showing the appropriate Census Geographic Area(s) (GCA) as well as a description of the GCA such as Census Tract or Block Group Number(s)? Should the target area(s) and/or improvement locations be placed upon this map?

How will the data be combined in cases where the Target Area is in multiple CGAs (two or more Census Tracts, One Census Tract with two or more different Block Groups, or two or more Census Tracts with one or more Block Groups each, etc.)? Will the data be calculated for poverty percentage by taking the total persons in poverty summed for all CGAs, and then divided by to the total populations summed for all GCAs? It is much more difficult to obtain a Per Capita Income calculation combining the data rather than using an average; if calculated, what will the procedure be (what data, calculations, etc.)?

Response:

Response Date: July 3, 2008

Yes, the applicant should provide the appropriate Census map for the census geographic area (census tract, block group) that corresponds to the poverty data or the per capita income for the target area. The Data Source and Information Needed From Applicant to Score will need to be revised to include the 2000 Census map for the Census geographic area.

Poverty Rate: In the case where the target area(s) covers more than one census geographic area, the applicant poverty rate will be calculated by:

- Adding the total number of persons at or below the designated poverty level for each census geographic area in the target area
- Adding the total population from which poverty persons was determined for each census geographic area in the target area
- Dividing the sum of numbers of persons at or below poverty by the total population.

Per Capital Income: In the case where the target area(s) covers more than one census geographic area, the applicant's Per Capita Income will be calculated using 2000 Census Data Summary File 3 Tables P1 and P83.

- Sum of P83 (Aggregate Income in 1999) for each census geographic area in the target area divided by sum of P1 (total population) for each census geographic area in the target area.

Requires RRC Guidebook Revision: Yes

RRC Support Staff Concurrence: W. Stovall

Date: July 3, 2008

Question #3

Receipt Date: June 11, 2008

Submitted By: Mary Alice Smith, Grantworks

Question (Page 16, #3):

What is the cost per low-to-moderate income (LMI) beneficiary for each applicant's jurisdiction in comparison to the average cost per low-to-moderate income beneficiary for all applicants?

To me the average CPB for all applicants would be \$1m/4,720 (Total sum of the grant amounts/total number of beneficiaries), or \$211.86.

The formula as stated appears to be using the Total CPB (\$4,904.76).

The same concern for the next question:

What is the cost per low-to-moderate income (LMI) beneficiary for each applicant's jurisdiction in comparison to the average cost per low-to-moderate income beneficiary for all applicants?

Response:

Response Date: June 30, 2008

The methodology and the formula provided describe how each applicant's cost per low-to-moderate income beneficiary will be calculated and compared to other applicants of the region. To provide an accurate description of the scoring question and methodology,

the scoring question and methodology will be revised by deleting the word average as follows:

What is the cost per low-to-moderate income (LMI) beneficiary for each applicant's jurisdiction in comparison to the cost per low-to-moderate income beneficiary for all applicants?

Methodology: This score is determined by comparing the applicant's cost per LMI beneficiary (CPLMIB) to the CPLMIB for all applicants.

Requires RRC Guidebook Revision: Yes

RRC Support Staff Concurrence: W. Stovall
Date: July 3, 2008

Question #4

Receipt Date: May 29, 2008

Submitted By: Robin Cisco, Langford Community Management Services

Receipt Date: June 4, 2008

Submitted By: Mary Alice Smith, Grantworks

Questions (Pages 17 & 18, #4):

What is the per capita appraised property value for the applicant's jurisdiction as compared to the average per capita appraised property value of all applicants for the region?

Robin Cisco – Several Regions

....several of the regions use as a scoring factor a comparison of applicants' "per capita appraised property value". However, in requesting this information from several Central Appraisal District offices, we are finding that the CAD's report several numbers to us....Which of these numbers should I use in figuring the applicant's "per capita appraised property value"?.....

Mary Alice Smith – Concho Valley and Permian Basin - Referenced Attachments Not Included

From the 3 examples attached it appears that the format for the data source will vary for communities. If this is the case in Concho Valley, will the report of appraised value signed in July 2007 be acceptable?

Two of the examples do not have the signature date of July 25, 2007, nor do they state that 'as of July 25, 2007' the value.

This question is regarding the question of the Appraised property value. Two of the examples in the attachment do not clearly state the 'as of July 25, 2007' the property value was \$\$\$. The examples are not signed on July 25, 2007. The intent of the question may

have been to determine the appraised property value as documented on the report of July 2007.

Are these examples acceptable as source documentation for the scoring question below from the RRC guidebook?

Response:

Response Date: July 3, 2008

Based on a review of samples submitted as support documentation, ORCA agrees that the scorer would be required to use judgment in selecting the values to be used for scoring purposes, leading to a violation of the 2009 Action Plan. Therefore, ORCA has determined that the reliable data available for comparison purposes is the 2006 taxable values as published in the Texas Comptroller's Office Annual Property Tax Report - Tax Year 2006 - Issued January 2008.

The website link is: <http://window.state.tx.us/taxinfo/proptax/annual06/>. The data source for counties is Chapter 4, Focus on County Taxes, Table 18. County taxable values will be calculated as follows: Total Value Less Deductions General Fund = Taxable Value. For cities, as listed in Chapter 5, Focus on City Taxes, Table 22 under the column titled Taxable Value.

Requires RRC Guidebook Revision: Yes

RRC Support Staff Concurrence: Wendy Stovall

Date: July 22, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Introduction..... 2
- II. WCTCOG RRC Approved Actions 3
- III. Summary of WCTCOG RRC Objective Scoring Criteria..... 4
- IV. WCTCOG RRC Objective Scoring Criteria 6

PART I - INTRODUCTION

WEST CENTRAL TEXAS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE GUIDEBOOK

2009-2010 TEXAS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

The West Central Texas Regional Review Committee (RRC) Guidebook has been prepared in accordance with the 2009 TxCDBG Action Plan and the 2009-2010 Regional Review Committee Scoring and Training Guidelines for the Community Development Fund. The Guidebook provides eligible applicants from the West Central Texas Council of Governments (WCTCOG) region with the application guidelines necessary to be scored under the West Central RRC scoring criteria.

Any questions regarding the RRC or the Guidebook should be directed in writing after the West Central Texas RRC Guidebook has been published in the website of the Office of Rural Community Affairs (ORCA) to:

**Mark Wyatt, Director
Community Development
Office of Rural Community Affairs
P.O. Box 12877
Austin, Texas 78711
e-mail address: mwyatt@orca.state.tx.us
ORCA website: www.orca.state.tx.us**

PART II
WCTCOG
RRC APPROVED ACTIONS

1. The WCTCOG RRC held its required Public Hearing on April 22, 2008 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 West Central Texas Council of Governments as support staff to develop and disseminate the RRC Guidebook. The RRC selected the West Central Texas Council of Governments as support staff to calculate the RRC scores and provide other administrative RRC support.

3. The RRC established the maximum grant amounts for the region:
 - Single jurisdiction: \$250,000.00
 - Multi-jurisdictions: \$350,000.00

4. The RRC did not establish set-asides for housing and non-border colonia projects.

PART III
WCTCOG RRC
SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVE SCORING CRITERIA

Total points by WCTCOG: **115 points**

1. Project Type: **Total points 30**

- First priority - **30 points**
- Second priority - **15 points**
- Third priority - **5 points**

2. Need/Distress: **Total points 50**

- Has the applicant been funded in the previous 2 Community Development/Community Development Supplemental Fund (CD/CDS) application cycles?
Maximum points 10
- What is the individual poverty rate of the census geographic area?
Maximum points 20
- What is the per capita income of the census geographic area?
Maximum points 15
- What is the unemployment rate for the applicant's jurisdiction based on the appropriate county data?
Maximum points 5

3. Resources: **Total points 35**

- What is the applicant's match amount?
Maximum points 10
- What is the cost per beneficiary for each applicant's jurisdiction in comparison to the cost per beneficiary for all applicants?
Maximum points 5
- What is the cost per low-to-moderate income (LMI) beneficiary for each applicant's jurisdiction in comparison to the cost per LMI beneficiary for all applicants?
Maximum points 5

- What is the per capita **property taxable value** for the applicant's jurisdiction as compared to the average per capita **property taxable value** of all applicants in the region?

Maximum points 10

- What is the applicant's residential water rate per 5,000 gallons for the project area(s) compared to the average residential water rate per 5,000 gallons for project areas of all applicants for the region, effective as of July 25, 2008?

Maximum points 5

**PART IV
WCTCOG
RRC OBJECTIVE SCORING CRITERIA**

MAXIMUM TOTAL OBJECTIVE SCORE POSSIBLE: 115

- * 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 TYPE/PRIORITY – Total Points 30

1. Is the project categorized as a first priority, second priority or third RRC priority?
(Maximum 30 Points)

Methodology: Table 1 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 all 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.

Project Types:	SCORE
1. First Priority – Water, wastewater, and first time service related to septic tanks/water and waste water yard lines	
First Priority Projects: <u>30 Points</u>	_____
2. Second Priority – Roads, streets, drainage	
Second Priority Projects: <u>15 Points</u>	_____
3. All other eligible projects	
Third Priority Projects: <u>5 Points</u>	_____

Data Source: As stated below:

RRC Project Priorities: RRC Guidebook

Project Type: CD Application Table 1 verified by ORCA

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. _____

NEED/DISTRESS – Total Points 50

1. Has the applicant been funded in the previous 2 Community Development/Community Development Supplemental Fund (CD/CDS) application cycles?
(Maximum 10 Points) **SCORE** _____

Methodology: Data source documentation will be reviewed and points will be assigned. Projects that include multiple jurisdictions – the applicant with the largest percentage (%) of beneficiaries will be considered the applicant of record.

If not funded in previous 2 CD/CDS cycles **10 pts**
If funded in 1 of 2 previous 2 CD/CDS cycles **5 pts**
If funded in 2 of 2 CD/CDS cycles **0 pts**

Data source: ORCA tracking system report

Information Needed from Applicant to Score:

Funded in previous 1 or 2 CD/CDS cycles:
2005-2006 2007-2008
Yes ____ No ____ Yes ____ No ____

List Contract No. List Contract No.

2. What is the individual poverty rate (poverty percentage) of the census geographic area?

(Maximum 20 Points)

SCORE _____

Methodology:

Poverty rate may be determined by reviewing the 2000 Census data for the census geographic area. Once this information is obtained for each applicant and the target area identified on the census map, the poverty rate for each applicant is calculated by dividing the total number of persons at or below the designated poverty level by the population from which poverty persons was determined. Once this has been determined, the average poverty rate of the applicants is determined by dividing the sum of all poverty rates by the number of applicants.

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

Finally, to determine scores the poverty 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.**

For example, a region has five applicants. The average rate of the five applicants is .2647. A constant of 1.25 is multiplied by the average poverty rate to determine the base. The poverty rate of each applicant is then divided by the base to determine their poverty factor. Finally, scores for each applicant are determined by multiplying the poverty factor by the maximum available points for this scoring criterion.

EXAMPLE

Applicant	Poverty Rate	Poverty Factor	Score
A	.1960	0.5925	11.85
B	.4096	1.2382	24.76
C	.2276	0.6880	13.76
D	.3760	1.1366	22.27
E	.1143	0.3455	6.91

Average: $1.3235 / 5 = .2647$ Base = $1.25 * .2647 = .3308$

****Any applicants exceeding the total allowed points will be capped at the maximum****

If the target area(s) encompasses more than one census geographic area (such as two or more Census Tracts or Block Groups or any combination of Census Tract(s) and/or Block Group(s)), the poverty rate shall be calculated as follows: sum of the total number of persons at or below the designated poverty level of all census geographic areas in the target area divided by the sum of the total population from which poverty persons was determined of all census geographic areas in the target area.

Data Source: As stated below

Population and Poverty Rate: 2000 Census Summary File 3 Table P87

Census Geographic Area: 2000 Census map(s)

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Total Population of the Census Geographic Area: _____

Census Geographic Area Poverty Rate: _____

Target Area(s) identified on Census Map(s): attach map(s)

3. What is the per capita income of the census geographic area?
(Maximum 15 Points) **SCORE** _____

Methodology:

Per capita income may be determined by reviewing the 2000 Census data for the census geographic area. Once this information is obtained for each applicant and the target area identified on the census map, the average annual per capita income is calculated by dividing the sum of all annual per capita incomes by the total number of applicants.

Next, a base is set to provide a constant for the equation. The base is calculated by multiplying the average per capita income by a set number such as .75 to represent 75%. The base is then divided by the annual per capita income for each applicant. This number is referred to as the annual per capita income factor.

Finally to determine the score for each applicant the annual per capita income factor is multiplied by the total maximum allowable points. **Any applicants exceeding the total allowed points will be capped at the maximum.**

For example, a region has five applicants. The average annual per capita income of the five applicants is \$34,200. A constant of .75 is multiplied by the annual average per capita income to determine the base (25,650). The base is then divided by the annual per capita income of each applicant to determine their per capita income factor. Finally, scores for each applicant are determined by multiplying the per capita income factor by the maximum available points for this scoring criterion.

Projects that include multiple jurisdictions – the applicant with the largest percentage (%) of beneficiaries will be considered the applicant of record.

EXAMPLE

Applicant	Per Capita Income (PCI)	PCI Factor	Score
A	\$36,000	.7125	10.6875
B	\$32,000	.8016	12.0240
C	\$33,500	.7657	11.4855
D	\$34,000	.7544	11.3160
E	\$35,500	.7225	10.8375
	\$171,000		

Average: $171,000 / 5 = 34,200$ Base= $.75 * 34,200 = 25,650$

****Any applicants exceeding the total allowed points will be capped at the maximum****

If the target area(s) encompasses more than one census geographic area (such as two or more Census Tracts or Block Groups or any combination of Census Tract(s) and/or

Block Group(s)), the per capita income shall be calculated as follows: sum of Aggregate Income in 1999 (P83) of all census geographic areas in the target area divided by the sum of the Total Population (P1) of all census geographic areas in the target area.

Data Source: As stated below

Per Capita Income for the Census Geographic Area: 2000 Census Data Summary File 3 Table P82

OR

If geographic area contains more than one Census Tract/Block Group: P1 and P83.
Census Geographic Area: 2000 Census map(s)

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Per Capita Income for the Census Geographic Area: _____
Target Area(s) identified on Census Map(s): attach map(s)

4. What is the unemployment rate for the applicant's jurisdiction based on the appropriate county data?
(Maximum 5 Points) **SCORE** _____

Methodology:

The unemployment rate for the applicant's jurisdiction may be determined by reviewing county data from the Tracer section of the Texas Workforce Commission's website. Next, the average unemployment rate of the applicants is determined by dividing the sum of all unemployment rates by the number of applicants.

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

Finally, to determine scores, the unemployment 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.**

For example, a region has five applicants. The average unemployment rate of the five applicants is .2647. A constant of 1.25 is multiplied by the average unemployment rate to determine the base (0.3308). The unemployment rate of each applicant is then divided by the base to determine their unemployment factor. Finally, scores for each applicant are determined by multiplying the unemployment factor by the maximum available points for this scoring criterion.

EXAMPLE

Applicant	Unemployment Rate	Unemployment Factor	Score
A	.1960	0.5925	2.96
B	.4096	1.2382	6.19
C	.2276	0.6880	3.44
D	.3760	1.1366	5.68
E	.1143	0.3455	1.73

Average: $1.3235 / 5 = .2647$ Base = $1.25 * .2647 = .3308$

**** Any applicants exceeding the total allowed points will be capped at the maximum****

Data Source: As stated below: TWC Tracer for 2007 Annual Data

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Applicant's unemployment rate for 2007 Annual Data: _____

**RESOURCES (MATCH/COST EFFECTIVENESS/FINANCIAL CAPACITY)
TOTAL POINTS 35**

1. What is the applicant's match amount?
(Maximum 10 Points) SCORE _____
(Match Amount / TxCDBG Funds Requested)

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 for 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.

Applicant(s) population equal to or less than 1,500 according to the 2000 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 2000 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 2000 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: 2000 Census Data Summary File 3 Table P1

County Unincorporated Water/Sewer Beneficiaries: CD Application Table 1 Verified By ORCA

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Applicant Population: _____

County Unincorporated Water/Sewer Beneficiaries: _____

Applicant TxCDBG Amount: \$ _____

Applicant Match From All Sources: \$ _____

2. What is the cost per beneficiary for each applicant’s jurisdiction in comparison to the cost per beneficiary for all applicants?
(Maximum Points 5) **SCORE** _____

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 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). **Any applicants exceeding the total allowed points will be capped at the maximum.**

EXAMPLE

Cost Per Beneficiary Total Points Available: **5 POINTS**

Applicant	Project Amount	Total Benes	Cost Per Bene	% of CPB	ABS CPB	Total Score
Applicant A	\$250,000.00	3,500	\$71.43	0.0146	0.9854	4.9272
Applicant B	\$250,000.00	120	\$2,083.33	0.4248	0.5752	2.8762
Applicant C	\$250,000.00	100	\$2,500.00	0.5097	0.4903	2.4515
Applicant D	\$250,000.00	1,000	\$250.00	0.0510	0.9490	4.7451
Sums			\$4,904.76	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 ORCA

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Total No. of Beneficiaries: _____

Total Project Amount TxCDBG Only: \$ _____

3. What is the cost per low-to-moderate income (LMI) beneficiary for each applicant's jurisdiction in comparison to the cost per low-to-moderate income beneficiary for all applicants?

(Maximum Points 5)

SCORE _____

Methodology:

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

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). **Any applicants exceeding the total allowed points will be capped at the maximum.**

EXAMPLE

CPLMIB **Total Points Available: 5 POINTS**

Applicant	Project Amount	Tot LMI Benes	CPLMIB	% CPLMIB	ABS CPB	Total Score
Applicant A	\$250,000.00	3,500	\$71.43	0.0146	0.9854	4.9272
Applicant B	\$250,000.00	120	\$2,083.33	0.4248	0.5752	2.8762
Applicant C	\$250,000.00	100	\$2,500.00	0.5097	0.4903	2.4515
Applicant D	\$250,000.00	1,000	\$250.00	0.0510	0.9490	4.7451

Sums \$4,904.76 1.0000

*(Project Amount / Total LMI Benes) / (CPLMIB / Sum of CPLMIB) * (1 - % of CPLMIB) * Total Points Available*

Data Source: As Stated Below:

CD Application Table 1 Verified By ORCA

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

No. of Low-to-Moderate Income Beneficiaries: _____

Total Project Amount TxCDBG Only: \$ _____

4. What is the per capita **property taxable value** for the applicant's jurisdiction (*see data source below) as compared to the average per capita **property taxable value** of all applicants for the region?

(Maximum 10 Points)

SCORE: _____

Methodology:

This score is determined by comparing the applicant's per capita **property taxable value** to the average per capita **property taxable value** of all applicants. The calculation considers the difference in the applicant's per capita **property taxable value** to the average per capita **property taxable value** of all applicants. The applicant's **property taxable value** is derived from the 2006 taxable values as published in the Texas Comptroller's Office *Annual Property Tax Report - Tax Year 2006 - Issued January 2008*. The applicant's per capita **property taxable value** is derived by dividing the **property taxable value** by the applicant's population. The average per capita **property taxable value** of all applicant's is derived by totaling the **property taxable values** of all applicants and then dividing by the total population of all applicants. The applicant's per capita percentage of the regional per capita average is determined by dividing the applicant's per capita **property taxable value** by the average region per capita **taxable value**. Next, subtracting the applicant's percentage of the region average from 100% determines the applicant's percentage below the region average. (Cities will be compared to cities and counties will be compared to counties.)

Cities:

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| a) Applicant does not levy a property tax | <u>0 points</u> |
| b) Equal to or above region's average | <u>2 points</u> |
| c) Below region's average but equal to or less than 20% | <u>4 points</u> |
| d) Below region's average between 20% but equal to or less than 40% | <u>6 points</u> |
| e) Below region's average between 40% but equal to or less than 60% | <u>8 points</u> |
| f) Below region's average by more than 60% | <u>10 points</u> |

Counties:

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| a) Applicant does not levy a property tax | <u>0 points</u> |
| b) Equal to or above region's average | <u>2 points</u> |
| c) Below region's average but equal to or less than 20% | <u>4 points</u> |
| d) Below region's average between 20% but equal to or less than 40% | <u>6 points</u> |
| e) Below region's average between 40% but equal to or less than 60% | <u>8 points</u> |
| f) Below region's average by more than 60% | <u>10 points</u> |

Data Source: As stated below:

Property Taxable Value:

2006 taxable values as published in the Texas Comptroller's Office *Annual Property Tax Report - Tax Year 2006 - Issued January 2008.*

The website link is: <http://window.state.tx.us/taxinfo/proptax/annual06/>.

Counties: The data source for counties is *Chapter 4, Focus on County Taxes, Table 18.* County taxable values will be calculated as follows: *Total Value Less Deductions General Fund = Taxable Value.*

Cities: For cities, as listed in *Chapter 5, Focus on City Taxes, Table 22* under the column titled *Taxable Value.*

Population: 2000 Census Data Summary File 3 Table P1

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Applicant's Property Taxable Value: _____

Applicant's Total Population: _____

Per Capita Property Taxable Value for Applicant: _____

5. What is the applicant's residential water rate per 5,000 gallons for the project area(s) compared to the average residential water rate per 5,000 gallons for project areas of all applicants for the region, effective as of July 25, 2008?
(Maximum 5 Points)

Below Average	<u>0 points</u>
Equal to Average	<u>2 points</u>
Above Average	<u>5 points</u>
No Public Water Service*	<u>5 points</u>

Methodology: This score is determined by comparing the applicant's residential water rate per 5,000 gallons for the project area(s) compared to the average residential water rate per 5,000 gallons for project areas of all applicants of the region. This scoring question is applicable to all eligible activities submitted for 2009-2010 CD funding.

If the project area(s) is not severed by a public water system, the applicant will receive 5 points (*100% of the project beneficiaries must be served by a non-public water source to receive the maximum points). If the project area(s) is served by a combination of public and private systems, the public system residential water rate per 5,000 gallons will be used in the calculations to determine the project area(s) residential water rate per 5,000 gallons for the applicant as described below.

Step 1. The applicant's residential water rate per 5,000 gallons for the project area(s) is derived from data provided by each of the applicant's service provider(s) that states the residential water rate for 5,000 gallons for the project area(s) and is certified by the Certifying Official (such as the Chief Financial Officer or the Chief Executive Officer) of the service provider as of 7/25/2008. Any project area(s) that is served by multiple water service providers or multiple 5,000 gallon residential rates the residential water rates per 5,000 gallons for each service provider and/or rates will be summed and then divided by the number of service providers to determine an average for the applicant. The applicant's average residential water rate per 5,000 gallons for the project area(s) will then be compared to the average for all applicants as described below.

Step 2. The average residential water rate per 5,000 gallons for all applicants is derived by summing the calculated residential water rates per 5,000 gallons for all applicants' of the region using Step 1 and then dividing the sum by the number of applicants.

Step 3. The applicant's residential water rate per 5,000 gallons for the project area(s) will then be compared to the average residential water rate per 5,000 gallons for project areas of all applicants of the region and points will be assigned. Water rates per 5,000 gallons will be calculated to the cent (xx.xx) for comparison purposes and assignment of points.

Data Source:

Residential Water Rate Per 5,000 Gallons for Project Area(s): Certifying Official (such as Chief Financial Officer or the Chief Executive Officer) Supplies Certification of the Residential Water Rate Per 5,000 Gallons for Project Area(s) As of 7/25/2008

Lead Multi-Jurisdiction Applicant: Identified in the Applicant Resolution Submitted with the CD Application

Information Needed From Applicant To Score:

Name of Service Provider: _____

Residential Water Rate(s) Per 5,000 Gallons for Project Area(s) Per Service Provider:

\$ _____

\$ _____

Name of Service Provider: _____

Residential Water Rate(s) Per 5,000 Gallons for Project Area(s) Per Service Provider:

\$ _____

\$ _____

Name of Service Provider: _____

Residential Water Rate(s) Per 5,000 Gallons for Project Area(s) Per Service Provider:

\$ _____

\$ _____