CDBG- Public Facilities

Agency Name:

Requested Amount:

Application Eligibility Screening (Performed by staff prior to committee review)	Staff Check
Application submitted by the deadline	☐
Application complete, with required materials and required acknowledgements as specified in the application	☐
Project is located wholly within Salt Lake County	☐
Eligible project type	☐
Eligible use of funds	☐
Comments:	

Application Scoring Criteria		Advisory Board Score	Weighted Score
Consolidated Plan (weighted at 4)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or response does not address the question		
1	Identifies a priority, but does not clearly connect the project to a specific objective, or the connection is vague/generic.		
2	Identifies a priority and an objective, with a reasonable explanation of how the project aligns.		
3	Clearly identifies a priority and specific objective(s), with a strong, project-specific explanation of how the project directly advances it.		
Comments:		3	12
Project Narrative & Target Population-Public Facilities (weighted at 5)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or the response does not describe the proposed improvements or population served.		
1	Vague. Improvements and/or population are described generally, with little explanation of the specific need or why the improvements are needed now.		
2	Clear. Identifies specific improvements, the population served, and the need addressed, with a reasonable explanation of why improvements are needed now.		
3	Clear and well-matched. Explains how specific improvements address the population's needs, with a strong, project-specific explanation of why improvements are needed now.		
Comments:		3	15
Applicant Background and Expertise (weighted at 5)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or does not describe the applicant's background or relevant experience.		
1	Vague. Mentions experience but provides little detail on previous construction projects or federal funding requirements.		
2	Clear. Descibes relevant experience on previous construction projects and some experience with federal funding requirements.		

3	Clear and well-supported. Provides specific examples of previous, similar construction projects and managing federal funding requirements, identifying specific federal funding requirements.		
Comments:		3	15
Project Readiness (weighted at 4)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or only the need is identified; no design or plan exist.		
1	Early planning. Scope or assessments are being developed, design funding is requested, or a design professional has not been selected.		
2	Design underway or substantially complete. A design professional is selected, but final documents or approvals remain pending.		
3	Final design complete. Plans, specificactions, and costs estimates are complete, or the project is ready for bidding and construction procurement.		
Comments:		3	15
Timeline (weighted at 3)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or no project timeline is provided		
1	Vague. Lists some tasks but omits major phases or target start and completion dates.		
2	Clear. Includes major tasks and target dates for remaining design/permitting, bidding, and construction, with a generally reasonable sequence.		
3	Clear and realistic. Includes all applicable phases with specific start and completion dates, logically sequences and consistent with project readiness.		
Comments:		3	9
Contingencies (weighted at 2)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or no plan addresses increased costs.		
1	Vague. Acknowledges potential cost increases but provides no specific strategy to cover them.		
2	Clear. Identifies a reasonable strategy for increased costs, but funding availibility or implementation details are limited.		
3	Clear and feasible. Identifies specific reasources or adjustments to cover increased costs and explains how they would preserve the projects core purpose.		
Comments:		3	6
Outcomes (weighted at 4)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, or no measurable outcomes are listed.		
1	Vague. Outcomes are listed but are not measurable, or no target number or percentage is given.		
2	Clear. At least one specific, measurable outcome is listed with a target number or percentage.		
3	Clear and well-supported. Multiple specific, measurable outcomes are listed, each with a target number or percentage, and the targets are realistic given the project size and population described.		
Comments:		3	12
Funding (weighted at 4)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Not answered, no other resources listed, or how the requested amount was determined		

1	Vague. Funding amounts or commitments are unclear. Provides little justification for the request.		
2	Clear. Lists committed sources and amounts. Explains the request based on project needs.		
3	Clear and well-supported. Lists committed funding, or states none. Justifies the request using costs and available funding consistent with the budget.		
Comments:		3	12
Budget (weighted at 5)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Budget form is missing or incomplete.		
1	Vague. The Budget Line Desciption and Justification provide little information as to what is being requested and why.		
2	Clear. Budget Line Descriptions itemize reasonable costs. Justifications connect costs to project activities with some explanation of calculations.		
3	Clear and well-supported. Budget Line Descriptions detail reasonable costs and accurate amounts. Justifications explain calculations and link costs to requested categories and project activities.		
Comments:		3	15
Application Completeness (weighted at 1)			
Score	*Description*		
0	Incomplete. Required boxes are blank or application materials are missing.		
1	Complete. All required boxes are filled and application materials are included.		
Comments:		1	1
TOTAL SCORE		**18**	**100**