

3 PLAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND FUNDING METHODOLOGY

THE CONSOLIDATED PLAN 2005 HAS BEEN PREPARED BY THE FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS TO DOCUMENT THE HOUSING, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT NEEDS OF SOUTHWESTERN UTAH. THIS CHAPTER HIGHLIGHTS THE PLAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS METHODOLOGY.

PLAN DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS METHODOLOGY

Developing the Plan

The development of the Five County Association of Governments Consolidated Plan follows a collaborative process that can be summarized in four primary steps:

1. Outreach and Data Collection
2. Organization of the data
3. Public Input
4. Approval of the Plan

Association staff conduct an outreach program to gather input from jurisdictions and other parties who are directly impacted by the plan, such as the Continuum of Care, provider organizations, special service districts, etc. Jurisdictions receive several notices and materials to aid them in updating the community assessment portion of the plan. The Steering Committee has final review and approves the regional priorities included in the plan. Association staff also gathers demographic, economic, housing and other related information about the region to meet the to the content requirements specified for the plan by the State of Utah Small Cities CDBG program. Once the primary data is gathered, staff organizes the plan following the outline provided by the State to create a draft document and makes the draft available for public comment. An open house and public hearing are held and the plan is made available for a 30-day public comment period. Input into the document is sought from a variety of sources, especially from jurisdictions within the region, through a public participation process. Comments received are considered and, where appropriate, are incorporated into the final draft of the plan. The final draft of the plan is submitted to the Steering Committee for final review and approval, and is then submitted to the State CDBG staff.

For CDBG funding distribution purposes, the Steering Committee has the responsibility to review regional rating and ranking policies on an annual basis. This is generally accomplished in the summer of each year. The Rating and Ranking as well as regional CDBG policies are adopted each August and provide the framework for the region's CDBG program. Regional policies are intended to ensure that HUD dollars are targeted toward those populations with the greatest need and to projects that will provide the greatest impact in addressing those needs.

Rating and Ranking Process

As mentioned previously, the Steering Committee annually approves the CDBG Rating and Ranking Policies. In determining what criteria will be included in the policies, the staff ensures that criteria established by the State CDBG Policy Committee are included. Other criteria included are a collection of elements that are important in this region, either as evidenced through county and regional priorities established in the Consolidated Plan, or through comments provided by local jurisdictions. The Rating and Ranking Criteria will be utilized for the 2005-06 CDBG program year. The adopted data sources to be utilized, as well as general CDBG program policies, are also listed.

**FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
FY 2005-06 CDBG RATING AND RANKING CRITERIA and APPLICANT'S PROJECT SCORE SHEET**

The Five County Association of Governments Steering Committee has established this criteria for the purpose of rating and ranking fairly and equitably all Community Development Block Grant Pre-Applications received for funding during FY 2005-06. Only projects which are determined to be threshold eligible will be rated and ranked. Eligibility will be determined following review of the submitted CDBG Pre-Application with all supporting documentation provided prior to rating and ranking. Please review the attached Data Sources Sheet for a more detailed explanation of each criteria.

Applicant:		Requested CDBG \$'s		Ranking:		of		Total Score:	
-------------------	--	----------------------------	--	-----------------	--	-----------	--	---------------------	--

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description Five County Association of Governments		Data	Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)							Score	X Weight	Total
1 A	Grantee Performance: Performance history of capacity to administer grant. First-time & <5-yr grantees: default 2.5 points		Excellent 4 points	Very Good 3 points	Good 2 points	Fair 1 point	Poor 0 points				1.0	
1 B	Grant Administration: Concerted effort made by grantee to minimize grant administration costs.		100% Other Funds 3 points	1 - 5% 2 points	5.1 - 10% 1 point						1.0	
2	Job Creation: Estimated number of new jobs completed project will create or number of jobs retained that would be lost without this project.		> 4 Jobs 4 points	3-4 Jobs 3 points	2 jobs 2 points	1 job 1 point					1.5	
3	Unemployment: What percentage is applicant County's unemployment percentage rate above State average percentage rate?	%	6% or greater 3.5 points	5% above state average 3 points	4% above state average 2.5 points	3% above state average 2 points	2% above state average 1.5 points	1% above state avg. 1 point	Equal to or < State average 0 points		.5	
4 A	Self-help Financing - (<i>Jurisdiction Population <1,000</i>) Percent of non-CDBG funds invested in total project cost	%	> 10% 5 points	7.1 % - 10% 4 points	4.1% - 7% 3 points	1% - 4% 2 points	< 1% 1 point				2.0	
4 B	Self-help Financing - (<i>Jurisdiction Population 1,000 - 2,500</i>) Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in total project	%	> 20% 5 points	15.1 - 20% 4 points	10.1 - 15% 3 points	5.1 - 10% 2 points	1 - 5.0% 1 point				2.0	

CONSOLIDATED PLAN 2005

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description Five County Association of Governments		Data	Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)					Score	X Weight	Total
4 C	Self-help Financing - (<u>Jurisdiction Population 2,501 - 6,000</u>) Percentage of Non-CDBG funds invested in total project	%	> 40% 5 points	30.1 - 40% 4 points	20.1 - 30% 3 points	10.1 - 20% 2 points	1 - 10% 1 point		2.0	
4 D	Self-help Financing - (<u>Jurisdiction Population >6,000</u>) Percentage of non-CDBG funds invested in total project	%	> 50% 5 points	40.1 - 50% 4 points	30.1 - 40% 3 points	20.1 - 30% 2 points	1 - 20% 1 point		2.0	
5	CDBG funds Requested Per Capita: CDBG funds requested divided by population		\$1 - 100 5 points	\$101-200 4 points	\$201- 400 3 points	\$401 - 800 2 points	\$801 or > 1 point		1.0	
6 T*	Jurisdiction's Project Priority: Project priority rating in Regional Consolidated Plan, (<u>Capital Investment Plan - One-Year Action Plan</u>)		High # 1 5 points	High # 2 4 points	High # 3 3 points	High # 4 2 points	High # 5 1 point	High # >5 0 point	2.5	
7	County's Project Priority: Prioritization will be determined by the three (3) appointed Steering Committee members representing the county in which the proposed project is located. The three (3) members of the Steering Committee include: one County Commission Representative, one Mayor's Representative, and one School Board Representative. (Note: for AOG application, determination is made by the Steering Committee Chair, in consultation with the AOG Executive Committee.)		# 1 5 points	# 2 4 points	# 3 3 points	# 4 2 points	# 5 1 point	#6 or > 0 points	2.5	
8	Regional Project Priority: Determined by the Executive Director with consultation of the AOG Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is comprised of one (1) County Commissioner from each of the five counties.		# 1 5 points	# 2 4 points	# 3 3 points	# 4 2 points	# 5 1 point	#6 or > 0 points	2.5	

CONSOLIDATED PLAN 2005

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description Five County Association of Governments		Data	Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)						Score	X Weight	Total
9	LMI Housing Stock: Number of units constructed, rehabilitated, or made accessible to LMI residents		> 15 Units 4 points	8 - 15 Units 3 points	3 - 8 Units 2 points	2 Units 1 point				1.0	
10	Affordable Housing Plan Implementation: City has adopted an Affordable Housing Plan and this project specifically demonstrates implementation of policies in the Plan (Criteria required by State Legislature). Towns applying for credit under this criteria may <u>either</u> meet a goal in their adopted Affordable Housing Plan or the project meets a regional affordable housing goal in the Consolidated Plan.		YES 2 points	No 0 points						1.0	
11	Project's Geographical Impact: Area benefitting from project.		Regional 6 points	Multi-county 5 points	County-wide 4 points	Multi-community 3 points	Community 2 points	Portion of Community 1 point		1.5	
12	Applicant's County Per Capita Income (PCI): as compared to State's PCI to target distressed areas from 2000 Census.	%	70% or < 5 points	71 - 80% 4 points	81 - 90% 3 points	90 - 100% 2 points	100-110% 1 point	> 110% 0 points		1.0	
13	Jurisdiction's Property Tax Rate: In response to higher demand for services, many communities have already raised tax rates to fund citizen needs. The communities that maintain an already high tax burden (as compared to the tax ceiling set by state law) will be given higher points for this category. Property tax rate as a percent of the maximum allowed by law (3 point default for non-taxing jurisdiction)	%	61% or > 5 points	51 - 60% 4 points	41 - 50% 3 points	31 - 40% 2 points	21 - 30% 1 point	< 20% 0 points		1.0	
14	Jurisdiction's LMI Population: Percent of residents considered LMI (based on 2000 Census Data or Survey)	%	91 - 100% 5 points	81 - 90% 4 points	71 - 80% 3 points	61 - 70% 2 points	51 - 60% 1 point			1.0	

CONSOLIDATED PLAN 2005

CDBG Rating and Ranking Criteria Description Five County Association of Governments		Data	Data Range/Score (circle only one for each criteria)						Score	X Weight	Total
15	Presumed LMI Group: Project specifically serves CDBG identified LMI groups, i.e. elderly, disabled, homeless, etc., as stipulated in CDBG Application Guide	%	100% 5 points	80 - 99% 4 points	60 - 79% 3 points	51 - 59% 2 points				1.0	
16 A	Jurisdiction's Participation in the 21st Century Communities Program: Communities with less than 1,000 population		21 st Century Participation 2 points							1.0	
16 B	Jurisdictions's Participation in the 21st Century Communities Program: Communities with greater than 1,000 population		21 st Century Participation 1 point							1.0	
17	Application Quality: Application identifies problem, contains a well-defined scope of work and is cost-effective.		Excellent 5 points	Very Good 4 points	Good 3 points	Fair 2 points	Acceptable 1 point	Poor 0 points		2.0	
18.	Project Maturity: Project demonstrates capacity to be implemented and/or completed in the 18 month contract period and is clearly documented.		Excellent 5 points	Very Good 4 points	Good 3 points	Fair 2 points	Acceptable 1 point	Poor 0 points		2.0	

PLEASE NOTE: Criteria marked with a T* is a THRESHOLD eligibility requirement for the CDBG Program.

< = Less Than > = More Than

Previously Allocated Set-Aside Funding:

\$150,000 – Five County AOG (Planning and Technical Assistance Grant)

\$140,000 – Iron County (Cedar Senior Citizen Center Expansion - Phase II)

\$ 58,600 – Glendale Town (Storm Drainage Improvements - Phase II)

Funding for Phase II of the Glendale Town project will be provided from FY 2004-05 CDBG funding allocation.

CRITERIA 17 WORK SHEET

APPLICATION QUALITY			
Criteria	Support Documentation	Other Documentation	Score (10 Points Total)
1. Problem Identification	Additional written text provided? Yes___ No___ 1 point	Detailed Architectural/Engineering Report prepared? Yes___ No___ 2 points	
2. Is proposed solution well defined in Scope of Work? In other words, is solution likely to solve problem?	Yes___ No___ 1 point		
3. Does the application give a concise description of how the project will be completed in a timely manner?	Yes___ No___ 1 point		
4. Proposed project does <u>not</u> duplicate any existing services or activities already available and provided to beneficiaries in that jurisdiction through other programs, i.e. those locally or regionally based.	Yes___ (Does not Duplicate) 5 points No___ (Duplicates Services) 0 points		
			Total Points

Excellent = 10 points
 Very Good = 9 points
 Good = 8 points

Fair = 7 points
 Acceptable = 6 points
 Poor = 5 points

CRITERIA 18 WORK SHEET

PROJECT MATURITY		
Criteria	Status	Score (5 Points Total)
1. Architect/Engineer already selected at time of application through formal RFP process	Yes___ No___ 1 point	
2. Is the proposed solution to problem identified in the Scope of Work ready to proceed immediately?	(Well Defined) Yes___ No___ 1 point	
3. Has applicant identified all funding sources?	Yes___ No___ 1 point	
4. Funding Status (Maturity)	All other project funding is applied for but not committed. Yes___ No___ 1 point (or) All other project funding is in place for immediate use. Yes___ No___ 2 point (or) Is CDBG the only funding source for the project? Yes___ No___ 2 Points	
		Total Points

Excellent = 5 points
 Very Good = 4 points
 Good = 3 points

Fair = 2 points
 Acceptable = 1 point
 Poor = 0 points

**Five County Association of Governments
CDBG Rating and Ranking Program Year 2005/06
Data Sources**

1. **GRANTEE PERFORMANCE:** Consultation with state CDBG staff based upon grants during the previous five years. Previous grantees will be advised if they received a poor or fair evaluation and will have an opportunity to present a plan to the State and AOG staff as to how problems with the previous grant will be avoided in the administration of this year's grant. A score of 2.5 will be received following approval of said plan. New grantees are presumed to have the capacity to adequately administer their grant and by default will receive 2.5 points. Previous grantees who were funded more than 5 years ago are considered to be new grantees for the purposes of this evaluation. If any grantee proposes to utilize an experienced outside consultant, for grant administration, a good or excellent rating may be awarded. Grant administration costs will be taken from the CDBG pre-application.
2. **JOB CREATION:** Information provided by applicant prior to rating and ranking. Applicant must be able to adequately support proposed figures for job creation potential. This pertains to permanent jobs created as a result of the project, not jobs utilized in the construction of a project. Two part-time employees = 1 full-time.
3. **UNEMPLOYMENT:** "Utah Economic and Demographic Profiles" (most current issue available prior to rating and ranking), provided by Utah Office of Planning and Budget; or "Utah Labor Market Report" (most current issue with annual averages), provided by Department of Workforce Services.
4. **SELF-HELP FINANCING:** From figures provided by applicant in grant application. Documentation of the source(s) and status (whether already secured or not) of any and all proposed "matching" funds must be provided prior to the rating and ranking of the application by the RRC. Any changes made in the dollar amount of proposed funding, after rating and ranking has taken place, shall require reevaluation of the rating received on this criteria. A determination will then be made as to whether the project's overall ranking and funding prioritization is affected by the score change.

Use of an applicant's local funds and/or leveraging of other matching funds is strongly encouraged in CDBG funded projects in the Five County Region. This allows for a greater number of projects to be accomplished in a given year. Acceptable matches include property, materials available and specifically committed to this project, and cash. Due to federal restrictions unacceptable matches include donated labor, use of equipment, etc. All match proposed must be quantified as cash equivalent through an acceptable process before the match can be used. Documentation on how and by whom the match is quantified is required. "Secured" means that a letter or applications of intent exist to show that other funding sources have been requested as match to the proposed project. If leveraged funds are not received then the points given for that match will be deducted and the project's rating reevaluated.

A jurisdiction's population (most current estimate provided by Utah Office of Planning and Budget) will determine whether they are Category A, B, C or D for the purposes of this criteria.

CONSOLIDATED PLAN 2005

5. **CDBG DOLLARS REQUESTED PER CAPITA:** Determined by dividing the dollar amount requested in the CDBG application by the population of the jurisdiction, using most current population estimate provided by Utah Office of Planning and Budget.
6. **LOCAL JURISDICTIONS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES: THRESHOLD CRITERIA:** Every applicant is required to document that the project for which they are applying is consistent with that community's and the Five County District Consolidated Plan. The project, or project type, must be a high priority in the investment component (Capital Investment Plan (CIP) One-Year Action Plan). The applicant must include evidence that the community was and continues to be a willing partner in the development of the regional (five-county) consolidated planning process. (See CDBG Application Guide.)
7. **COUNTY'S COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND POLICIES:** Prioritization will be determined by the three (3) appointed Steering Committee members representing the county in which the proposed project is located. The three (3) members of the Steering Committee include: one County Commission Representative, one Mayor's Representative, and one School Board Representative. (Note: for AOG application, determination is made by the Steering Committee Chair, in consultation with the AOG Executive Committee.)
8. **REGIONAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND POLICIES:** Determined by the Executive Director with consultation of the AOG Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is comprised of one County Commissioner from each of the five counties.
9. **IMPROVEMENTS TO, OR EXPANSION OF, LMI HOUSING STOCK, OR PROVIDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACCESSIBILITY TO LMI RESIDENTS:** Information provided by the applicant. Applicant must be able to adequately explain reasoning which supports proposed figures, for the number of LMI housing units to be constructed or substantially rehabilitated with the assistance of this grant. Or the number of units this grant will make accessible to LMI residents through loan closing or down payment assistance.
10. **AFFORDABLE HOUSING PLAN IMPLEMENTATION:** In January, 1999, the Community and Economic Development State Legislative Committee passed a resolution requiring the Community Impact Fund and the Community Development Block Grant Program to implement rating and ranking criteria that would award jurisdictions that had complied with HB 295 law and had adopted their Affordable Housing Plans when they applied for funding from these two programs. The CDBG State Policy Board adopted the following rating and ranking criteria to be used by each regional rating and ranking system: "To further the objectives of HB 295, applications received from communities/counties, which have plans completed and adopted, to further the development of affordable housing, will be given additional points." Projects which actually demonstrate implementation of a jurisdiction's Affordable Housing Plan policies will be given points. Applicants must provide sufficient documentation to justify their project does, in fact, comply with this criteria. Towns applying for credit under this criteria may either meet a goal in their adopted Affordable Housing Plan or the project meets a regional affordable housing goal in the Consolidated Plan.
11. **GEOGRAPHIC EXTENT OF PROJECT'S IMPACT:** The actual area to be benefitted by the project applied for.
12. **PER CAPITA INCOME OF APPLICANT'S COUNTY RELATIVE TO STATE PER CAPITA INCOME:** Utah Department of Workforce Services; or more current source available prior to rating and ranking.

CONSOLIDATED PLAN 2005

13. **PROPERTY TAX RATE FOR JURISDICTION:** Base tax rate for community or county, as applicable, will be taken from the "Statistical Review of Government in Utah", or most current source using the most current edition available prior to rating and ranking. Basis for determining percent are the maximum tax rates allowed in the Utah Code: .70% for municipalities, and .32% for counties.
14. **PERCENTAGE OF APPLICANT'S JURISDICTION WHO ARE LOW TO MODERATE INCOME:** Figures from the most current available census data provided by the State Department of Community and Economic Development. If a community or county is not on the DCED provided "HUD Pre-approved List", the figures will be provided from the results of a DCED approved income survey conducted by the applicant of the project benefit area households.
15. **PRESUMED LMI GROUP:** Applicant will provide information as to what percent of the proposed project will assist a presumed LMI group as defined in the current program year CDBG Application Guide handbook.
16. **JURISDICTION'S PARTICIPATION IN THE 21st CENTURY COMMUNITY PROGRAM:** Points are given based upon 21st Century Community Program participation by the jurisdiction at the time of project rating and ranking. Communities with a population less than 1,000 who are participating in the 21st Century Community Program will be awarded additional points not available to larger cities.
17. **APPLICATION QUALITY:** Quality of the Pre-Application in terms of project identification, justification, and well-defined scope of work likely to address identified problems.
18. **PROJECT MATURITY:** Funding should be prioritized to those projects which are the most "mature". For the purposes of this process, maturity is defined as those situations where: 1) the applicant has assigned a project manager; 2) has selected an engineer and/or architect through a formal process in accordance with applicable laws and regulations; 3) knows who will administer the grant; 4) proposed solution to problem is identified in the Scope of Work and ready to proceed immediately; and 5) identifies all funding sources and funding maturity status. Projects that are determined to not be sufficiently mature so as to be ready to proceed in a timely manner, may not be rated and ranked.

Five County Association of Governments Community Development Block Grant General Policies

1. Five County AOG staff will visit each applicant on site for an evaluation/review meeting.
2. All applications will be evaluated by the Five County Association of Governments Community and Economic Development staff using criteria approved by the Steering Committee.
3. Staff will present prioritization recommendation to the RRC (Steering Committee) for consideration and approval.
4. Maximum amount per year \$150,000.00.
5. Maximum years for multi-year is 2 years at \$150,000 per year.
6. All applications for multi-year funding must contain a complete budget and budget breakdown for each specific year of funding.
7. Applications on behalf of sub-recipients (i.e., special service districts, non-profit organizations, etc.) are encouraged. However, the applicant city or county must understand that even if they name the sub-recipient as project manager the city/county is still responsible for the project's viability and program compliance. The applying entity must be willing to maintain an active oversight of both the project and the sub-recipient's contract performance. An inter-local agreement between the applicant entity and the sub-recipient must accompany the pre-application. The inter-local agreement must detail who will be the project manager and how the sponsoring entity and sub-recipient will coordinate work on the project. A letter from the governing board of the sub-recipient requesting the sponsorship of the project must accompany the pre-application. This letter must be signed by the board chairperson.
8. Projects must be consistent with the District's Consolidated Plan. The project applied for must be included in the prioritized capital improvements list that the entity submitted for inclusion in the Consolidated Plan. Projects sponsored on behalf of an eligible sub-recipient may not necessarily be listed in the jurisdictions capital investment plan, but the sub-recipient's project must meet goals identified in the region's Consolidated Plan.
9. Previously allocated set-aside funding:
 \$150,000 Five County AOG (Planning and Technical Assistance Grant)
 \$140,000 Iron County (Cedar Senior Citizen Center Expansion - Phase II)
 \$ 58,600 Glendale Town (Storm Drainage Improvements Phase II)
 NOTE: Funding for Phase II of the Glendale Town project will be provided from the FY 2004-05 CDBG funding cycle)

Adopted by the Five County Association of Governments Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee) August 14, 2002; Revised by Steering Committee on August 11, 2004

Five County Association of Governments How-to-Apply CDBG Application Workshop Attendance Policy

Attendance at one workshop within the region is mandatory by all prospective applicants or an "OFFICIAL" representative of said applicant. [State Policy]

Attendance at the workshop by a county commissioner, mayor, city council member, or county clerk satisfies the above referenced attendance requirement of the prospective applicant's jurisdiction. In addition, attendance by a city manager, town clerk, or county administrator also satisfies this requirement.

Jurisdictions may formally designate a third party representative (i.e., other city/county staff, consultant, engineer, or architect) to attend the workshop on their behalf. Said designation by the jurisdiction shall be in writing. The letter of designation shall be provided to the Five County Association no later than at the beginning of the workshop.

Attendance by prospective eligible "sub-grantees", which may include non-profit agencies, special service districts, housing authorities, etc. is strongly recommended so that they may become familiar with the application procedures. If a city/town or county elects to sponsor a sub-grantee it is the responsibility of that jurisdiction to ensure the timely and accurate preparation of the CDBG application on behalf of the sub-grantee.

Extraordinary circumstances relating to this policy shall be presented to the Executive Director of the Five County Association of Governments for consideration by the Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee).

Adopted by the Five County Association of Governments Regional Review Committee (Steering Committee) October 9, 2002.

Rating and Ranking Procedure

Each application is evaluated based on specific applicable criteria. The rating and ranking process proceeds as follows:

- Association staff reviews all pre-applications with the State of Utah CDBG staff to ensure eligibility and compliance with national objectives.
- Staff conducts site visits with each applicant to personally investigate and become familiar with each project. During the site visits additional information is obtained to clarify concerns, and applicant questions are answered.
- For eligible projects, staff completes the preliminary rating process employing the objective criteria listed in the regional Rating and Ranking criteria.
- Pre-application materials are distributed to a three-person committee in each of the five counties. These committees (consisting of the Steering Committee members from that particular county) provide a county prioritization of projects within the geographic boundaries of that county.
- The Executive Director, in consultation with the Executive Committee (made up of the county commissioner from each of the five counties who serves on the Steering Committee), determine regional prioritizations.
- Based upon final scoring matrix ratings, the Steering Committee makes final a funding ranking determination for projects and grantees are announced.

Applicant Input into the Process

The annual approval of the rating and ranking policies allows staff to identify changing conditions. Local officials can also reflect changing priorities. The Association is always open to suggestions from all interested parties as to modifications to the policies that those parties believe may be needed. The Association strives to base any change upon measurable criteria in order to retain an objective process.

The Steering Committee and staff make every effort to ensure that policies are implemented in such a way to prioritize projects that best meet the objectives of the CDBG program, are well thought out as part of a comprehensive and ongoing planning process, and will realize significant local or regional impact or benefit. In this way, the funding is distributed in compliance with HUD and state regulations, and meets the greatest identified needs in individual communities and in this region.

Some of the primary methods used to gather input into the process include discussions with individual applicants, comments and suggestions from representatives of jurisdictions, and input received directly from Steering Committee members. Because the Steering Committee is composed of members including elected officials representing their respective county, local jurisdictions, and school district, a representative process is followed in updating the CDBG Rating and Ranking process and criteria.