



**BRAZOS VALLEY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE GUIDEBOOK**

2013-2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....1

II. BVCOG RRC Approved Actions.....2

III. Summary of BVCOG RRC Objective Scoring Criteria.....3

IV. BVCOG RRC Objective Scoring Criteria4-12

**PART I – INTRODUCTION
BVCOG RRC
2011-2012 TEXAS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT
PROGRAM**

**BRAZOS VALLEY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS REGIONAL REVIEW
COMMITTEE GUIDEBOOK**

The Brazos Valley Regional Review Committee (RRC) Guidebook has been prepared in accordance with the 2013-2014 Regional Review Committee Scoring and Training Guidelines for the Community Development Fund. The Guidebook provides eligible applicants from the Brazos Valley Council of Governments (BVCOG) with the application guidelines necessary to be scored under the BVCOG RRC scoring criteria.

Any questions regarding the RRC or the Guidebook should be directed in writing after the BVCOG RRC Guidebook has been published on the website of the Texas Department of Agriculture.

PART II
BVCOG RRC
RRC APPROVED ACTIONS

1. The BVCOG RRC held its required public hearing on April 24, 2012 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 has designated the Brazos Valley Council of Governments to serve as their support staff, finalize and disseminate the RRC Guidebook, and calculate scores for the BVCOG region.
3. The maximum grant amount for a single jurisdiction application is established at \$275,000. The maximum grant amount for a multi-jurisdiction application is established at \$350,000.
4. The RRC did not establish set-asides for housing and non-border colonia projects.
5. The RRC has established the following criteria and has allocated the appropriate number of points for scoring applications from the BVCOG region. The maximum number of possible points for each criterion is listed. This table is a summary of the criteria and point structure to be used for scoring application, for more details about each criteria or point values, please see pages 6-12.

Project Priorities		100 points
Local Effort	Per Capita Income	20 points
	Local Match	20 points
Merits of the Project	TCEQ violation Letters	20 points
	Cost per Beneficiary	30 points
	Past Awards and Previous Projects	110 points
Total Possible Points from RRC		300 points

6. The RRC shall participate in the Forward Commitment Program.

PART III
BVCOG RRC
SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVE SCORING CRITERIA

Total Points by BVCOG: **300 Points**

1. Project Priorities: **Total Points 100**

- First Priority – 100 Points
- Second Priority – 25 Points
- Third Priority – 0 Points

2. Local Effort: **Total Points 40**

- Per Capita Income – Up to 20 Points
- Local Match – Up to 20 Points

3. Merits of the Project **Total Points 160**

- Has the applicant received a letter of violation from the state? – Up to 20 Points
- What is the cost per beneficiary? Cost per beneficiary equals TxCDBG grant amount divided by total number of persons served. – Up to 30 Points
- Past Awards and Previous Projects – Up to 110 Points

**PART IV
BVCOG RRC
RRC OBJECTIVE SCORING CRITERIA**

1. PROJECT PRIORITIES (100 Points Maximum)

Methodology: This criterion addresses the overall type of project regardless of the various components needed to accomplish it. Public works projects often include the administration, engineering, and construction, of the types of projects listed below. All points will be awarded if the project is wholly contained in a single priority and does not include multiple priority levels. If a project does contain multiple priority levels, projects that include multiple priority levels must be prorated based on percentage of Texas CDBG dollars. Using as a base figure the Texas CDBG funds requested minus the Texas CDBG fund requested for administration, a percentage of the total Texas CDBG 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 requested is applied on pro rata to these amounts. The percentage of total Texas CDBG 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, Septic, and Sewage Projects***, Street and Drainage Projects	
First Priority Projects:	<u>100 Points</u> _____
2. Second Priority – Housing and Fire Protection	
Second Priority Projects:	<u>25 Points</u> _____
3. Third Priority Projects – All other projects	
Third Priority Projects:	<u>0 Points</u> _____

*** For purposes of Project Priorities scoring, the provision of first-time, or replacement, water, septic, and sewer service through work on private property will be considered a water or sewer activity.

Data Source: CD Application Table 1 Verified By TDA

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Projects Submitted by Type as Stated in Table 1:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

2. LOCAL EFFORT (40 Points Maximum)

The following questions will be utilized to assist the RRC in determining the score for this factor. Specific responses to these questions should be detailed by each applicant as a part of their application and can be included as a separate attachment to the application. The outcome of each equation determines the number of points awarded, up to a maximum of 20 points for section A and a maximum of 20 points for section B.

A. PER CAPITA INCOME (1-20 Points)

This criteria looks at the general ability of the population to fund the project as based on per capita income.

(Maximum 20 points)

SCORE _____

METHODOLOGY FOR INCORPORATED CITIES:

This criterion applies to projects that have city-wide benefit. The applicant's per capita income in relation to the highest and lowest values for incorporated cities as defined by the U.S. Census in the Brazos Valley region will determine the number of points awarded. All data should be obtained using table **P82 PER CAPITA INCOME IN (DOLLARS)** from the **Census 2010 Summary File Data**. Using the following formula:

$$20 \text{ pts} - \left(\frac{X - \text{Min}}{\text{Max} - \text{Min}} \times 20 \text{ pts} \right) = \text{Points Awarded (to two decimal places)}$$

X = the city's per capita income according to the 2010 Census data

Min = the lowest per capita income among all incorporated cities in the region according to the 2010 Census data

Max = the highest per capita income among all incorporated cities in the region according to the 2010 Census data

METHODOLOGY FOR COUNTIES:

This criterion applies to projects that have county-wide benefit, and does not include projects submitted on behalf of a non-county service provider. The per capita income of the unincorporated areas of the applicant's county in relation to the highest and lowest values for unincorporated areas of Brazos Valley counties will determine the number of points awarded. All data should be obtained using **ATTACHMENT A** of this document. Using the following formula:

$$20 \text{ pts} - \left(\frac{X - \text{Min}}{\text{Max} - \text{Min}} \times 20 \text{ pts} \right) = \text{Points Awarded (to two decimal places)}$$

X = the per capita income of the unincorporated areas of the applicant's county according to the 2010 Census data

Min = the lowest per capita income among all the counties—excluding incorporated cities—in the region according to the 2010 Census data

Max = the highest per capita income among all the counties—excluding incorporated cities—in the region according to the 2010 Census data

FOR TARGET AREA BENEFIT CITIES OR COUNTIES:

This criterion applies to projects that do not have city-wide or county-wide benefit but provide for a target area benefit resulting in a more localized effect. If the

applicant is applying for a target area project, such as a particular street, or a project area of a water district, then the applicant will use an average (mathematical mean) of the data from all Census Block Groups that intersect the applicant's project. The applicant's per capita income in relation to the highest and lowest values for Census Block Groups in the Brazos Valley region will determine the number of points awarded. All data should be obtained using table **P82 PER CAPITA INCOME IN (DOLLARS)** from the **Census 2010 Summary File Data**. Using the following formula:

$$20 \text{ pts} - \left(\frac{X - \text{Min}}{\text{Max} - \text{Min}} \times 20 \text{ pts} \right) = \text{Points Awarded (to two decimal places)}$$

X = the average per capita income among all Census Block Groups that intersect the applicant's feature according to the 2010 Census data

Min = the lowest per capita income among all Census Block Groups in the region according to the 2010 Census data

Max = the highest per capita income among all Census Block Groups in the region according to the 2010 Census data

Data Source:

City-Wide Benefit Projects: 2010 Census Data

County-Wide Benefit Projects: 2010 Census Data

City or County Target Area Project: 2010 Census Data

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Per Capita Income for the Project Area: _____

Target Area Project - List Census Block Groups that Intersect the Applicant's Project (list all that apply):

B. LOCAL MATCH (up to 20 Points)

An applicant that provides matching funds as a percentage of the total Texas CDBG request amount based on population will be awarded points as shown below:

Population	Matching funds threshold as a % of total Texas CDBG request amount	
0—499	1 %	20
500—1,499	5 %	20
1,500—2,999	10 %	20
3,000—4,999	15 %	20
5,000 or more	20 %	20

SCORE _____

Methodology:

FOR INCORPORATED CITIES AND COUNTIES:

The applicant’s population should be determined using data obtained from **TOTAL POPULATION** from the **Census 2010 Summary File Data**.

If the project serves beneficiaries for applications submitted by cities, the total city population is used. 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 an unincorporated area of a county with a target area of beneficiaries, the population category is based on the actual number of beneficiaries to be served by the project activities.

Data Source:

Applicant Match: SF 424 and Resolution; if match is coming from a 3rd party and not a city or county, letters of commitment from 3rd party sources to document match contributions

County Target Area Beneficiaries: CD Application Table 1 Verified By TDA

Population: 2010 Census Data Summary File 3 (SF3)Table P1 – Sample Data

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Applicant Population: _____

County Target Area Beneficiaries: _____

Applicant TxCDBG Funds Requested: \$_____

Applicant Match Amount from All Sources: \$_____

3. MERITS OF THE PROJECT (up to 160 Points)

SCORE _____

Up to 160 points will be assigned to each applicant based on their answers to the following questions.

- A. Has the applicant received a letter of violation from the state? (Maximum 20 Points)** An applicant will be awarded points based on the type of violation letter received from TCEQ as listed below:

Type of TCEQ Letter of Violation	Number of Points Awarded
Notice of Violation	0
Notice of Enforcement	10
Administrative Order- Agreed	20
Administrative Order- Default	20
Water, Septic, or Sewage Projects with No Violation as Stated Above	0
Non-water, Non-septic or Non-Sewage Projects	0

Methodology:

In order to receive points for this section, the project an applicant is seeking to resolve must be for the same type of activity (water or sewer) cited in the letter of violation received from TCEQ and must be active. For scoring purposes, an applicant will be defined as a city or county OR an applicant city or county submitting an application on behalf of a service provider. For this application, a letter of violation from the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) includes a Notice of Violation (NOV)¹, a Notice of Enforcement (NOE)², and Administrative Orders (Agreed and Default)³.

1. The Notice of Violation (NOV) is the least serious; this letter means that TCEQ observed problems and the recipient has a prescribed time period to correct any problems. If the problems are fixed within the time frame, there are no penalties enforced; if the problems are not fixed, the violator is referred to enforcement action.

2. A Notice of Enforcement (NOE) is a written notification that the TCEQ is initiating formal enforcement action for violations observed during an inspection. This notice informs the business or individual, known as the respondent, what violations are being pursued and provides contact information for questions regarding the enforcement action.

3. An Administrative Order is an order from TCEQ enforcing or directing compliance with any provisions; whether of statutes, rules, regulations, permits, licenses, or orders. TCEQ is entitled by law to enforce and entitled by law to compel compliance. It breaks into “agreed orders” (the respondent agrees to TCEQ’s terms) or to a “default order” (the respondent fails to answer TCEQ’s Admin.Order).

If an applicant has not received any type of violation letter from TCEQ, the applicant will be awarded 0 points for this section. Applicants who have received a letter of violation from TCEQ must provide a copy of the letter in the application package. An applicant will only receive points for water, septic, or sewage projects, but not for any other improvement project. Please refer to the TCEQ for further clarification at:

<http://www.tceq.state.tx.us/compliance/enforcement/definitions.html>

Data Source:

Type of Project: CD Application Table 1 Verified by TDA

TCEQ Documents (documents submitted must have the violation title clearly indicated by TCEQ and may be addressed to the applicant or to the service provider being supported by a city or county application):

Copy of Notice of Violation

Copy of Notice of Enforcement

Copy of TCEQ Agreed Order - Agreed Order with docket number and date stamped by the TCEQ Chief Clerk

Administrative Order- Default: Notice indicating that the applicant has failed to answer TCEQ's Administrative Order

Information Needed from Applicant to Score:

Type of Project(s): 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____

TCEQ Violation: ___ Yes ___ No

If Yes, Type of Violation (State As Listed Above): _____

For Administrative Order - Agreed:

Copy of Agreed Order: _____

Date of Agreed Order – Chief Clerk Date Stamp: _____

Docket Number: _____

B. What is the cost per beneficiary? Cost per beneficiary equals the total project cost for all aspects of the project divided by total number of persons served.

(Maximum 30 Points)

SCORE _____

Methodology:

FOR COUNTIES, CITIES AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL APPLICANTS:

All applicant must provide documentation showing the number of beneficiaries that the particular project will serve. The applicant's expenditure per persons served in relation to a maximum expenditure threshold of \$2,000 per persons served will determine the number of points awarded. Using the following formulas:

$$X = \frac{\text{Cost}}{\text{Beneficiaries}}$$

X = the applicant's expenditure per person

Cost = the TxCDBG Grant amount in dollars

Beneficiaries = the amount of people projected to be served by the project upon completion

$$\frac{\$2,000 - X}{\$2,000} \times 30\text{pts} = \text{Points Awarded (to two decimal places)*}$$

X = the applicant's expenditure per person

\$2,000 = maximum expenditure threshold

** For values of X > \$2,000, no points are awarded*

Data Source: CD Application Table Verified By TDA

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

Amount of People Projected to Be Served Upon Project Completion: _____

TxCDBG Grant amount in Dollars (use Table 1 of application: \$_____

C. Past Awards and Previous Projects
(Maximum 110 Points)

SCORE _____

How much funding have you received in the past six years ?

Methodology:

Points are awarded based upon prior Community Development/Community Development Supplemental (CD/CDS) funding received by the applicant based on the number of times the applicant has received funding during the previous three funding cycles. Partial or marginal funding is considered having received funding for scoring purposes. The points will be awarded to applicants based on the table below*:

Awards Within Last 3 Funding Cycles	Total Number of Points Awarded
No awards	110
1 award	60
2 awards	30
3 awards	0

* Multi-jurisdiction applications will be scored based on whether the same combination of participating jurisdictions were funded in 2007-2008, 2009-2010, or 2011-2012.

Data Source:

Funding Received in the Previous Six Years: TDA Tracking System Report

Information Needed From Applicant to Score:

If the applicant has received funding in any of the 3 previous cycles, please provide appropriate documentation and fill out the following form:

Did you receive CD/CDS funds for the 2007-2008 cycle?

Yes_____ No_____

Contract Number _____

Did you receive CD/CDS funds for the 2009-2010 cycle?

Yes_____ No_____

Contract Number _____

Did you receive CD/CDS funds for the 2011-2012 cycle?

Yes_____ No_____

Contract Number _____

TOTAL POINTS
(300 Points Maximum)

SCORE _____

ATTACHMENT A

The following table should be used to calculate the applicant's score for Section 2A. The data in this table was derived from **DP03 Selected Economic Characteristics** and **DP-1 Profile of General Population** from the **2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates** and **2010 Census Demographic Profile Data**, respectively.

Place	Per Capita Income	Population	Total Income
<i>Brazos County</i>	21,018	194,851	4,095,378,318
→ Bryan	18,930	76,201	1,442,484,930
→ College Station	20,079	93,857	1,884,554,703
→ Kurten	16,014	398	6,373,572
→ Millican	67,729	240	16,254,960
→ Wixon Valley	27,527	254	6,991,858
→ Unincorporated	30,907	23,901	738,718,295
<i>Burleson County</i>	21,379	17,187	367,440,873
→ Caldwell	20,954	4,104	85,995,216
→ Snook	19,537	511	9,983,407
→ Somerville	17,545	1,376	24,141,920
→ Unincorporated	22,090	11,196	247,320,330
<i>Grimes County</i>	17,365	26,604	461,978,460
→ Anderson	16,151	222	3,585,522
→ Bedias	15,784	443	6,992,312
→ Iola	20,105	401	8,062,105
→ Navasota	12,463	7,049	87,851,687
→ Todd Mission	92,782	107	9,927,674
→ Unincorporated	18,799	18,382	345,559,160
<i>Leon County</i>	22,484	16,801	377,753,684
→ Buffalo	16,574	1,856	30,761,344
→ Centerville	22,492	892	20,062,864
→ Jewett	14,102	1,167	16,457,034
→ Leona	30,054	175	5,259,450
→ Marquez	33,792	263	8,887,296
→ Normangee	17,719	685	12,137,515
→ Oakwood	18,076	510	9,218,760
→ Unincorporated	24,435	11,253	274,969,421
<i>Madison County</i>	14,245	13,664	194,643,680
→ Madisonville	14,642	4,396	64,366,232
→ Midway	16,156	228	3,683,568
→ Normangee	17,719	685	12,137,515
→ Unincorporated	13,699	8,355	114,456,365
<i>Robertson County</i>	21,113	16,622	350,940,286
→ Bremond	15,365	929	14,274,085
→ Calvert	16,686	1,192	19,889,712
→ Franklin	15,241	1,564	23,836,924
→ Hearne	12,773	4,459	56,954,807
→ Unincorporated	27,835	8,478	235,984,758
<i>Washington County</i>	25,464	33,718	858,595,152
→ Brenham	18,958	15,716	297,943,928
→ Burton	25,942	300	7,782,600
→ Unincorporated	31,232	17,702	552,868,624