

## **Use 1 - 5 for all rankings**

### **Degree to which the proposed activity is appropriate for CDBG funding:**

1. Low = Does not appear to further the CDBG program purpose in any meaningful way
2. Medium/Low =
3. Medium = Relates to some aspects of the CDBG program purpose
4. Medium/High =
5. High = Clearly furthers most aspects of the CDBG program purpose

### **Degree to which CDBG funds will be leveraged by other funds:**

1. Low = Less than 25% of project financed with leveraged funds
2. Medium/Low = 26% - 35%
3. Medium = 36% - 45%
4. Medium/High = 46% - 55%
5. High = Over 55%

### **Degree of impact the activity will have on the overall elimination of slum and blight in the identified target area, relative conditions of participating and non-participating buildings, prominence/visibility of project buildings, and geographic proximity of buildings:**

1. Low = Minimal impact on the identified need; results/outcomes are unclear; does not appear to be the best long term solution
2. Medium/Low =
3. Medium = Partial impact on the identified need; immediate results not evident
4. Medium/High =
5. High = Activity will directly and substantially address the identified need; immediate results will be achieved; best long term solution

### **Degree to which the proposed design and work specs address identified and prioritized contributing factors to slum and blight identified per individual building:**

1. Low = Minimal impact on the identified need; results/outcomes are unclear; does not appear to be the best long term solution
2. Medium/Low =
3. Medium = Partial impact on the identified need; immediate results not evident
4. Medium/High =
5. High = Activity will directly and substantially address the identified need; immediate results will be achieved; best long term solution

### **Degree to which the scale and scope of the project is appropriate for the CDBG program timeframe (max 3 years):**

1. Low = Late start; lengthy/unrealistic/unclear timetable
2. Medium/Low =
3. Medium = Average/reasonable construction timetable based on project type
4. Medium/High =
5. High = Construction to commence quickly; minimum length; realistic time-frame

**Degree of community involvement with the proposed downtown revitalization efforts (community outreach, public input, planning exercises, expressed support):**

1. Low = Little support shown; all necessary parties have not been contacted and discussions have been minimal.
2. Medium/Low =
3. Medium = Full support not evident, but discussions among all parties is on-going
4. Medium/High =
5. High = Strong support documented by all parties involved

**Degree of clarity, completeness, readability, and viability of the application:**

1. Low = confusing/unclear/inconsistent/incomplete
2. Medium/Low =
3. Medium = complete but not all sections or information immediately clear or entirely consistent
4. Medium/High =
5. High = completely and clearly defines project; all attachments properly prepared and included; demonstrates forethought and attention to detail

**Degree to which the project is planned out and prepared to proceed:**

1. Low = Little preliminary work done on site or financing
2. Medium/Low =
3. Medium = Some preliminary work done, but some important elements remain undetermined (e.g. site, some financing)
4. Medium/High =
5. High = Preliminary work is done and needed financial resources are secured

**Degree the project will impact the Target Area in terms of total project buildings in ratio to total number of buildings in target area:**

**Regular Program**

1. Less than 10%
2. 11% -15%
3. 16%-25%
4. 26%-40%
5. Greater than 40%

**For Iconic Building Applications: Average of all other scores plus 1 point if under 10,000 population; plus 1.5 points if under 5,000 population**