

Attachment C

This page intentionally left blank.

CDBG & HOME Rating and Ranking Criteria – FY 2026–2027

These rating and ranking criteria establish the objective framework for evaluating FY 2026–2027 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) program applications for the Monterey Urban County. Evaluations are based on the FY 2025–2029 Consolidated Plan (Amended October 2025).

1. Threshold Review (Pass/Fail)

Applications must meet all threshold requirements before scoring. Those failing any threshold item will not be ranked.

Criterion	Requirement	Verification Source
Eligibility	Activity is eligible under 24 CFR 570.201–207 (CDBG) or 24 CFR 92.205–92.209 (HOME).	Section 9A or 9B
National Objective	Meets one National Objective (Benefit to L/M Income, Slum/Blight, or Urgent Need).	Attachment M
Completeness	All required sections and Attachments A–N submitted.	Section 10 checklist
Capacity	Applicant demonstrates ability to manage federal funds and implement projects.	Section 4, Attachment C
Environmental Readiness	No known barriers preventing compliance with NEPA.	Section 9A/9B
HOME Requirements (if applicable)	Income targeting ≤80% AMI, affordability period, and underwriting completed.	Section 9B, Attachment N

2. Rating Criteria (105 Points Total)

Category	Criteria	Max Points	Evaluation Source
Community Need & Consolidated Plan Alignment	Identifies a well-documented need supported by data and directly aligns with Consolidated Plan goals; includes measurable progress indicators.	20	Section 3, Attachment A
Program Design & Impact	Logical program design, measurable outcomes, and clear beneficiary tracking; enhances level of service.	20	Sections 3, 5, 6
Organizational Capacity & Readiness	Demonstrated experience, fiscal controls, staff qualifications, and readiness to implement.	15	Section 4, Attachment C
Budget & Leveraging	Realistic, cost-effective budget; matching funds secured or pending; reasonable administrative cost ratio.	15	Section 6, Attachment B

Category	Criteria	Max Points	Evaluation Source
Performance Measurement & Evaluation	Defines outputs/outcomes; method for evaluating impact and continuous improvement.	15	Section 6
Equity & Cross-Jurisdictional Benefit	Demonstrates equitable service distribution and proportional benefit across Urban County jurisdictions.	15	Section 5, Census Tract Data
Innovation / Creative Solution (Bonus)	Employs novel, collaborative, or data-driven strategies that expand reach or efficiency.	+5	Sections 3, 6, Attachments A-C

3. Objective Scoring Standards

Score	Description
5 – Excellent	Fully documented, evidence-based, exceeds expectations.
4 – Strong	Meets all requirements with clear supporting documentation.
3 – Adequate	Meets most requirements but lacks detail or strong evidence.
2 – Limited	Weak documentation or unclear alignment with Consolidated Plan.
1 – Poor	Major deficiencies or missing information.
0 – Not Addressed	No relevant response provided.

4. Ranking Process

Each eligible application is independently scored by reviewers using the Scoring Rubric. Scores are averaged to determine a composite total (max 105 points).

Applications are ranked highest to lowest, and ties are broken by the higher score in “Community Need & Consolidated Plan Alignment.”

Funding recommendations are adjusted based on entitlement allocations, eligibility caps, and project readiness.

5. Application-to-Criteria Crosswalk

Application Section	Related Scoring Category	Max Points
Section 3 – Community Need & Proposed Improvement	Community Need & Innovation	20 + 5
Section 4 – Applicant Capacity	Organizational Capacity & Innovation	15 + 5
Section 5 – Beneficiaries	Program Design & Equity	35
Section 6 – Budget & Evaluation	Budget & Performance Measurement	30
Section 9A – CDBG-Specific	Eligibility, Need, Impact	10–20
Section 9B – HOME-Specific	Eligibility, Need, Impact	10–20
Attachments A–N	Supporting Documentation	All