Community Development Block Grant
Home Investment Partnerships

Reviewer Scoring Guidance

CDBG PRO Housing *Addressing Zoning, Permitting & Building Code Barriers to Affordable Housing* grants

Updated as of 3/10/26

Requirement	Priority	Base	Multiplier*	Final
0. Implementation Ready	*Eligibility – Must be implementation ready in 36-month for Category A and 24-month for Category B*			
1. Logic Model: RHS Tool, CDBG PRO Housing Activity, Logic Model	1	6	10	**60**
2. Cost	2	6	3	**18**
a. Leverage Bonus (2 pt. for 25% and 4 pts for 50%)	Bonus	Bonus	Bonus	**4 max**
3. Narrative	3	6	2	**12**
4. Experience & Qualifications	4	6	1.0	**6**
Total				**100**

This scoring is based on the idea that each item can be thought be on a basic range of 1-6 pts (1-2= Below Average, 3-4= Average, 5-6= Above Average) then multiplied by priority weight. If something is missing, the score is 0. Multipliers are based on priority level with a base score of 6.

Example, the Narrative has a priority of 3 and is weighted with a multiplier of 2, so if the answer is above average at 5 points, and multiplied by the weight of 2 it is worth 10 pts.

Overview of Scoring Approach

Proposals will be evaluated using a standardized 1–6 point scale for each scored item:

5-6 = Above Average (strong, clear, and well-supported response)

3-4 = Average (adequate response that meets expectations)

1-2 = Below Average (weak, unclear, or incomplete response)

0 = Not Addressed (item not addressed or insufficient information provided)

Each criterion has:

- A defined number of scored items, and
- An associated weighting multiplier to reflect its relative importance to the CDBG PRO Housing program.

Final scores are calculated by multiplying the base score by the assigned multiplier. This ensures that higher-priority program goals carry greater weight in the overall evaluation.

Reviewers should score proposals based on the content provided, not assumptions or external knowledge of the applicant.

Question	Description	Score 5-6 – Above Average	Score 3-4 - Average	Score 1-2 – Below Average	Score 0 - Not Addressed
0. **Implementation Ready**	Eligibility Question – Must be implementation ready in 36-month for Category A and 24-month for Category B	N/A	N/A	N/A	
1. **CDBG PRO Housing Goals (60 points) – Multiple base 1-6 score by 10**	Evaluate how well the logic model aligns with the core purpose of the CDBG PRO Housing program: removing regulatory, zoning, or procedural barriers to housing and enabling near-term housing outcomes.	Clearly uses the Regional Housing Strategy (RHS) to identify specific regulatory, zoning, or procedural barriers to housing in the jurisdiction. Accurately connects the barriers to the PRO Housing activity Provides a compelling and well-defined explanation of how the proposed project will remove or reduce those barriers. The inputs, planned activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts are clearly defined and demonstrate strong alignment with CDBG PRO Housing goals of reducing barriers to affordable housing. Accurately connects PRO Housing Activity category (A or B) to correct timeline in eligibility question.	Identifies barriers and alignment with CDBG PRO Housing goals, but linkages are not specific or fully accurate. The inputs, planned activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts are present but are not specific or fully reasonable. Alignment with CDBG PRO Housing goals are present but not strongly demonstrated. Accurately connects PRO Housing Activity category (A or B) to correct timeline in eligibility question.	Barriers are vaguely described or weakly connected to proposed activities. The inputs, planned activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts are missing or unclear. Limited or unclear alignment with CDBG PRO Housing goals. Incorrectly connects PRO Housing Activity category (A or B) to correct timeline in eligibility question.	
2. **Cost (18 points)** **Multiple base 1-6 score by 3**	Evaluate the reasonableness and alignment of the proposed budget. • All costs must be necessary, reasonable, and allocable in accordance with 2 CFR Part 200. • Does the detailed budget align with the proposed activities/barriers?	Budget is clear, necessary, reasonable, allocable, and directly aligned with proposed activities and deliverables. Demonstrates efficient use of funds relative to anticipated outcomes. Budget summary clearly aligns with experience and qualifications. The detailed budget includes alignment with the proposed barriers.	Budget is generally reasonable but lacks detail or clear justification in some areas. Budget summary does not clearly align with experience and qualifications, there is some discrepancy between staffing (municipal staff vs consultant) based on qualifications and experience.	Budget is unclear, poorly justified, or weakly aligned with the scope of work. Budget summary does not align with experience and qualifications, there is major discrepancy between staffing (municipal staff vs consultant) based on qualifications and experience.	Budget is missing or clearly includes ineligible costs.

	• Does the budget summary align with experience and qualifications plan? (i.e., if they identify that they don't have the capacity and need to have a consultant does the budget reflect that or do they still have a majority budgeted for staff time?)		The detailed budget is vague in how the budget aligns with the proposed barriers.	The detailed budget poorly or weakly aligns the budget items with the proposed barriers.	
A. Leverage Bonus	4 max (2 pt. for 25% and 4 pts for 50%)	4 pts – Show leverage for 50% of total budget. Leverage has to be non-federal source.	2 pts – Show leverage for 25% of total budget. Leverage has to be non-federal source.		No leverage identified.
3. Narrative (12 points) **Multiple base 1-6 score by 2**	Evaluate how clearly and specifically the narrative: • Provides context for the barriers identified • Explains how the selected activities address those barriers • Describes the intended housing impact and expected change • Describe how the proposed reforms will principally benefit low- and moderate-income persons by increasing housing access, affordability, or opportunity. Clarifies any information not easily captured in the Logic Model.	Narrative is well-organized, specific, and implementation-focused. Narrative demonstrates meaningful use of the RHS tool by clearly linking identified gaps to specific PRO Housing Activities, timelines, and deliverables proposed in the application. Narrative clearly states how the reforms will benefit low-and-moderate income persons by increasing housing access, affordability, or opportunity. If collaborating with another municipality, the applicant is able to identify the municipality and clearly describe how the collaboration addresses the CDBG PRO Housing goals to reduce barriers to housing. Clearly demonstrates how the improved zoning and building codes are addressing the production and preservation of affordable housing and clearly explain the need for such improvement.	Narrative is completed, but the connection between identified gaps and proposed activities is limited or generalized. Narrative vaguely describes how the reforms will benefit low-and-moderate income persons by increasing housing access, affordability, or opportunity. If collaborating with another municipality, the applicant is able to identify their partner but only vaguely describes how the collaboration addresses the CDBG PRO Housing goals to reduce barriers to housing. Vaguely describes how the improved zoning and building codes are addressing the production and preservation of affordable housing and clearly explain the need for such improvement.	Narrative is incomplete, poorly completed, or weakly connects the barriers to the proposed project. Narrative poorly explains how the reforms will benefit low-and-moderate income persons by increasing housing access, affordability, or opportunity. If collaborating with another municipality, the applicant does not identify their partner or does not describe how they the collaboration addresses the CDBG PRO Housing goals to reduce barriers to housing. Poorly explains how the improved zoning and building codes are addressing the production and preservation of affordable housing and	

				clearly explain the need for such improvement.	
4. Experience and Qualifications (6 points) **Only use base 1-6 score**	Evaluate the applicant's capacity to successfully implement the proposed project.	Demonstrates strong, relevant experience implementing similar zoning, planning, or policy reforms. Key staff and/or consultants are clearly identified and are either currently secured or under contract, or the applicant has identified the need for a consultant and provided a clear plan for procurement.	Relevant experience is demonstrated, but staffing or consultant arrangements are not yet finalized and would be procured if awarded; however, the plan to do so is vague or not clearly defined.	Limited relevant experience or unclear staffing plan.	No staff or consultant has been identified, and no information has been provided on how consultant services will be procured.