



D A N E C O U N T Y

Community Development Block Grant  
Home Investment Partnerships

## DRAFT Reviewer Scoring Guidance

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

Updated as of 2/27/26

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

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
<b>0. Implementation Ready</b>	Eligibility Question – Must be implementation ready in 36-month for Category A and 24-month for Category	N/A	N/A	N/A	
<b>1. CDBG PRO Housing Goals (60 points) – Multiple base 1-6 score by 10</b>	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.	<p>Clearly uses the RHS to identify specific regulatory, zoning, or procedural barriers to housing in the jurisdiction.</p> <p>Accurately connects the barriers to the PRO Housing activity</p> <p>Provides a compelling and well-defined explanation of how the proposed project will remove or reduce those barriers.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Accurately connects PRO Housing Activity category (A or B) to correct timeline in eligibility question.</p>	<p>Identifies barriers and alignment with PRO Housing goals, but linkages are not specific or fully accurate.</p> <p>The inputs, planned activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts are present but are not specific or fully reasonable.</p> <p>Alignment with CDBG PRO Housing goals are present but not strongly demonstrated.</p> <p>Accurately connects PRO Housing Activity category (A or B) to correct timeline in eligibility question.</p>	<p>Barriers are vaguely described or weakly connected to proposed activities.</p> <p>The inputs, planned activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts are missing or unclear.</p> <p>Limited or unclear alignment with CDBG PRO Housing goals.</p> <p>Incorrectly connects PRO Housing Activity category (A or B) to correct timeline in eligibility question.</p>	
<b>2. Cost (18 points)</b>	Evaluate the reasonableness and alignment of the proposed budget.	Budget is clear, necessary, reasonable, allocable, and directly aligned with proposed activities and deliverables.	Budget is generally reasonable but lacks detail	Budget is unclear, poorly justified, or weakly	Budget is missing or clearly

<p><b>Multiple base 1-6 score by 3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All costs must be necessary, reasonable, and allocable in accordance with 2 CFR Part 200.</li> </ul>	<p>Demonstrates efficient use of funds relative to anticipated outcomes.</p>	<p>or clear justification in some areas.</p>	<p>aligned with the scope of work.</p>	<p>includes ineligible costs.</p>
<p><b>A. Match Bonus</b></p>	<p>4 max (2 pt. for 25% and 4 pts for 50%)</p>	<p>4 pts – Show match for 50% of total budget</p>	<p>2 pts – Show match for 25% of total budget</p>		
<p><b>3. Narrative (12 points)</b></p> <p><b>Multiple base 1-6 score by 2</b></p>	<p>Evaluate how clearly and specifically the narrative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides context for the barriers identified</li> <li>Explains how the selected activities address those barriers</li> <li>Describes the intended housing impact and expected change</li> <li>Describe how the proposed reforms will principally benefit low- and moderate-income persons by increasing housing access, affordability, or opportunity.</li> </ul> <p>Clarifies any information not easily captured in the Logic Model.</p>	<p>Narrative is well-organized, specific, and implementation-focused.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Narrative clearly states how the reforms will benefit low-and-moderate income persons by increasing housing access, affordability, or opportunity.</p> <p>If collaborating with another municipality, the applicant is able to identify the municipality and clearly describe how the collaboration addresses the PRO Housing goals to reduce barriers to housing.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Narrative is completed, but the connection between identified gaps and proposed activities is limited or generalized.</p> <p>Narrative vaguely describes how the reforms will benefit low-and-moderate income persons by increasing housing access, affordability, or opportunity.</p> <p>If collaborating with another municipality, the applicant is able to identify their partner but only vaguely describes how the collaboration addresses the PRO Housing goals to reduce barriers to housing.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Narrative is incomplete, poorly completed, or weakly connects the barriers to the proposed project.</p> <p>Narrative poorly explains how the reforms will benefit low-and-moderate income persons by increasing housing access, affordability, or opportunity.</p> <p>If collaborating with another municipality, the applicant does not identify their partner or does not describe how they the collaboration addresses the PRO Housing goals to reduce barriers to housing.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p><b>4. Experience and Qualifications (6 points)</b></p> <p><b>Only use base 1-6 score</b></p>	<p>Evaluate the applicant’s capacity to successfully implement the proposed project.</p>	<p>Demonstrates strong, relevant experience implementing similar zoning, planning, or policy reforms.</p> <p>Key staff and/or consultants are clearly identified and currently secured or under contract.</p>	<p>Relevant experience is demonstrated, but staffing or consultant arrangements are not yet finalized and will be procured if awarded.</p>	<p>Limited relevant experience or unclear staffing plan.</p>	<p>No staff or consultant identified.</p>