

**CITY OF GILROY**  
**EXHIBIT A**  
**CITY OF GILROY – CDBG and HTF**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**FYs 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

In evaluating eligible projects, the criteria listed below will be used to determine which projects will be recommended for funding. Each project proposal will be rated on the degree to which it meets each of the numerical rating factors.

**RATING FACTORS**

- The rating a project receives will be based on the information provided in the Project Proposal
- Use whole numbers only when rating proposals
- A high numerical score alone does not guarantee funding

Examples of high, medium, and low degrees needed to meet each criterion are shown. After rating numerically, proposals with tied scores should be further evaluated, for ranking purposes, based on which proposal meets a greater need.

<b>CRITERION 1: NEED</b>		<b>AGENCY RESPONSE</b>
Measures how effectively the proposed project addresses one or more FY 2020-2025 Consolidated Plan priority needs.		Found in Section 2, A2 of proposal
<b>HIGH (6 pts.)</b>	<b>MEDIUM (3 pts.)</b>	<b>LOW (0 pts.)</b>
Clearly documents an effective approach to meeting this need.	Need is clearly documented, approach is less effective than in comparative proposals.	Need is not clearly documented and/or applicant cannot demonstrate they are addressing a Consolidated Plan priority goal being met.

<b>CRITERION 2: TARGETED INCOME</b>		<b>AGENCY RESPONSE</b>
Measures the income levels of proposed beneficiaries.		Found in Section 2, B1 of proposal
<b>HIGH (6 pts.)</b>	<b>MEDIUM (4 pts.)</b>	<b>LOW (2 pts.)</b>
All proposed beneficiaries are extremely low income	All proposed beneficiaries are Very low income or lower	All proposed beneficiaries are low income or lower

<b>CRITERION 3: EXPERIENCE</b>		<b>AGENCY RESPONSE</b>
Measures the extent of experience the agency has providing the proposed service or similar service.		Found in Section 2, C3 of proposal
<b>HIGH (4 pts.)</b>  Agency has experience providing the same service proposed.	<b>MEDIUM (2 pts.)</b>  Agency has experience providing a similar service to that proposed.	<b>LOW (0 pts.)</b>  Agency has no organizational or staff experience providing the type of service proposed.

<b>CRITERION 4: LEVERAGED FUNDS</b>		<b>AGENCY RESPONSE</b>
Measures the total revenue the agency proposes to acquire from other funding sources in order to operate the proposed program.		Found in Section 3, D of proposal
<b>HIGH (4 pts.)</b>  25% or higher of total proposed project revenues are budgeted from other sources.	<b>LOW (1 pt.)</b>  Less than 25% of total proposed project revenues are budgeted from other sources.	<b>BELOW (0 pts.)</b>  No proposed project revenues are budgeted from other sources.

<b>CRITERION 5: WORKING WITH OTHER AGENCIES</b>		<b>AGENCY RESPONSE</b>		
Measures the agency's efforts to collaborate in order to augment rather than duplicate services to beneficiaries.  <b>BONUS POINTS:</b> measures the use of leveraging staff and resources to enhance services.		Found in Section 2, A5 & A6 of proposal		
<b>HIGH (4 pts.)</b>  Agency clearly demonstrates how it actively works with other agencies in delivering program services.	<b>MEDIUM (2 pts.)</b>  Agency actively participates in a consortium of service providers related to project services. The South County Collaborative or Santa Clara County Collaborative on Affordable Housing and Homeless Issues are examples.	<b>LOW (1pt.)</b>  Agency has informal but established working relationships with other public service providers.	<b>NO SCORE (0 pt.)</b>  Applicant shows no evidence of working with other agencies.	<b>BONUS POINTS (2 pts.)</b>  Collaboration with other service providers including elements such as shared staff, locations or budgets that resulted in increased, expanded, or different services.

<b>CRITERION 6: MEASURABLE OUTCOMES AND SYSTEM</b>		<b>AGENCY RESPONSE</b>
Measures the extent to which the application proposes outcome measures and a feasible measurement system.		Found in Section 2, B3, #1 and #2 of proposal
<b>HIGH (4 pts.)</b>  Application identifies outcome measures for proposed services and has implemented a feasible outcome measurement system.	<b>MEDIUM (1 pt.)</b>  Application identifies outcome measures and measurement methods, but has not implemented a feasible outcome measurement system.	<b>BELOW (0 pts.)</b>  Application does not identify outcome measures and/or feasible outcome measurement system.

<b>CRITERION 7: PROGRAM PERFORMANCE</b>	<b>WHERE TO FIND</b>
Measures applicant's history or track record of meeting goals and completing projects.	Information to be provided by Housing & Community Development staff.

<b>High (4 pts.)</b>  Applicant has demonstrated history of exceeding all 3 performance benchmarks (i.e. unduplicated participants, activities and outcomes).	<b>Medium (2 pts.)</b>  Applicant has demonstrated history of meeting at least 2 of 3 performance benchmarks and has no pending or unresolved monitoring or financial audit findings requiring corrective actions.	<b>Low (1 pt.)</b>  Applicant has demonstrated history of meeting at least 1 of 3 standard performance benchmarks and has no pending or unresolved monitoring or financial audit findings requiring corrective actions.	<b>NEW APPLICANT (0 pt.)</b>	<b>CORRECTIVE ACTIONS PENDING (-2 pt.)</b>  A project with pending corrective actions identified in monitoring reports from the City, another funding source or financial audit. This includes projects subject to a corrective action plan, including probationary status from any funding source.	<b>CORRECTIVE ACTIONS UNRESOLVED (-4 pts.)</b>  A project with unresolved corrective actions not being adequately addressed at the time of application. Rating also applies to applicants who have shown substantial delays in implementing past projects and have not corrected past performance problems.
---	--	---	----------------------------------	---	---