

Downtown Revitalization Review Form

Application Checklist:

Is the UEI documentation provided?	Yes	No
Is the Slum & Blight summary included?	Yes	No
Is the grant amount requested at or below the amount allowable?	Yes	No
Is the administration line 10% or less of CDBG amount AND of total cost?	Yes	No
Is the “Construction, Professional Fees, & Permit Administration” budget table completed?	Yes	No
Is the public hearing publication date no less than 4 days but no more than 20 days prior to the hearing?	Yes	No
Does the public hearing notice contain correct & necessary information?	Yes	No
Do the public hearing minutes cover the 9 required points and include correct and necessary information?	Yes	No
Is the disclosure statement completed and signed? (If Yes on Part 1 Question #2, then Parts II and III must also be completed)	Yes	No
Is the CEO signature in federal assurances page?	Yes	No
Is a city resolution declaring slum & blight area included?	Yes	No
Is the Community Needs Assessment current (good for one year only, then must be re-adopted; the minutes and proof of publication are both uploaded)?	Yes	No
Have all documents under Required Attachments been uploaded?	Yes	No

Application Review:

Previous Grants:	Yes	No
Previous Grants Comments:		
Administrative Capacity:	Yes	No
Administrative Capacity Comments:		
Is the activity in a CISA floodplain?	Yes	No

Floodplain Comments:

Comprehensive Downtown Revitalization Planning Efforts Comments:

Percentage of buildings in fair or poor condition:

Was the city resolution designating slum & blight/urban renewal area adopted within the past two years?	Yes	No
---	-----	----

Map or boundaries of city resolution consistent with inventory and target area?	Yes	No
---	-----	----

Comments related to current conditions/need:

Completed inventory form for each building in designated slum & blight area?	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Building(s) selected for improvements classified as fair or poor conditions?	Yes	No
--	-----	----

Comments related to S&B National Objective:

Local funds secured:	Yes	No
----------------------	-----	----

Owner interest letters(s)?	Yes	No
----------------------------	-----	----

Local match amount and sources:

Comments related to the project's potential impact to the community:

Project eligible for funding?	Yes	No
-------------------------------	-----	----

Eligibility Comments:

Scored Component; Use 1-5 for all rankings:

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, no supplemental documents uploaded

2 Medium/Low =

3 Medium = Full support not evident, but discussions among all parties is on-going, minimal documentation uploaded showing past/current/future efforts

4 Medium/High =

5 High = Strong support documented by all parties involved, multiple types of efforts are documented and uploaded spanning past, present, and future

Rank the degree of community involvement: (1 – 5)

Degree to which the applicant adhered to the Downtown Revitalization Design Guide based on the quality and appropriateness of their design choices:

(Optional/bonus points if applicant chose to utilize the Downtown Design Guide)

0 No Compliance or Inappropriate Design = The applicant did not opt for design bonus points; or, the proposed designs and materials are clearly inappropriate for the building or surrounding downtown district, detracting from the district's historic or aesthetic integrity.

1 Minimal Compliance with Design Standards = The applicant made an effort to comply with the Design Guide, but several design elements or materials are inappropriate for the building or district.

2 General Compliance with Design Standards = The applicant followed most aspects of the Design Guide and achieved a generally appropriate design; however, the designs would not be strong examples for others in the field. There may be minor issues or missed opportunities to elevate the design.

3 Exemplary Compliance with Design Standards = The applicant's designs fully align with the Design Guide and represent best practices; these designs could serve as exemplary models for architects, design professionals, and others engaged in downtown revitalization projects.

Rank the degree to which the applicant followed the Downtown Revitalization Design Guide: (0 - 3)

Degree the project will impact the Target Area in terms of total project buildings in ratio to total number of buildings in target area: (For iconic building awards, this measure of impact is determined by the relative population of the applicant).

(# of participating buildings/ # of buildings in target area)

1 Less than 10%

2 11%-15%

3 16%-25%

4 26%-40%

5 Greater than 41%

Rank the degree to which the project will impact the Target Area: (1 – 5)

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%

Rank the degree to which CDBG funds will be leveraged by other funds: (1 – 5)

Degree to which applicant appropriately and accurately completed the individual building components prioritization ranking for each participating building:

1 Low = Rankings are incomplete or inaccurate (e.g., some left blank, some duplication of numbers), and/or the descriptions and/or photos do not justify the blight ranking selection, or are missing

2 Medium/Low =

3 Medium = Generally the ranking is aligned with the blight on most buildings; perhaps one or two of the ranking prioritization positions should be switched or are not fully justified by the photos/descriptions

4 Medium/High =

5 High = The ranking order of components is complete for each building with no duplication of numbers, and the worst blighted component is ranked #1 (and so on); photos and/or descriptions are robust and clearly identify blight

Rank the degree to which the applicant appropriately completed the prioritization ranking: (1 – 5)

Degree to which the proposed design and work specs address identified and prioritized contributing factors to slum and blight:

1 Low = Minimal impact on the identified need; design focused primarily on lesser-ranked blighted components or cosmetic/non-blighted concerns

2 Medium/Low =

3 Medium = Partial impact on the identified need; addresses only half (or less) of the existing blight; may have included an extra (non-blighted) component in the scope of work before adequately addressing existing blight

4 Medium/High =

5 High = Activity will directly and substantially address the identified need; all blighted components of the building have a proposed rehab solution

Rank the degree to which the proposed design and work specs address contributing factors to slum and blight: (1 – 5)

Degree of impact the activity will have on the overall elimination of slum and blight in the identified target area (includes 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

Rank the degree of impact the activity will have on the overall elimination of slum and blight:

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

1 Low = Little preliminary design done, historic survey is outdated/isn't uploaded, no draft Tier I ERR or draft DTR Admin Plan uploaded, match funding not confirmed/documented

2 Medium/Low =

3 Medium = Some preliminary design done, but some important elements remain undetermined; some but not all of the following may be uploaded: historic survey, draft Tier I ERR, financing documentation, draft DTR Admin Plan

4 Medium/High =

5 High = Preliminary design work is done and needed financial resources are secured, historic survey is done and current, a draft DTR Admin Plan is uploaded, a draft Tier I ERR (ready for publication but unsigned) is uploaded

Rank the degree to which the project is planned out and prepared to proceed: (1 – 5)

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

Rank the degree of clarity, completeness, readability, and viability of the application: (1 – 5)

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

Rank the degree to which the proposed project is appropriate for CDBG funding: (1 – 5)