6. The application is for an amount which does not exceed the grant ceilings that are established by the NOFA.

(f) Application Review Process Description

1. Threshold review. The field office will review each application that passes the initial screening process to ensure that each applicant and each proposed project meets the applicable threshold requirements set forth in 24 CFR 953.302(a), as implemented by this NOFA. If an applicant fails to meet any of the applicant-specific thresholds, its application cannot be accepted for rating and ranking. Project(s) that do not meet the community development appropriateness or applicable projectspecific thresholds will not be considered for funding.

2. All projects that meet the acceptance criteria and threshold requirements will be reviewed and rated by a field office rating team of at least three voting members. The field office will examine each project to determine in which one of the three rating categories set forth in 24 CFR 953.303 through 24 CFR 953.305 the project most appropriately belongs. The project will be rated on the basis of the criteria identified in the rating category component to which the project has been assigned. The total of points for a rating component is 100, which is the maximum any project can receive.

3. Public service projects. Due to the statutory 15 percent cap on public services activities, applicants may not receive single purpose grants solely to fund public services activities. However, any application may contain a public services component for up to 15 percent of the total grant. This component may be unrelated to the application's other project(s). If an application does not receive full funding, the public services allocation will be proportionately reduced to comprise no more than 15 percent of the

total grant award.

4. Corrections to deficient applications and supplemental information. HUD will not accept unsolicited information regarding the application after the application deadline has passed. The field office will advise applicants of technical deficiencies in applications and permit them to be corrected. A technical deficiency is an error or oversight which, if corrected, would not alter, in either a positive or negative fashion, the review and rating of the application. Examples of curable technical deficiencies would be a failure to submit proper certifications or failure to submit an application containing an

original signature by an authorized official. HUD will notify applicants in writing of any curable technical deficiencies in applications.

The field office also may, at its discretion, request supplemental information to resolve inconsistencies or ambiguities in the application or information that may help clarify an application that, in the field office's view, contains information that is inconsistent with known facts or data. Applicants will have 14 calendar days from the date of HUD's correspondence to reply and correct the technical deficiency or provide the requested supplemental information. If the technical deficiency is not corrected within this time period, HUD will reject the application as incomplete. If the supplemental information is not provided in this time period and, as a consequence, the field office determines that the applicant has failed to establish compliance with the requirements of 24 CFR part 953, the application will be returned, unrated.

Applicants may not submit information that would enhance a project's rating, and a new project may not be substituted for one included in the application.

5. Final ranking. All projects will be ranked against each other according to the point totals they receive, regardless of the rating category or component under which the points were received. Projects will be selected for funding based on this final ranking, to the extent that funds are available. Individual grant amounts will be determined in a manner consistent with the considerations set forth in 24 CFR 953.100(b)(2). If the field office determines that an insufficient amount of money is available to adequately fund a project, it may decline to fund that project and fund the next highest ranking project or projects for which adequate funds are available. HUD may select, in rank order, additional projects for funding if one of the higher ranking projects is not funded, or if additional funds become available.

6. Tiebreakers. When rating results in a tie among projects and insufficient resources remain to fund all tied projects, field offices shall approve projects that can be fully funded over those that cannot be fully funded. When that does not resolve the tie, the following factors should be used in the order listed to resolve the tie:

A. Eastern Woodlands Office. (1) The project that would benefit the

highest percentage of low and moderate income persons.

(2) The project that would benefit the most low and moderate income persons. B. Southern Plains Office.

(1) The project that would benefit the highest percentage of low and moderate income persons.

(2) The applicant with the fewest

active grants.

(3) The project that would benefit the most low and moderate income persons.

C. Northern Plains Office.

- (1) The project that would benefit the highest percentage of low and moderate income persons.
- (2) The project that would benefit the most low and moderate income persons.

D. Southwest Office.

- (1) The applicant with the fewest active grants.
- (2) The applicant that has not received an ICDBG grant over the longest period of time.
- (3) The project that would benefit the highest percentage of low and moderate income persons.

E. Northwest Office.

(1) The applicant that has not received an ICDBG grant over the longest period of time.

(2) The applicant that has received the fewest ICDBG dollars since the inception of the program.

- (3) The project that would benefit the highest percentage of low and moderate income persons.
 - F. Alaska Office.
- (1) The applicant that has not received an ICDBG grant over the longest period of time.
- (2) The project that would benefit the highest percentage of low and moderate income persons.
- (3) The project that would benefit the most low and moderate income persons.

(g) Overall Thresholds

Two types of general thresholds are set forth in 24 CFR 953.302(a): those that relate to applicants, and those that address the overall community development appropriateness of the project(s) included in the application. Project-specific thresholds will be addressed within the pertinent project selection criteria categories.

Applicant thresholds focus on the administrative capacity of the applicant to undertake the proposed project, and on its past performance in the ICDBG and Housing programs. An applicant that has previously participated in the ICDBG program must have performed adequately. In cases of previously documented deficient performance, the applicant must have taken appropriate corrective action to improve its performance prior to submitting an ICDBG application to HUD.

In order to rate and rank a project contained in an application that has passed the screening tests outlined in