

Public Health and Safety. In the case of public facility projects, documentation of the problem by outside, third-party sources is of primary importance. In the case of water and sewer projects, documentation from public agencies is particularly helpful, especially where such agencies have pinpointed the exact cause of the problem and have recommended courses of action which would eliminate the problem. Such supporting documentation should be as up-to-date as possible: the older the supporting material, the more doubt arises that the need is current and immediate. Applicants also should be sure to indicate how the project would address public health and safety needs and conditions. Quantification also is essential in describing needs. Documentation from those affected should be included.

In order to show that the project is likely to impact upon the problem, the following items should be covered:

- (1) Total project costs. Total project costs should be documented by qualified third party estimates, and be as recent as possible.
- (2) Source of other funds. To the extent that CDBG funds will not cover all costs, the source of other funds should be identified and committed. If local funds are to be used, the applicant should show both the willingness and the ability to provide the funds.
- (3) How the project will solve the problem. The applicant should demonstrate that the project will completely solve the problem and, if applicable, the applicant should address whether the proposal would be satisfactory to other State/local agencies which have jurisdiction over the problem.
- (4) Cost effectiveness of the proposal. The applicant should address whether the proposal is the most cost effective and efficient among the possible alternatives considered.
- (5) Reasonableness of service area. The applicant should address whether the service area claimed for the project is reasonable, in view of the nature of the proposed project, and if not, the applicant should address what effect a more realistic appraisal would have on overall benefit to low- and moderate-income persons.
- (6) Project impact on public health and safety; and
- (7) Other applicable feasibility issues have been addressed. Individual projects often vary in the extent to which they meet the criteria outlined above. Therefore, it is difficult to define precisely those combinations of characteristics which constitute, for example, "maximum" versus

"substantial" impact. Not all applications receiving a particular rating will match point-for-point all the criteria in the same way. The following standards will be applied:

MAXIMUM (up to 400 Points)

1. Need is serious, current and requires prompt attention.
2. Program would resolve the problem completely, either through funds requested or with the support of other resources already committed.
3. No other obstacles to timely and effective implementation of the program exist.
4. Benefits a large number of persons when compared to other public facility projects.
5. Demonstrates that the applicant has considered and, as appropriate, will use alternative cost effective methods or material in the execution of the project.
6. Public health and safety concerns are fully resolved by the project.
7. Project would significantly address serious deficiencies in accessibility for disabled persons and/or provide a substantial increase in the number of public facilities accessible to disabled persons.
8. Significantly supports the strategic plan of a designated Empowerment Zone or Enterprise Community.

SUBSTANTIAL (up to 300 Points)

1. Serious need is shown.
2. Program would resolve the problem completely.
3. There are no major feasibility questions.
4. Benefits a substantial number of persons.
5. There is evidence that efforts have been made to minimize project costs through use of alternative methods and materials, as appropriate.
6. Public health and safety concerns are substantially resolved by the project.
7. Project would substantially address serious deficiencies in accessibility for disabled persons and/or provide a significant increase in the number of public facilities accessible to disabled persons.
8. Substantially supports the strategic plan of a designated Empowerment Zone or Enterprise Community.

MODERATE (up to 200 Points)

1. Serious need is shown, but is not as serious or well documented as other applications.
2. Program may not meet the need as completely as in some other applications.
3. There may be some questions relative to feasibility.
4. Benefits a significant number of persons.

5. There is evidence that efforts have been made to minimize project costs.

6. Public health and safety concerns are partially met by the project.

7. Project would somewhat address serious deficiencies in accessibility for disabled persons and/or provide some increase in the number of public facilities accessible to disabled persons.

8. Moderately supports the strategic plan of a designated Empowerment Zone or Enterprise Community.

MINIMAL (up to 100 Points)

1. Some need is evident, but is not serious.

2. Only a portion of the need would be met or the problem would not be resolved completely.

3. There are serious feasibility questions.

4. Benefits only a small number of persons.

5. There is little evidence that efforts have been made to minimize costs.

6. Public health and safety concerns are minimally addressed by the project.

7. Project would minimally address serious deficiencies in accessibility for disabled persons and/or provide a minimal increase in the number of public facilities accessible to disabled persons.

8. Minimally supports the strategic plan of a designated Empowerment Zone or Enterprise Community.

INSIGNIFICANT (0 Points)

1. No clear need has been demonstrated.

2. Program is not appropriate to meeting described needs, or there is serious doubt that there would be much impact on needs.

3. There are major feasibility questions.

4. Benefits a very small number of people.

5. There is no evidence that efforts have been made to minimize project costs.

6. Public health and safety needs are not addressed by the project.

7. Project would not address serious deficiencies in accessibility for disabled persons and/or would not provide an increase in the number of public facilities accessible to disabled persons.

8. Project does not support the strategic plan of a designated Empowerment Zone or Enterprise Community.

(c) *Program Impact—Single Purpose—Economic Development Projects.* As discussed earlier in this section of the NOFA, each individual Single Purpose project will receive a separate impact rating. Applicants whose proposed economic development program will