training), the use of public/Indian housing funds available through existing State and local programs, or other commitments.

- (i) A *high score* (18–25 points) is received where the applicant provides:
- Evidence that it has a strong and cooperative partnership with its residents and that residents were involved in the development of the application;
- Evidence that the residents will continue their involvement throughout the implementation stages of the FIC, including evidence that the applicant will seek resident input in identifying resident needs:
- Evidence that the applicant will contract with or employ residents to provide services and conduct renovation/conversion/construction activities;
- Certification (in letter or resolution) that it is currently implementing a FSS program (or similar Mutual Help Program), and demonstrates success with previous partnerships in other similar program efforts.
- Evidence that the facility will be located in a target area, such as Weed and Seed, distressed, etc.;
- Evidence of strong and committed partnerships with existing social service agencies and evidence of social service agencies' intent to provide various resources to the FIC (identifying source committed, availability of funds, etc.).
- (ii) A *medium score* (9–17 points) is received where:
- The applicant mentions its partnership with residents. Where the residents were notified of the FIC, but were not involved in the development of the application, the applicant ensures that the residents' role will be increased during the implementation stages of the FIC:
- The applicant states its intent to provide services, although the plan for hiring and contracting is not specific;
- The applicant provides certification (in letter or resolution) that it is currently implementing a similar program (volunteer) utilizing partnerships with service agencies in its locality;
- The FIC facility will not be located in a target area, such as Weed and Seed, distressed, etc.;
- The applicant provides some evidence of partnerships with existing social service agencies and some evidence of social service agencies' intent to provide various resources to the FIC (identifying source committed, availability of funds, etc.).
- (iii) A *low score* (1–8 points) is received where the applicant:

- Mentions a partnership with existing social service agencies, but evidence of such support is not provided;
- Does not currently implement a FSS program or a Federal or local program similar to Mutual Help, but has indicated its intent to implement such a program;
- Mentions its efforts to coordinate the FIC facility in a target area, but does not include evidence of commitments from existing local, State, Federal sources.
- (2) Supportive Services Only (Maximum 100 points). Applications for funds for these activities will be scored on the following factors:
- (a) Evidence of Need [35 Points]

Evidence of need for supportive services by eligible residents.

- (i) A high score (26–35 points) is achieved where the applicant provides a detailed needs assessment of eligible residents, clearly identifies specific target areas of concern, and documents milestone results and benefits to be derived from resident participation in FIC services.
- (ii) A *medium score* (13–25 points) is achieved where the applicant provides a general needs assessment of eligible residents and identifies target areas, but does not provide milestone results to be derived from resident participation in FIC services.
- (iii) A *low score* (1–12 points) is achieved where the applicant merely mentions there is a need for services, but does not clearly address specific areas of concern.
- (b) Program Quality [20 Points]

The extent to which the HA and each service provider has evidenced that supportive services and other resources will be provided for at least 3 to 5 years following the receipt of funding for supportive services under this NOFA. The extent to which the HA has demonstrated that it will commit to its FIC part of its formula allocation of Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP)/Comprehensive Improvement Assistance Program funds for CGP/CIAP-eligible activities that result in employment, training, and contracting opportunities for eligible residents.

- (i) A *high score* (14–20 points) is received where the applicant:
- Provides letters from the service provider(s) that contain the provider's strong commitment to provide support services and other resources (i.e., direct financial staff, training/educational) over the grant period;
- Clearly documents its current use of CGP/CIAP funds and its continued

plans to utilize part of its CGP/CIAP funds toward eligible FIC activities;

- Provides a detailed and precise description of the location of the FIC, the coordination of services proposed at the facility, and the area to be served by the FIC;
- Clearly indicates the accessibility of the FIC to residents, including distance and the transportation necessary to reach the facility.
- (ii) A *medium score* (7–13 points) is received where the applicant:
- Provides letters or narrative language regarding a limited commitment of service providers to provide support services and other resources:
- Does not currently have CGP/CIAP funding, but has made clear its intention to use part of future CGP/CIAP funding toward eligible FIC activities;
- Provides a description of the facility location, but the accessibility of the facility to residents is limited or is somewhat unclear.

(iii) A *low score* (1–6 points) is received where the applicant:

- Merely mentions that providers will provide services, but does not provide letters or language indicating a commitment by the providers;
- Does not make clear any intention to use part of its current or future CGP/ CIAP funding toward eligible FIC activities;
- Mentions the location of the FIC facility, but does not provide specific details regarding the accessibility or distance to residents.

## (c) HA Capability [20 Points]

The capability of the HA or designated service provider to provide the supportive services. The extent to which the HA has demonstrated success in modernization activities under the Comprehensive Grant/Comprehensive Improvement Assistance (CIAP) Programs (see 24 CFR part 968 and, for IHAs, part 905, subpart I). The extent to which the HA has a good record of maintaining and operating public housing, as determined by the Public Housing Management Assessment Program (PHMAP) (see 24 CFR part 901 and, for IHAs, 905.135), and has utilized innovative and workable strategies to improve management (e.g., LEAP, which uses highly skilled retired military personnel in key management positions).

- (i) A *high score* (14–20 points) is received where the applicant:
- Demonstrates success in providing similar supportive services programs and has clearly detailed how the services were coordinated and complemented with other programs;