FY26-27 CDBG POLICIES

MAG
Expert Resources. Enriching Lives.

MAG CDBG Rating and Ranking Policies - FY26-27

Approved: **August 19, 2026**

The following policies have been established to govern the MAG CDBG award process so that HUD dollars are targeted toward projects of greatest need and impact, and to determine project eligibility under CDBG federal and state program guidelines. All eligible project applications will be accepted for rating and ranking.

1. In compliance with the policies of the State of Utah CDBG program, in order to be eligible for funding consideration, all grantees or sub-grantees must have expended 50% of any prior year's CDBG funding prior to the Rating and Ranking Committee's (RRC) rating and ranking session (generally mid-January).
2. Applicants must provide written documentation of the availability and status of all other proposed funding at the time the application is submitted, including all sources of funding which are considered local contributions toward the project and its administration. A project is not mature if funding cannot be committed by the time of application.
3. All proposed projects must be listed in the latest capital improvements list submitted by the applicant for the Consolidated Plan, and must meet the regional priorities identified in the Consolidated Plan. First time applicants and those submitting projects through a sponsoring city or county must make reasonable effort to amend the sponsor's listing in MAG's Consolidated Plan in a timely manner as determined by the RRC.
4. To maintain project eligibility, attendance at the annual "How to Apply" Workshops held in the Mountainland Region is mandatory for all applicants and sub-grantees. The project manager and an elected official from the applicant's jurisdiction should be in attendance. Newly elected officials and project managers are especially encouraged to attend since the administrative requirements and commitments of a CDBG project are considerable.
5. HUD regulations provide that no more than 15% of the State CDBG allocation can be used for "Public Service" activities. It is MAG's intent to generally apply that same cap to the regional allocation. Consideration of any exceptions will be coordinated with the State and will be based upon impact to the state-wide cap.
6. The state allows up to $50,000 in funding for the MAG region for program administration and consolidated planning. The actual amount of funding allocated to the AOG for regional program administration and planning will be determined by the RRC.
7. The minimum CDBG allocation per project is $200,000, except if it is rated on Scoring Criteria question 10, then the project can be awarded funds greater than $30,000 but less than $199,000.
8. The RRC may establish a set aside for project applications in a broad category on an annual basis based on regional needs identified in the MAG Consolidated Plan (i.e., planning, housing, infrastructure, economic development, public service, etc.). For any such set aside(s) that may be established, the RRC will provide notification to eligible jurisdictions of the type and amount of the set aside(s), and rating and ranking policies to be applied, prior to the commencement of the application process, usually in August of each year. There is no specific set aside identified for project applications received in the FY2025 program year.
9. Projects that are primarily designed to enhance private businesses or developers will be denied. Ownership of CDBG funded improvements must remain in the public domain.
10. Any project that can or will receive greater than 30% of project from private funding sources (excepting grants), will be ineligible for CDBG funds.
11. Mountainland Association of Governments will provide application assistance at the request of any jurisdiction. Technical assistance provided prior to the award of the contract, such as filling out applications, submitting information for the Consolidated Plan, LMI surveys or public hearings, shall be provided without cost to the applicant.
12. RRC, MAG staff and State staff review of all applications will proceed as follows:

a. MAG staff will review all applications and become familiar with each project prior to meeting with State staff for review.
b. RRC will interview applicants at least one week prior to the application deadline.
c. MAG staff will review all applications with the State CDBG staff to determine eligibility and national objective compliance.
d. RRC members will review all applications that are determined eligible.
e. RRC members will rate and rank projects.
f. The RRC determines final rating and ranking of projects and funding allocations. This information is reported to the Executive Council.

13. Funding will be awarded based on project ranking. The RRC may award less funding than the application request based upon project needs and ability of the jurisdiction to complete the project, including consideration of project planning (is the community prepared to implement the project), project timing (when will the project begin), project phases (can the project be completed in phases), supplemental funding (timing and availability of matching funds), jurisdiction commitment to the project, demonstrated need for the project in the community weighted against project needs for other communities.
14. Multi-year funding (maximum of two years) for projects will generally not be awarded, unless a specific request for multi-year status is received from the project applicant based on defined project needs, and the amount and timing of future funding available can be adjusted to meet such a request.
15. Any appeal of the Mountainland CDBG review process and/or funding allocations will follow the State Regional Appeal Procedure.
16. Emergency Projects: An emergency project is defined as one that addresses a detriment to the health, safety and/or welfare of residents. For any critical project that meets this definition, a jurisdiction may submit an application for emergency CDBG funding outside the normal allocation cycle.
    a. The application must be made utilizing the state's application form for the most recent funding cycle, and by holding a public hearing. All emergency applications must meet CDBG program requirements, and the Mountainland CDBG policies defined herein, including meeting minimum matching requirements, if any (see Paragraph 5).
    b. AOG staff will review the application for eligibility and consistency with the Consolidated Plan.
    c. The RRC will review the project application, including the jurisdiction's capacity to meet funding needs.
    d. If the RRC recommends the application to the State Policy Committee, the state staff will review the application to ensure the project meets program eligibility and national objective compliance. The state reserves the right to reject or amend applications that do not meet these threshold requirements.
    e. The state will permit applications for emergency projects. The State Policy Committee will make the final review and funding determination on all emergency projects.
    f. Any emergency funds distributed to projects in the region will be deducted from the region's allocation during the next funding cycle. Therefore, any emergency funds awarded to a jurisdiction will be considered as a funded project in the next funding cycle. Policies on second round funding will be applied as outlined in Paragraph 5.
    g. Additional information on the Emergency Fund program is available in the Application Policies and Procedures handbook developed annually by the state in Chapter 2, Funding Processes.
17. Membership on the RRC is by appointment of the Chairman of the Executive Council with annual ratification by the full Council. RRC membership will include at least two representatives from each county (1 from the county and 1 from a city/town). There are four members of the RRC. One member of the RRC will be appointed to sit on the State CDBG Policy Committee. RRC members representing jurisdictions that are submitting applications must abstain from ranking their applications.
18. MAG CDBG Rating and Ranking Policies are updated annually by MAG Staff and the RRC, with consideration given to guidance from the State CDBG Policy Committee and/or State CDBG Staff. Rating and Ranking policies are published for public comment and provided to all eligible

cities and counties. The RRC has final review and is responsible to adopt the MAG CDBG Policies and Rating and Ranking System.

19. In the event of a tie for the last funding position, the following are the tiebreakers in order of priority:
    a. The project with the highest percentage of LMI
    b. The highest score on Scoring Criteria question 10.
    c. The project that has highest percent of local funds leveraged
    d. The project with the most other funds leveraged.
20. All applications will be fully funded beginning with the highest rated project then sequentially to the next highest ranked project, and so on. In the event that the next highest-ranked project cannot be fully funded, the following policies will be implemented to allocate the remaining funds:
    a. The next ranked application will be evaluated to determine whether or not the project is still viable and can meet a CDBG national objective with reduced funding. If it is viable, this project will be funded at a reduced award amount.
    b. Funding reviews will proceed sequentially by project score. Each project will be evaluated for viability under a reduced budget. In the event that a project is deemed unfeasible with partial funding, consideration will immediately shift to the next highest-scoring project.
    c. If there are no other applications for viable projects, the remaining funds will be allocated to MAG's Single Family Housing Rehab program.

Scoring Criteria

Rating and Ranking System Notes: Underlined Criteria are required by the State of Utah.

1. Percent of the applicants' total population directly benefiting from the project in the proposed project area. (7 POINTS) Regardless of size, the applicant jurisdiction is given greater priority for projects that benefit the highest proportion of the applicant's total population when compared to the proposed project area. Direct benefit will result from the project for:

   More than 75% of the applicant's total population - 7 points

   Between 50-74.9% of the applicant's total population - 5 points

   Between 25-49.9% of the applicant's total population - 3 points

   Less than 25% of the applicant's total population - 2 points

2. Percent of the applicants' jurisdiction's LMI population directly benefiting from the project (for site-specific or city/county-wide projects) (5 POINTS):

   Points are awarded to applicants serving the highest percentage of their LMI population.

   A substantial proportion of LMI served (>70%) - 5 points

   A more moderate proportion of LMI served (55-69%) - 4 points

   A moderate proportion of LMI served (45-54%) - 3 points

   A small proportion of LMI served (< 45%) - 1 point

   OR

   A Project serves a limited clientele, or targeted LMI group as defined by HUD - 3 points

   Project serves a limited clientele group (presumed to be 51% LMI) OR targeted LMI group(100% LMI):

   Points are awarded to limited clientele activities that serve a HUD presumed LMI group (abused children, elderly, disabled, homeless, etc.), a documented low income group (LMI income certification required for program eligibility), or activities that serve a targeted LMI group, where benefit is provided exclusively to LMI persons based upon their income eligibility (example: construction of new housing whose occupancy is limited exclusively to LMI individuals or families).

3. Points are awarded to projects which serve low-income (defined as 50% Area Median Income) and very low-income (defined as 30% of the County Median Income) beneficiaries as documented by survey (5 POINTS):

25% or more of the direct beneficiaries are low or very low income - 5 points

20-24.9% - 4 points

15-19.9% - 3 points

10-14.9% - 2 points

1-9.9% - 1 point

4. Local dollars invested in the project (8 POINTS):

Points are awarded to applicants investing local (city/county) dollars in their own projects, thus leveraging regional CDBG funding. Local contribution must be documented, and includes bonded indebtedness that is directly attributable to a proposed project, loans, and city/county funds. Points are awarded based upon the following scale:

Population	*8 Points*	*5 Points*	*3 Points*	*2 Points*	*1 Point*
< 1,000 population	> 20%	17.1% – 200%	14.1% – 17.0%	10% – 14.0%	<10%
1,001 to 10,000	> 30%	24.1% – 30%	18.1% – 24%	10% – 18%	<10%
> 10,000 population	> 40%	30.1% – 40%	20.1% – 30%	10% – 20%	<10%

5. Amount of outside project leveraging by the applicant (5 POINTS):

Points are awarded to applicants who are able to use CDBG dollars to leverage other state or federal funds. This includes federal and state grants. Leveraging is based on outside funds committed that are currently available.

Outside funding is 40-49% of the total cost - 5 points

Outside funding is 30-39% of the total cost - 4 points

Outside funding is 20-29% of the total cost - 3 points

Outside funding is 10-19% of the total cost - 2 points

Outside funding is 0-9% of the total cost - 0 point

6. The capacity of the grantee to carry out the project (5 POINTS):

Points will be awarded on a scale of 1-5 to grantees who have previously demonstrated the ability to successfully administer and carry out a CDBG project, or to new grantees who have administered other grants in the past and demonstrated an understanding, capacity and desire to successfully administer a CDBG project.

Previous Performance (Rated by State CDBG Office) - 1-5 Points

OR

No Previous Experience - 3 Points

7. Points are awarded to applicants (not project sponsor) based on the amount of funding received in prior years (5 POINTS):

Applicant has not received funding in the last two years - 5 Points

Applicant received less than $150,000 in last two years - 3 Points

Applicant has received from $150,000 to $299,999 in last two years - 1 Points

Applicant has received more than $300,000 in last two years - 0 Points

8. Moderate income housing planning by the applicant or its sponsor (5 POINTS):

   As part of the Housing Plan defined by state statute and/or adopted by city/county ordinance and included in the General Plan. Towns less than 5,000 are not required to have a housing plan. However, they will receive 2 points if they do not have one and 5 points if they do have a housing plan.

   Compliant/Adopted by Ordinance - 5 points

   Small Cities (less than 5,000) - 2 points

   Non-compliant - 0 points

9. Project which support affordable housing for LMI up to 80% AMI (5 POINTS):

   The majority of project funds will be used to improve, expand, or support LMI housing education, choice, availability, affordability, or opportunity.

   Projects benefiting 10 or more units or individuals - 5 Points

   Projects benefiting 5-9 units or individuals - 3 Points

   Projects benefiting 1-4 units or individuals - 1 Point

10. Projects which develop/improve infrastructure (10 POINTS):

    The majority of project funds are for the expansion of basic infrastructure (water, sewer) or other physical infrastructure (fire stations, community center, etc.) to create suitable living environments for the residents of the community.

    Water/Sewer Projects - 10 Points

    Secondary Water - 7 Points

    Storm Drainage - 6 Points

    Infrastructure Plans - 5 Points

    Streets/Sidewalks - 5 Points

    Public Health/Safety (First Response Vehicle) - 4 Points

    Public Service Vehicles - 2 Points

    Other Public Facilities/Housing - 2 Points

    Single Family Rehab - 1 Point

11. For water projects, system user fees are competitive according to state drinking water and water quality standards (7 POINTS)

    Maximum Affordable Water Bill = 1.75% of MAGI. Non-Water Projects get a default score of 5

7 Points	5 Points	3 Points	0 Points	Your Jurisdiction's Tax Rate as a Percentage of State Ceiling
Fee rate>1.25% of MAGI	Fee rate 0.75-1.25% of MAGI	Fee rate 0.51- .75	Fee rate<0.5% of MAGI	

12. Attendance by an elected official of the applicant at the “How to Apply” workshop (2 POINTS):

    Elected official in attendance - 2 Points

    Elected official not in attendance - 0 points

13. Jurisdiction participated in updating the Consolidated Plan (5 POINTS):

    Provided MAG with updated materials for the consolidated plan and capital improvement list - 5 Points

    Did not provide MAG with updated materials for consolidated plan and capital improvement list - 0 Points

14. Project meets jurisdiction priorities identified in the consolidated plan priorities (5 POINTS):

    Local priorities identified in each jurisdiction's capital improvements list will be used to determine jurisdiction priorities.

    On Capital Improvements List - 5 Points

    Not on list - 0 Points

15. Completed “ADA Checklist for readily achievable barrier removal” for city/county office (1 POINT):

    Completed checklist - 1 point

    Did not complete checklist - 0 points

16. City/County has adopted the following policies: grievance procedure under the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504, and ADA Effective Communication Policy, Language Access Plan, and Section504 and ADA Reasonable Accommodation Policy (1 Point)

    Adopted policies - 1 point

    Has not adopted policies - 0 points

17. Priority will be given to projects that are mature and have a demonstrated ability to solve the problem (16 POINTS):

    A mature project exhibits a specific and detailed scope of work, a timeline, a well thought out funding plan with supplemental funding already applied for and committed, and a detailed engineer's cost estimate. Immediate viability of the project means CDBG dollars can be spent in a timely manner. Points are awarded for each of the following:

    a. *The problem or need is clearly identified in application; applicant is able to present project clearly and concisely and can respond to questions; staff and/or engineer, etc., are involved in and understand the planning process. - 4 points*
    b. *The proposed solution is well defined in Scope of Work and is demonstrated to solve the problem or need. - 5 points*
    c. *Applicant has secured matching funds - 3 points*

       -OR-

       Applicant is pursuing matching funding. - 1 point

    d. *Applicants can demonstrate a timeline for project completion during the grant period, and can give a concise description of how the project will be completed in a timely manner. - 4 points*

18. Projects that have lower CDBG project costs per person will receive more points (3 POINTS):

Dividing the CDBG project request amount by the number of project beneficiaries results in a calculation of the cost per beneficiary. Projects that have a lower cost per beneficiary will receive additional points.

Projects that cost less than $1,000 per beneficiary - 3 Points

Projects that cost between $1,001 and $5,000 per beneficiary - 2 Points

Projects that cost over $5,001 per beneficiary - 0 Points

UNDER THIS SYSTEM, A MAXIMUM OF 100 POINTS IS POSSIBLE.

Appendix

Public Comment

A 30-day public comment period was held from **July 8, 2026, to August 10, 2026.**

Comments Received: No public comment was received.