GRANT EVALUATION CRITERIA

The CDBG Subcommittee will use the following criteria to evaluate proposals and make funding recommendations. In order to be considered for funding, a proposed activity must, at minimum, be eligible for funding according to HUD's regulations by meeting at least one of HUD's National Objectives, and address at least one goal of the Town of Arlington Consolidated Plan, which can be found under CDBG on the Town of Arlington's Planning and Community Development page. Application, including Budget Description, must also be complete.

Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)
1. Community Need Does the proposed project address a pressing or significant need in the town of Arlington and demonstrated familiarity with said need? Project goals should be consistent with the Priority Need categories identified in the 5-Year Consolidated Plan	Applicant can demonstrate comprehension of said need, and that the proposed project meets a new or growing need in the community that is either not being met or is underserved by other programs.	Applicant can demonstrate familiarity with said need, and that the proposed project meets an existing need in the community.	It is unclear from the application if the applicant has comprehension of said need, or if the proposed project meets an unmet community need.
2. Resources & Capacity Does the organization have the appropriate level of experienced staff and resources to execute the proposed project and the aptitude to meet the need?	Applicant has had experience with other projects similar to the one proposed and can demonstrate strong staff/resource levels capable of successfully implementing the proposed project.	Applicant has had some experience with other projects similar to the one proposed and has adequate staff/resources capable of completing the proposed project.	Applicant has limited experience with projects similar to the one proposed and it is unclear from the application if there is adequate staff capacity to complete the proposed project.
3. Cost Benefit How does the cost of the proposed project compare to its proposed output and outcome accomplishments?	Proposed project yields a low cost-benefit ratio comparable to similar programs.	n/a	Proposed project yields a high cost-benefit ratio comparable to similar programs.
4. Encouraging Partnerships Does the proposed project involve new or existing partnerships with other service providers in the community?	Applicant and/or proposed activity will encourage new partnerships as a result of the project.	Applicant will utilize existing partnerships to complete the proposed project.	Proposed project does not encourage partnerships.
5. Leveraged Funds Has the organization secured additional funding sources or in-kind support to cover the proposed project?	Applicant has demonstrated the capability of leveraging funds or in-kind support to cover 50% or more of the proposed project costs. The majority of these leveraged funds are committed.	Applicant has demonstrated the capability of leveraging funds or in-kind support to cover some of the project costs.	Applicant has identified few to none additional funds/ in-kind support to cover the proposed project OR the majority of leveraged funds/ in-kind support identified are pending.
6. Self Sufficiency Will the proposed project be self-sufficient and no longer require CDBG funding after one year? After a few years?	Applicant is making a one-time request for funds and has demonstrated that the project is capable of becoming self-sufficient beyond one year of seed-funding.	Applicant has demonstrated that the project is capable of becoming self-sufficient within 2-3 years.	Applicant is attempting to achieve self-sufficiency but anticipates requesting additional funds beyond the next three years.
7. New Public Services Program Is the proposed project offering a new service and is it available from any other providers in the community?	The proposed project offers a new service not provided elsewhere in the Town.	The applicant is seeking funding for a new project or quantifiable increase in level of an existing service.	The proposed project received a CDBG grant in the previous year, is not a new service, and does not propose an increase in the level of an existing service.

Name of Reviewer **Date**

GRANT EVALUATION CRITERIA

Please indicate whether each Comparative Criteria Category is "Highly Advantageous", "Advantageous", or "Not Advantageous". "Highly Advantageous" receives a score of 3, "Advantageous" receives a score of 2, and "Not Advantageous" receives a score of 1. Please fill in the total score for each application.

Applicant	Housing Corporation of Arlington	Project	Affordable Housing Capital Improvements	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Arlington Menotomy Weatherization P	Project	Energy Efficiency Program	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Arlington Planning & Community Deve	Project	Workforce Development Grant Program	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Arlington EATS	Project	Program Support	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Arlington Boys and Girls Club	Project	Scholarship Program	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Arlington Boys and Girls Club	Project	Jobs, Jobs, Jobs Program	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Arlington High School	Project	Athletic Scholarships	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Arlington Housing Authority	Project	Operation Success Learning Center	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Arlington Youth Counseling Center (AYCC)	Project	Mental Health Counseling and Support Services	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Council on Aging	Project	Adult Day Health Services	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Council on Aging	Project	Transportation Program	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Council on Aging	Project	Volunteer Coordinator	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Fidelity House	Project	Jobs, Jobs, Jobs Program	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Fidelity House	Project	Menotomy Manor Outreach Program	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Recreation Department	Project	Program Scholarships	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Arlington Facilities Department	Project	Town Hall Plaza	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Arlington Planning & Community Deve	Project	Whittemore Park Revitilization, Phase II	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Food Link, Inc.	Project	Capital Funding	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0

2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0

Notes/Summary Statement

Applicant	**Arlington EATS**	**Project**	**Fit Out Project**	
Comparative Criteria Categories	**Highly Advantageous (HA)**	**Advantageous (A)**	**Not Advantageous (NA)**	**Score**
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0

Notes/Summary Statement

Applicant	Planning and Community Development De	Project	Planners	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Planning and Community Development De	Project	Planning Studies	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Envision Arlington	Project	Annual Town Survey 2021	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Planning and Community Development De	Project	Grants Administrator (salary + benefits)	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0

2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

Applicant	Planning and Community Development De	Project	General Administration	
Comparative Criteria Categories	Highly Advantageous (HA)	Advantageous (A)	Not Advantageous (NA)	Score
1. Community Need				0
2. Resources & Capacity				0
3. Encouraging Partnerships				0
4. Cost Benefit				0
5. Leveraged Funds				0
6. Self Sufficiency				0
7. New Public Services Program				0
Total Score				0
Notes/Summary Statement				

GRANT EVALUATION CRITERIA, SCORE SUMMARY		
Applicant	**Project**	**Score**
Housing Corporation of Arlington	Capital Improvements	0
Arlington Menotomy Weatherization Program	Energy Efficiency Program	0
Arlington Planning & Community Development	Workforce Development Grant Program	0
Arlington EATS	Program Support	0
Arlington Boys and Girls Club	Summer Scholarships	0
Arlington Boys and Girls Club	Jobs, Jobs, Jobs Program	0
Arlington High School	Athletic Fee Scholarships	0
Arlington Housing Authority	Operation Success Learning Center	0
Arlington Youth Counseling Center (AYCC)	Mental Health Services for Youth and Families	0
Council on Aging	Adult Day Health Services/Scholarships	0
Council on Aging	Transportation Program	0
Council on Aging	Volunteer Coordinator	0
Fidelity House	Jobs, Jobs, Jobs Program	0
Fidelity House	Menotomy Manor Outreach Program	0
Recreation Department	Program Scholarships	0
Arlington Facilities Department	Town Hall Plaza	0
Arlington Planning & Community Development	Whittemore Park Revitilization Project, Phase II	0
Food Link, Inc.	Capital Funding	0
Arlington EATS	Fit Out Project	0
Planning and Community Development Department	Planners	Exempt
Planning and Community Development Department	Planning Studies	Exempt
Envision Arlington	Annual Town Survey	0
Planning and Community Development Department	Grants Administrator (salary + benefits)	Exempt
Planning and Community Development Department	General Administration	Exempt