

NOTICE PIH 96-31 (HA)

ISSUED: 5/22/96

EXPIRES: 5/31/97

Directors, Office of Public Housing,
Administrators, Area Offices Native
American Programs, Executive
Directors, Public and Indian
Housing Authorities

**PROCESSING OF GRANT APPLICATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR (FY)
1996 PUBLIC HOUSING DRUG ELIMINATION PROGRAM (PHDEP)**

1. **PURPOSE.** This notice provides instructions for processing grant applications submitted for funding under the FY 1996 PHDEP.
2. **APPLICABILITY.**
 - A. This notice is applicable **ONLY** to those public housing authorities (PHAs) and Indian housing authorities (IHAs) submitting grant applications for FY 96 PHDEP grant program.
 - B. The term housing authority (HA) **SHALL** include PHAs and IHAs. The term Field Office (FO) shall refer to local HUD Field Offices or Area Office of Native American Programs (AONAPs).
3. **BACKGROUND.** A Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) announcing HUD's FY 96 funding was published in the Federal Register (Docket No. 4003-N-01) on Monday, April 8, 1996.
4. **FUND ASSIGNMENT PLAN.** The fund assignment plan for distributing grant funds to be awarded under the FY 96 PHDEP will be in accordance with Handbook 1830.4, REV-2, dated July 31, 1986.
5. **DEFINITIONS.** The definitions for the PHDEP program are contained in 24 CFR 761 of the "Streamlined" Consolidated Public and Assisted Housing Drug Elimination Program final rule dated March 28, 1996.

6. GRANT APPLICATION ELIGIBLE AND INELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.

- A. Eligible and ineligible activities under the FY 96 PHDEP are described in Section I of the NOFA. Funding is available only for public housing agencies and Indian housing authorities.
- B. An applicant may submit **ONLY** one application under each NOFA.
- C. In accordance with the FY 96 PHDEP NOFA joint applications **ARE NOT** permitted under this program with the following exception: housing authorities under a single administration (such as housing authorities managing another housing authority under contract; or Housing authorities sharing a common executive director) may submit a single application, even though each HA has its own operating budget.

7. GRANT APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.

- A. To receive funding, housing authorities **MUST** submit a grant application to HUD using a FY 96 PHDEP application kit as described in Section II (Application Process) of the NOFA.
- B. The NOFA provides information concerning the purpose, applicant eligibility, available amounts, selection criteria, financial requirements, management, and application processing, including how to apply, how selections will be made, and how applicants will be notified of results.
- C. The application kit contains information on all exhibits and certifications required under the NOFA.

8. GRANT APPLICATION SELECTIVE RATING CRITERIA.

- A. The number of points that an applicant receives will depend on the extent to which the grant application is

responsive to the information requested in the selection criteria. An applicant must receive a score of 70 points or more out of the maximum of 100 points awarded under this competition to be eligible for funding.

- B. After applications have been scored, Headquarters rank the applications on a national basis. Awards be made in ranked order until all funds are expended. **WILL WILL**

9. GRANT DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.

- A. HUD is distributing grant funds under the FY 96 PHDEP NOFA on a national competition basis. Maximum grant award amounts are computed on a sliding scale, using an overall maximum cap, depending upon the number of public housing agency (PHA) or Indian housing authority (IHA) units. For specific guidance refer to Section I(b)(2) of the NOFA and/or the FY 96 PHDEP Application Kit.

- B. The unit count includes rental, Turnkey III Homeownership, Mutual Help Homeownership and Section 23 leased housing bond-financed projects. Units in the Turnkey III Homeownership, Mutual Help Homeownership and Section 23 bond-financed programs are counted **IF** they have not been conveyed.

- C. Eligible projects must be covered by an annual contributions contract (ACC) or annual operating agreement (AOA) during the period of the grant award.

- (1) Public housing agencies.

- (a) PHA-Owned Rental Housing Program. In accordance with Notice 94-66 (PHA), Low Rent Public Housing Program - Streamlined Operating Budget and Financial Reporting Procedures, PHAs with fiscal years beginning January 1, 1995 and after, **ARE NOT REQUIRED** to submit an Operating Budget (Form HUD-52564) **IF** they have been determined, by HUD, to be High or Standard performers under

Public Housing Management Assessment Program (PHMAP) and **HAVE NOT FAILED** the PHMAP financial indicators.

- (b) Those requesting subsidy must, however, submit Form HUD-52723, Calculation of Performance Funding System (PFS) Operating Subsidy and units are in the header.
 - (c) PHAs (rental program) that are **NOT REQUIRED** to submit a budget under the PHMAP criteria in Section I(b)(2)(ii)(A) above **AND** not requesting operating subsidy **ARE NOT REQUIRED** to submit Form HUD-52723.
 - (d) Unit counts **MUST** be confirmed with the local Field Office prior to submission of the FY 96 PHDEP application.
 - (e) For PHA-Owned Turnkey III Homeownership Program and Section 23 Leased Housing Programs, PHAs **ARE REQUIRED** to submit Form HUD-52564, in accordance with Notice PIH 94-66 (PHA), and units in the header.
 - (f) For purposes of the FY 96 PHDEP NOFA, PHAs **ARE REQUIRED** to validate their unit counts with the local Field Office as of April 1, 1996. Units identified after this date will not be accepted.
- (2) Indian housing authorities.
- (a) As of January 1, 1995 Indian housing authorities **ARE NOT REQUIRED** to submit Form HUD-52564, **UNLESS** a corrective action order has been issued in accordance with Notice PIH 94-72 (IHA) extended by Notice PIH 95-65.
 - (b) For purposes of this NOFA, Indian housing authorities **ARE REQUIRED** to validate their unit counts with the local AONAP, prior to submission of the PHDEP application, to ensure the unit count matches the data in the Management Information Retrieval System (MIRS) for units in management as of April 1, 1996. Units identified after this date will not be accepted.

- D. The amount computed above **MUST** be compared with the dollar amount requested in the PHA/IHA application to make certain the amount requested does not exceed the maximum grant award.
- E. **BASED UPON THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION I(b)(2)(i) THROUGH (iii) OF THE FY 96 PHDEP NOFA, APPLICANTS THAT REQUEST FUNDING THAT EXCEED THE ESTIMATED MAXIMUM GRANT AWARD AMOUNT PERMITTED WILL BE REJECTED AND WILL NOT BE ELIGIBLE FOR ANY FUNDING.**

10. HUD REFORM ACT PROVISIONS.

- A. The HUD Reform Act of 1989 prohibits any applicant from gaining an advantage in the competition as a result of receiving confidential information. The final rule, (24 CFR part 4) "Prohibition of Advance Disclosure of Funding Decisions," which implements section 103 of the Reform Act, specifically prohibits advance disclosure of the following:

- (1) Information regarding an applicant's relative standing;
- (2) The amount of assistance requested by any other applicant;
- (3) The identity of any other applicant;
- (4) The number of applications; and
- (5) Any other information contained in another application.

- B. HUD employees who have **SPECIFIC** program questions, such as whether particular subject matter can be discussed with persons outside the Department, should contact Field Office counsel, or Headquarters counsel for the program to which the question pertains.

11. FY 96 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION OPTIONAL REVIEW PROCESS.

- A. The Office of Resident Initiatives (ORI) Grants Management Handbook 7490.01 allows in situations where the Field Office workload exceeds the resources available for a manageable and efficient review process, an optional review process may be used.

- B. Headquarters has determined that an optional review process will be used for processing FY 96 PHDEP grant applications.
- (1) Public housing authorities FY 96 PHDEP applications **WILL** be reviewed and scored by panel members located at the grant application center processing site, Office of Public Housing, New York City, NY.
 - (2) Indian housing authorities (IHA) FY 96 PHDEP applications **WILL** be reviewed and scored by panel members located at the grant application center processing site, AONAPs, Denver, CO.
- C. Screening and scoring the PHDEP grant application's Selection Criteria 3.
- (1) Prior to transmitting applications to the processing center sites Field Offices/AONAPs **WILL** screen and score each PHDEP grant application's Selection Criteria 3.
 - (2) Due to workload requirements/staffing Field Office, Directors, Office of Public Housing and Administrators, AONAPs **ARE AUTHORIZED** to conduct one review per application.
- D. Training materials **WILL** be provided by the Office Community Relations and Involvement (OCRI), Crime Prevention and Security Division (CPSD), and ONAPs to local Field Offices/AONAPs.
- E. Grant applications **WILL** be forwarded to the appropriate grant application processing site.
- F. Selection Criteria 1, 2 and 4 of the grant applications **WILL** be scored at the designated grant application processing site.
- G. Grant applications **WILL** be shipped to the processing sites, to include applications that are late, and applications that were determined to be ineligible **FOR WHAT EVER REASON.**
- H. All tasks in this notice **MUST** be executed in accordance

with the schedule set forth in paragraph 22 of this notice.

12. HEADQUARTERS RESPONSIBILITIES.

- A. Headquarters, OCRI, CPSD, **WILL** provide in this notice attachments with FY 96 PHDEP grant application screening instructions and other related documents to be used by the Field Offices/AONAPs to complete the grant application screening process.
- B. Training for the reviewers at the grant application processing center site **WILL** be conducted by Headquarters, OCRI, and ONAPs staff.
- C. Headquarters, OCRI, CPSD and ONAPs **WILL** provide technical assistance and guidance to the Grant Administrators (GA) at grant application processing center sites located at the Office of Public Housing, New York City, NY, AONAPs, Denver, CO, and Field Offices/AONAPs Grant Administrators (FOGAs) throughout the grant application process. Refer to paragraph 22 of this notice for guidance.

13. FY 96 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION PROCESSING REQUIREMENTS.

- A. Field Office, Directors, Office of Public Housing and Administrators, AONAPs, **WILL ASSURE** that the FY 96 PHDEP grant application process is conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in this processing notice, ORI Grants Management Handbook 7490.01, and related HUD regulations, such as the PHDEP Final Rule (24 CFR 761), FY 1996 NOFA, notices, OMB Circular, handbooks, and additional written guidance provided by Headquarters.
- B. Chapter 2 of ORI Grants Management Handbook 7490.01 describes the actions required in processing PHDEP grant applications by the receiving Field Office/AONAPs.
 - (1) The handbook contains instructions for the administration of grants awarded by the Assistant

Secretary, Office of Public and Indian Housing.

- (2) The handbook provides specific instructions on the grant application processing, grant agreement execution process, payment procedures, required reporting, monitoring, grant extensions, grant closeout procedures, etc.

C. Grant applications **MUST** be received at each designated Field Office, ATTN: Director, Office of Public Housing and/or Administrator, AONAPs, in accordance with Chapter 2 of ORI Resident Initiatives Grants Management Handbook 7490.01 with the following exceptions and **WITH THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE.**

- (1) Following receipt of grant applications and completing the Application Master Log (Appendix A) the Director, Office of Public Housing and Administrator, AONAPs will fax the FY 1996 PHDEP Application Master Log to Headquarters as follows:

- (a) **PHA APPLICATIONS:** Office of Public Housing fax the log to Headquarters, CPSD, Room 4112, fax number (202) 401-7965, ATTN: Malcolm E. Main, telephone (202) 708-1197, ext 4232 (CC:mail address for Malcolm E. Main is PIHPOST2).

- (b) **IHA APPLICATIONS:** AONAPs fax the log to Headquarters, East L'Enfant Plaza, Suite 8204, fax number (202) 755-0182, ATTN: Tracy Outlaw. (CC:mail address for Tracy Outlaw is PIHPOST2). ONAPs must:

- (1) Review and verify that the FY 96 PHDEP Application Log information is correct prior to submission to Headquarters CPSD; and

- (2) Fax the final FY 1996 PHDEP Application Log to Headquarters, CPSD, ATTN: Malcolm E. Main, Room 4112, fax number (202) 401-7965, telephone (202) 708-1197, ext

4232.

- (c) FY 96 PHDEP grant application validation process.
 - (1) In order to validate grant application information Headquarters, OCRI, CPSD will request, via cc:mail, verification of the Application Master Log information (Appendix A of this notice) from each Director, Office of Public Housing and Administrator, AONAPs.
 - (2) Field Offices/AONAPs should refer to paragraph 22 for guidance regarding this process.
- (2) **IF** a Field Office/AONAPs receives an application not in their jurisdiction by the application deadline date, the Field Office/AONAPs **WILL** ensure the following actions take place:
 - (a) Log the date and time of receipt in the master log;
 - (b) Transfer the application to the appropriate Field Office/AONAPs within 24 hours of receipt of the application; and
 - (c) Notify the Field Office/AONAPs by telephone that the application is being forwarded. Send designated Field Office(s), via cc:mail, "what actions were taken" with a copy to the appropriated personnel as follows:
 - (1) CC:mail point of contact for Office of Public Housing New York City, NY, is Jed Abrams (CC:mail address for Jed Abrams is NYCPOST1); and/or
 - (2) CC:mail point of contact for AONAPs, Denver, CO, is Robert Harris (CC:mail address for Robert Harris is DENPOST2).
 - (3) In all cases provide a copy of all communication to Headquarters PHDEP

Coordinator Malcolm E. Main (CC:mail address for Malcolm E. Main is PIHPOST2).

- (d) The application is to be forwarded via **OVERNIGHT MAIL WITH A TRANSMITTAL MEMO** to the Director, Office of Public Housing and/or Administrator, AONAPs as appropriate, ATTN: PHDEP Grants Administrator (Refer to paragraph 11.C. of this notice for guidance).
 - (e) The Field Office/AONAPs receiving the application **WILL**:
 - (1) Per instructions in this notice log in the application according to the prior Field Office/AONAPs receipt date and time.
 - (2) The Field Office/AONAPs shall attach any appropriate documentation to the log.
- D. In accordance with the NOFA, applicants that deliver applications to Field Offices/AONAPs after the deadline date and hour **(FRIDAY, JUNE 14, 1996, AT 3:00 PM, LOCAL TIME)** are ineligible applicants and will be immediately notified that their applications will not be processed.
- E. Grant applications **SHALL** be screened in accordance with Chapter 2 of ORI Resident Initiatives Grants Management Handbook 7490.01 for curable deficiencies and eligibility with the following additional guidance.
- (1) The basic procedures require the receiving Field Office/AONAPs to screen, using Appendix B of this notice, each application. Headquarters, OCRI, CPSD will provide a FOGA application checklist and reviewer instructions, via cc:mail, to each Field Office/AONAPs.
 - (2) Selection Criteria 3 of the PHDEP application shall be scored, using Appendix E of this notice, by the Field Office/AONAPs having jurisdiction over the HA. The screening and scoring (Selection Criteria 3 of the PHDEP application) **WILL** be supervised and validated by each Field Office and AONAPs FOGA.

- (3) Due to workload and staffing requirements Field Office, Directors, Office of Public Housing and Administrators, AONAPs **ARE AUTHORIZED** to conduct one review per application for Selection Criteria 3.
- (4) Field Office/AONAPs staff validating any of the screening process **SHALL NOT** be the same person who scores a grant application. Scoring information **MUST** be posted on both scoring sheets.
- (5) Field Offices/AONAPs **WILL** acknowledge receipt of all grant applications received with a letter to the applicant as outlined in ORI Resident Initiatives Grants Management Handbook 7490.01, Chapter 2-4. This letter must also include a required response date.

F. In connection with ORI Resident Initiatives Grants Management Handbook 7490.01, the SMIRPH/MIRS Grants Management Module will be used in the FY 96 PHDEP grant cycle/process. The FOGA receiving the grant application **WILL** be responsible for:

- (1) Assuring initial grant application information (See Tab 1 of PHDEP application kit) on all applications is entered into the computer system; and
- (2) Information is entered for screens 1, 2, and 7 in the Grants Management Module.

NOTE: FOR PURPOSES OF THIS PROCESS DO NOT DELETE ANY INELIGIBLE APPLICATIONS FROM THE DATABASE AS INSTRUCTED IN THE ORI GRANTS MANAGEMENT HANDBOOK AT CHAPTER 2, 2-5.

G. The FOGA **WILL** validate the correctness of all information entered into each of the required screens of the Grants Management Module.

- (1) If the databases **ARE NOT** complete the FOGA **WILL** be required, in a timely manner, to make appropriate corrections and resubmit the database to the processing panel.

- (2) The database **MUST** include the project summary on screen 7 at F3 and be no more than 4 to 5 brief sentences describing the activities supported by the award.
- (3) The summary **WILL** be taken from the DRUG****.DBF and used in Congressional notification. The FOGA will ensure that the summary contains complete sentences.

H. For administrative purposes Field Offices/AONAPs **WILL** retain one original FY 96 PHDEP grant application and send **2 (TWO) IDENTICAL COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION** with one score sheet attached to each copy and related documents to the appropriate processing site guaranteeing arrival by **JULY 12, 1996**. An identical Selection Criteria Score should be entered on each score sheet.

- (1) The box being shipped **WILL** (but not limited to) contain the following items:
 - (a) Transmittal letter. The transmittal letter shall include a list of grant applications:
 - (1) Prepared for scoring; and
 - (2) Those not to be scored for whatever reason.

NOTE: EACH FIELD OFFICE/AONAPs MUST STATE AND JUSTIFIED WHY THE GRANT APPLICATION(S) WERE NOT SCORED AND PROVIDE ALL DOCUMENTATION RELATED TO THE APPLICATION(S).

- (b) Grant application master log.
- (c) Grant applications (Organized by HA Code).
- (d) Copies of the grant application acknowledgment and curable deficiency letters (Attached to each application).
- (e) Grant application screening checklist and

Score Sheets with Selection Criteria 3 score entered on score sheets. (Attached to each application)

- (f) Grant application correctable deficiency master log.
- (g) Diskette with the SMIRPH/MIRS Grants Management databases (DRUG****.DBF and DRUG****.DBT (**** = Field Office Code) with the application information for screens 1, 2, and 7 in the ORI, Grants Management Module completed.
- (h) Contact the Field Office/AONAPs Data Base Administrator (DBA) for additional guidance.

I. Grant applications **WILL** be sent to the below processing center sites for processing. Addresses and point of contacts are as follows:

- (1) Public housing authority FY 96 PHDEP grant applications **WILL** be sent to:

HUD - New York State Office
Director, Office of Public Housing
ATTN: Grants Administrator: Jed Abrams
26 Federal Plaza, Suite 3237
New York, NY 10278-0068
Telephone Number (212) 264-6500
Office hours: 8:30am - 5:00pm local time

- (2) Indian housing authority FY 96 PHDEP grant applications **WILL** be sent to:

HUD - Northern Plains Office of Native American Programs
Administrator, AONAPs, ATTN: Grants Administrator:
Tracy Outlaw
First Interstate Tower North, 633 17th Street
Denver, CO 80202-3607
Telephone Number (303) 672-5457
Office hours: 8:15am - 4:45pm local time

NOTE:

- (1) **GRANT APPLICATIONS MUST BE CONTROLLED AND ACCOUNTED FOR AT ALL TIMES DURING THIS**

PROCESS.

- (2) **ALL APPLICATIONS WILL BE SENT "OVERNIGHT MAIL" TO THE APPLICATION PROCESS SITE. FIELD OFFICES/AONAPs MUST CHECK WITH THEIR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND MAIL ROOM SUPERVISOR FOR GUIDANCE REGARDING THIS MATTER.**

J. Field Offices/AONAPs **WILL** monitor and track grant applications by sending a urgent cc:mail to the appropriate grant application processing site that states "when" and "how" the applications were shipped and "expected arrival date." The following personnel are points of contact regarding this matter:

- (1) Jed Abrams, Office of Public Housing, NYC, NY (CC:mail address for Jed Abrams is NYCPOST1); and/or
- (2) Robert Harris, AONAPs, Denver, CO (CC:mail address for Robert Harris is DENPOST2).

K. Coordination and oversight of the PHDEP grant application process:

- (1) Field Offices and AONAPs **SHALL** send a copy of all cc:mails regarding this process to MALCOLM E. MAIN (CC:mail address for Malcolm E. Main is PIHPOST2).
- (2) Any violation in carrying out this notice may result in funding delays or repeating the scoring and ranking procedures.
- (3) HUD Headquarters, in conjunction with the Office of public and Indian housing comptroller, **WILL** audit a sample of Field Offices to validate the review process.

14. SCORING OF FY 96 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATIONS.

A. Assignment of the Grant Administrator. Two grant application processing center site grant administrators (GAs) **WILL** be assigned to oversee the review process. One GA **WILL** be assigned to each selected site. The GAs **WILL**:

- (1) Receive all grant applications and validate receipt based on the application print-out from the Grants Management Module reports and the hard copy of the PHDEP Application Log.
- (2) Coordinate and manage the FY 96 PHDEP grant application review process.
- (3) Identify reviewers for applications. Reviewers **WILL** be selected from HUD staff from local and other Field Offices/AONAPs.
- (4) Work with data entry person at the processing panel entering data in the Grants Management Module. Validate data entry.
- (5) The work load **WILL** be divided among panels of reviewers with one or more grant panel leader(s) (GPL) assisting the GA in overseeing the process.
- (6) All reviewers **WILL** be trained in one training session by Headquarters, OCRI, CPSD and ONAPs staff at the beginning of the review process to assure consistency.
- (7) Each grant application **WILL** be independently scored by two individuals.
- (8) Scores **WILL** be posted on the FY 96 PHDEP Scoring Sheets. The GA or the GPL(s) **WILL** verify that all factors are scored, math computations are correct, scoring sheets reflect appropriate comments for score and are signed by reviewer, and validate all data entry with the score sheets.
- (9) Scores **WILL** be entered into the Grants Management Module at the grant application processing site.

15. RANKING OF FY 96 GRANT APPLICATIONS.

- A. After grant applications have been processed and scored, the GA, Office of Public Housing, NYC, NY **WILL** provide a ranking of the applications on a national basis.
- B. The awards **WILL** be made in ranked order until all funds

are awarded. In the event that two eligible applications receive the same score, and both cannot be funded because of insufficient funds, the application with the highest score in selection criterion 3 "The capability of the applicant to carry out the plan" will be selected.

- C. If Selection Criterion 3, of the grant application, is scored identically for both applications:
 - (1) The scores in Selection Criteria 1, 2, and 4 **WILL** be compared in this order, one at a time, until one grant application scores higher in one of the factors and is selected.
 - (2) **If**, the grant application score is identically in all factors, the grant application that requests less funding will be selected.
- D. All awards **WILL** be made to fund fully a grant application, except as provided in section I.(b)(4) (Reduction of Requested Grant Amounts and Special Conditions) under the NOFA.
- E. The GA, Office of Public Housing, NYC, NY **WILL** provide to Headquarters, OCRI, CPSD all completed database files with all grant application and scoring information for the FY 96 PHDEP grant applications.
- F. A grant application **MUST** receive a score of **70 OR MORE POINTS OUT OF THE MAXIMUM OF 100 POINTS AWARDED** under this competition to be eligible for funding.

16. ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR SUBMISSION OF FY 96 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION SELECTION DATA.

- A. The FY 96 PHDEP Grants Management Module databases DRUG****.DBF and DRUG****.DBT with all grant application and scoring information completed **MUST** be submitted to Headquarters through standard procedures and guidance in this notice for transmission of SMIRPH/MIRS databases.
- B. The GA, Office of Public Housing, NYC, NY **WILL** assure

that data entry on screens 1 through 7 of the module are validated to be correct and complete before the database is sent to Headquarters, OCRI, CPSD.

- C. Grant application processing site GA, AONAPs, Denver, CO:
 - (1) The FY 96 PHDEP Grants Management Module databases DRUG****.DBF and DRUG****.DBT with all grant application and scoring information **MUST** be submitted to the GA Office of Public Housing, NYC, NY.
 - (2) The GA, AONAPs **WILL** assure that data entry on screens 1 through 7 of the module are validated to be correct and complete before the database is transmitted. Refer to paragraph 11.C. of this notice for guidance.
- D. After the completion of the review process, the GA, Office of Public Housing, NYC, NY **WILL** through standard procedures transmits all SMIRPH/MIRS databases to Headquarters, OCRI, CPSD.

17. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATIONS.

- A. Based on information in the Grants Management Module Congressional notifications for the Office of Public Housing and ONAPs **WILL** be prepared by the GA, Office of Public Housing, New York City, NY and submitted to Headquarters, OCRI, CPSD.
- B. A memorandum will be submitted by the Assistant Secretary, Office of Public and Indian Housing that includes a listing of the grant awards to the Assistant Secretary, Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, who will officially notify Congress.
- C. After Congress has been notified the OCRI, CPSD **WILL** notify Field Offices/ONAPs as to Congressional notification release date.

18. NOTIFICATIONS TO SELECTEES AND NON-SELECTEES.

- A. Headquarters, OCRI, CPSD **WILL** prepare and forward, via cc:mail, selectee awards for signature to the ONAPs,

and each Director, Office of Public Housing and Administrator, AONAPs for distribution. **THE AWARD LETTERS WILL NOT BE SENT UNTIL:**

- (1) Field Offices/AONAPs receive the HUD-185 from Headquarters; and
- (2) Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations has completed the notification of Congress.
- (3) After Congress has been notified Headquarters, OCRI, CPSD will notify ONAPs, Field Offices/AONAPs as to Congressional notification release date.

B. Applicants who were not funded **WILL** also be notified in writing at the same time as funded grant applications. The OCRI, CPSD will provide, via cc:mail, all disapproval letters from the Grants Management Module and forward them to the ONAPs, and each Director, Office of Public Housing and Administrators, AONAPs for distribution.

C. An original signature copy of each award letter **WILL** be provided to the Field Accounting Director (FAD) to reserve grant funds.

19. FY 96 PHDEP GRANT AGREEMENT PREPARATION AND PROCESS.

A. Form HUD-1044 with grant agreement and related forms will be prepared in accordance with Chapter 4 of the ORI, Grants Management Handbook 7490.01.

B. Grant Agreement.

- (1) A standardized grant agreement **WILL** be provided by Headquarters, OCRI, CPSD to Field Offices/AONAPs to assist in this process. This agreement is provided to Field Offices as a **GUIDE**.
- (2) Field Offices/AONAPs **MUST** verify award amount and may place any special conditions, such as LOCCS edits or funding or programmatic restrictions necessary for compliance or performance of the

approved grant.

- C. The FY 96 PHDEP grant agreement **MUST** be executed in accordance with the schedule set forth in paragraph 22 of this notice.

20. APPLICATION DEBRIEFINGS.

- A. After the completion of the scoring process the GA, Office of Public Housing, New York City, NY, and AONAPs, Denver, CO **WILL** provide via transmittal letter; a copy of scoring sheets to each Field Office/AONAPs.
- B. The GA, Office of Public Housing, New York City, NY and AONAPs, Denver, CO **MUST** ensure, via transmittal letter, two copies of the grant applications and scoring sheets, and any related documents, per applicant, are sent (**OVERNIGHT MAIL**) to HUD's DISC. The DISC will maintain a file copy of all grant applications and score sheets and related documents. The materials will be sent to the following address:

Aspen Systems
Drug Information and Strategy Clearinghouse (DISC)
ATTN: Gary Ballinger
(For informational purposes: Gary Ballinger may be contacted on HUD cc:mail address ASPENPOST and/or INTERNET E-MAIL ADDRESS: GBallinger @ ASPENSYS.COM)
1600 Research Boulevard, STOP 3k
Rockville, MD 20850
Telephone Number (301) 251-5123

- C. HUD's DISC will be available to provide feedback to those HAS whose applications were not approved for funding.
- D. This process **MUST** be executed in accordance with the schedule set forth in paragraph 22 of this Notice.

21. HUD FY 96 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION REPORTS REQUIRED.

- A. As in past years, to ensure that the program schedules are adhered to and that applicants are not adversely affected, the below listed monitoring/tracking report **IS REQUIRED**. Field Offices/AONAPs report **SHALL** be, but not limited to, submitted in the following format for the FY 96 PHDEP:

- (1) Date Office of Public Housing/AONAPs approval letters were transmitted to applicants;
- (2) Date the Office of Public Housing/AONAPs transmitted executed grant agreements to FAD;
- (3) Date funds were obligated by the FAD;
- (4) Date Office of Public Housing/AONAPs entered FY 96 PHDEP budget line items (BLIs) into LOCCS; and
- (5) Any grantee that does not have access to LOCCS-VRS for the FY 96 PHDEP as of the date of the report and what actions were taken.

B. Each Director, Office of Public Housing and Administrator, AONAPs, as appropriate, **WILL** submit this report, via cc:mail, no later than **OCTOBER 1, 1996** as follows:

- (1) Director, Office of Public Housing: Send cc:mail to Headquarters, OCRI, CPSD, ATTN: Malcolm E. Main (CC:mail address for Malcolm E. Main is PIHPOST2).
- (2) Administrator, AONAPs: Send cc:mail to Headquarters, ONAPs ATTN: Tracy Outlaw (CC:mail address for Tracy Outlaw is PIHPOST2). Headquarters, ONAPs, after review, **MUST** forward final reports to OCRI, CPSD ATTN: Malcolm E. Main by **October 1, 1996**.

22. FY 1996 PHDEP GRANT PROCESS TIMETABLE. Headquarters, ONAPs, Field Offices and AONAPs **MUST** executed this process in accordance with the below schedule.

STEPS	DEADLINE COMPLETION DATE
1 Director, Office of Public Housing and Administrators, AONAPs designates FOGAs	June 07, 1996

Action for Offices of Public Housing:

Provide, via cc:mail, FOGAs name,
cc:mail address and phone number
to: Malcolm E. Main (CC:mail address
PIHPOST2); and

Action for ONAPs:

ONAPs will provide a consolidated
FOGA list to OCRI, CPSD ATTN:
Malcolm E. Main (CC:mail address
PIHPOST2)

- 2 Headquarters provides instructions
and guidance regarding data entry
into the ORI Grants Management
Module provided to GA and FOGAs June 07, 1996
 - 3 Headquarters,
provides FO PHDEP training
materials to GA/FOGAs June 07, 1996
 - 4 **APPLICATION DEADLINE** **June 14, 1996**
 - 5 FOGAs fax Application Master
Log to Malcolm E. Main, (fax number
(202) 401-7965, CC:mail address
PIHPOST2) to Headquarters, CPSD
and/or ONAPs, as appropriate
(Refer to Appendix A) June 18, 1996
 - 6 Headquarters, verifies
via cc:mail Application Master Logs June 19, 1996
 - 7 FOGAs begin data entry of
applications in SMIRPH/MIRS Grants
Management Module June 19, 1996
 - 8 FOGAs screen for technical
deficiencies and provide application
acknowledgement and, if applicable,
curable deficiencies letter to HAs
(Refer to Appendix B) June 19, 1996
 - 9 FOs start scoring of selective
criterion 3 June 24, 1996
- INDEPENDENCE DAY - HOLIDAY** **July 04, 1996**

- applications were shipped and "expected arrival date". (Refer to paragraph 13 of this notice) July 11, 1996
- 15 Applications with all related documentation must arrive at application processing sites July 12, 1996
- 16 Headquarters staff and GA grant application processing center site administrative time:
- A. GA begins organization of grant applications for review process **(WEDNESDAY)**
July 17, 1996
- B. GA completes organization of grant applications for review process. Weekend staff workload July 20-21, 1996. **(SUNDAY)**
July 21, 1996
- 17 Headquarters, staff train reviewers July 22, 1996
- 18 Start review and scoring of applications by processing panel (July 22 - Aug 02, 1996 - 10 working days) July 22, 1996
- 19 GA, AONAPs, Denver, CO transmits application database to GA NYC ATTN: Jed Abrams, Office of Public Housing, NYC, NY (CC:mail address for Jed Abrams is NYCPOST1) August 06, 1996
- 20 Data entry completed in Grants Management Module by data entry staff and validated by GA August 09, 1996
- 21 Headquarters award documents and HUD 185s transmitted to Headquarters, CPSD August 09, 1996
- 22 CPSD prepares a decision memo regarding award funding for the

- Assistant Secretary August 12, 1996
- 23 Decision memo regarding award funding submitted to PIH Budget Division August 12, 1996
- 24 Headquarters, Assistant Secretary, PIH makes final approval of grant selections August 16, 1996
- 25 GA ships boxes, with transmittal letter and related documents to include applications to DISC. (Refer to paragraph 20 of this notice) August 16, 1996
- 26 GA provides FOs with copies of Score sheets August 16, 1996
- 27 Headquarters, provides list of final grant awards to FOs August 16, 1996
- 28 **HEADQUARTERS--CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATIONS** **August 16, 1996**
- 29 Headquarters sends HUD-185 to FOs August 20, 1996
- 30 FY 96 PHDEP awards. FOs ensures award letters (copy of award letter to FAD to reserve funds), disapproval letters and grant agreements are transmitted to HAS August 23, 1996
- 31 FAD completes reservation of FY 96 PHDEP grant funds August 30, 1996
- 32 FY 96 PHDEP grant agreements executed between HUD and HAS September 06, 1996
- 33 FOs enter activity budget line items into LOCCS September 06, 1996
- 34 FY 96 PHDEP funds available for grantees to draw down September 23, 1996

- 35 FOS submits FY 96 PHDEP Grant Status Report to Headquarters 1996 October 08,
- 36 DISC prepares FY 96 PHDEP analysis to Headquarters and local FOS November 22, 1996

For further information on the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program contact Malcolm E. (Mike) Main, Office of Community Relation and Involvement, Crime Prevention and Security Division, Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, S.W., Room 4112, Washington, D.C. 20410 on (202) 708-1197, ext 4232 and/or the Drug Information and Strategy Clearinghouse on 1-800-578-3472.

/s/ Casimir Bonkowski for

Kevin Emanuel Marchman
Acting Assistant Secretary for
Public and Indian Housing

Attachments:

- Appendix A: FY 1996 PHDEP Grant Application Master Log
- Appendix B: FY 1996 PHDEP Grant Application Screening Field Office Checklist
- Appendix C: FY 1996 PHDEP Grant Application Correctable Deficiency Master Log
- Appendix D: FY 1996 PHDEP Grant Application Deficiency Letter
- Appendix E: FY 1996 PHDEP Grant Application Score Sheet Instructions
- Appendix F: FY 1996 PHDEP Grant Application Scoring Sheet *

*Appendix F which contains LOTUS files will be sent separately.

APPENDIX A: FY 1996 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION MASTER LOG

	HA CODE	PHA/IHA NAME	DATE	TIME	LOGGED IN BY:	FUNDS REQUESTED
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						

TOTAL FUNDS REQUESTED \$ _____
 HUD FIELD OFFICE _____
 DATE SUBMITTED TO HEADQUARTERS: _____
 SUBMITTED BY: _____

NOTE: LOG MUST BE TYPED

FY 1996 PHDEP FIELD OFFICE GRANT APPLICATION MASTER LOG

	HA CODE	PHA/IHA NAME	DATE	TIME	LOGGED IN BY:	FUNDS REQUESTED
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						

TOTAL FUNDS REQUESTED \$ _____

HUD FIELD OFFICE _____

DATE SUBMITTED TO HEADQUARTERS: _____

SUBMITTED BY: _____

NOTE: LOG MUST BE TYPED

APPENDIX B: FY 1996 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION FIELD OFFICE SCREENING CHECKLIST

SECTION 1. FIELD OFFICE GRANT APPLICATION SCREENING CHECKLIST

HA Name: _____

HA Code: _____

Field Office: _____

Requested Grant Term in Months: _____

SECTION 2. FIELD OFFICE GRANT APPLICATION CHECKLIST

	TABS COMPLETE		ACTION
	YES	NO	
1	_____	_____	Applicant Cover Letter
2	_____	_____	Applicant Data Input Form
3	_____	_____	SF-424, Application for Federal Assistance
4	_____	_____	SF-424A Budget Information with budget narrative(s) attached
5	_____	_____	SF-424B Assurances
6	_____	_____	First Selection Criteria
7	_____	_____	Second Selection Criteria
7A	_____	_____	- Implementation Schedule/Activity timetable

- 7B _____ - Personnel Position Descriptions (if applicable)
- 8 _____ Third Selection Criteria
- 9 _____ Fourth Selection Criteria
- 9A _____ - Summary of Written Resident Comments
- 9B _____ - Letters of Commitment (if applicable)
- 10 _____ Certifications
- 10A _____ - RMC, RC and RO certification
- 10B _____ - Drug treatment program certification (Applicable only if applying
for drug treatment activities NOT prevention activities)
- 10C _____ - Law enforcement certification (Applicable only if applying for
law enforcement activities)
- 10D _____ - Form HUD-50070 drug-free work place certification
- 10E _____ - Chief Executive Officer (CEO) certification
- 10F _____ - HUD-50071 lobbying certification
- 10G _____ - SL-LLL disclosure of lobbying activities certification
- 10H _____ - Debarment and Suspension Certification
- 10I _____ - Form HUD-2880, Applicant Disclosures

SECTION 3. REVIEW OF FY 96 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION

COMPLETE
YES NO ACTION

1. ___ ___ A. Are all computations in the SF-424A (budget) and budget narrative complete and correct?

- ___ ___ B. Did the FO review the SF-424A and narrative to check for duplication of funds with other HUD programs? **ANSWER YES OR NO.**

- ___ ___ C. If yes, were any duplication of funds found? **ANSWER YES OR NO.** If Yes, explain what actions were taken. (Review SF-424A and Tab 1)

2. ___ ___ Did the FO verify the unit count? (Review Tab 1)

3. ___ ___ Does the amount requested **EXCEED THE MAXIMUM GRANT AMOUNT PERMITTED?** In accordance with section I.(b)(2) of the NOFA. If an error was identified, please explain actions taken in specific comment section below.

4. ___ ___ Did the applicant request funding for the activities described in section I.(c)(1) through (6) of the NOFA, to eliminate drug-related crime in housing owned by public housing agencies that is not public housing assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937 and is not otherwise federally assisted:
 - A. ___ ___ Did the applicant demonstrate that the housing is located in a high intensity drug trafficking area designated pursuant to section 1005 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988; and

 - B. ___ ___ Did the applicant demonstrate that on the basis of information submitted in accordance with the requirements of section I.(c)(9) of the NOFA, that

drug-related activity, and the problems associated with it, at the housing has a detrimental affect on or about the real property comprising any public or other federally assisted low-income housing.

SECTION 4. FIELD OFFICE SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Were technical deficiencies noted:

Yes____ No____

Were curable technical deficiencies corrected:

Yes____ **No____ (Explain below)

Application fully acceptable:

Yes____ **No____ (Explain below)

Application screened by (print): _____

Signature: _____ Date of screening: _____

Verification:

_____ Date: _____

(FOGA Signature)

Specific comments: (Use additional paper if necessary)

**APPENDIX C: FY 1996 PHDEP FIELD OFFICE GRANT APPLICATION CORRECTABLE DEFICIENCIES
MASTER LOG**

	DATE OF FO LTR	PHA/IHA NAME	DATE	TIME	CORRECTIONS RECD. LOGGED IN BY:	COMMENTS
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						

HUD FIELD OFFICE _____

DATE SUBMITTED TO HEADQUARTERS: _____

SUBMITTED BY: _____

FY 1996 PHDEP FIELD OFFICE GRANT APPLICATION CORRECTABLE DEFICIENCIES MASTER LOG

	DATE OF FO LTR	PHA/IHA NAME	DATE	TIME	CORRECTIONS RECD. LOGGED IN BY:	FUNDS REQUESTED
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						

HUD FIELD OFFICE _____

DATE SUBMITTED TO HEADQUARTERS: _____

SUBMITTED BY: _____

**APPENDIX D: SAMPLE FY 1996 PHDEP FIELD OFFICE GRANT
APPLICATION DEFICIENCY LETTER**

SAMPLE - ONLY

Applicant
Address

Dear Executive Director (Name):

Thank you for your recent application submission for the FY 1996 Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP). The (Name of Local HUD Field Office) has conducted the initial screening of your application. Your submission was found technically deficient in the following areas:

(SAMPLE)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Please provide the additional information and/or corrected certification(s) for the identified deficiencies within 14 days from the date of this letter. Please submit your corrections to:

Name of Local Field Office
Address
Name of contact person
Phone Number
Fax Number

If you have any questions, please contact (Insert contact name and phone number).

Thank you for your interest in the Department's programs.

Sincerely,

**APPENDIX E: FY 1996 PHDEP GRANT APPLICATION SCORE SHEET
INSTRUCTIONS**

Each reviewer will receive a number of assigned Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP) grant applications to review and score. These applications will be listed on the assignment sheet accompanying the applications. Please check to verify the receipt of all applications listed and sign the sheet as confirmation. You are responsible for the applications in your possession at all times. Return each application to the grant administrator or panel leader as you complete the review and scoring of each application. Please review the applications in the order listed on your assignment sheet.

The applications are to be reviewed and scored according to the FY 96 NOFA, 24 CFR 961 (PHDEP Final Rule), FY 96 application Processing Notice and any additional training instructions provided.

You must remember that all of the documents used during the process are official documents and are subject to review. Therefore, all documents must be legible and scorers must document decisions completely and accurately.

STEP 1 REVIEW AND SCORE THE APPLICATION:

- A. The number of points that an application receives **MUST** depend on the extent to which the application is responsive to the information requested in the selection criteria.

- B. As the reviewer scores each selective criterion they **MUST** post the scores in Section 1 of the score sheet and initial the entry.

- C. All scores issued by the reviewer must be justified in writing. The written justification **MUST** indicate **"WHY"** the applicant **"DID NOT"** receive the maximum allowable points for the particular selection criteria factor. Appropriate entries/comments **MUST** be made on any factor requiring a score.

- D. The reviewer can use additional paper if necessary. All scores **MUST** be justified and verified by a supervisor.

- E. Each application submitted for a grant under the FY 96 PHDEP NOFA **WILL** be evaluated on the basis of the following selection criteria:

THIS DOCUMENT IS A RECOMMENDED REVIEWER "HIGH," "MEDIUM," "LOW," POINT DISTRIBUTION. ALL SCORES ISSUED BY THE REVIEWER MUST BE JUSTIFIED IN WRITING. THE WRITTEN JUSTIFICATION MUST INDICATE "WHY" THE APPLICANT "DID NOT" RECEIVE THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE POINTS FOR THE PARTICULAR SELECTION CRITERIA FACTOR. APPROPRIATE ENTRIES/COMMENTS MUST BE MADE ON ANY FACTOR REQUIRING A SCORE. IN ASSESSING EACH CRITERION THE REVIEWER WILL CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING:

1. FIRST SELECTIVE CRITERION. THE EXTENT OF THE DRUG-RELATED CRIME PROBLEM IN THE APPLICANT'S DEVELOPMENT OR DEVELOPMENTS PROPOSED FOR ASSISTANCE. MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE POINTS FOR SELECTIVE CRITERION 1: 40 POINTS

SUBFACTOR 1-A SECTION I.(D)(1) UNDER PARAGRAPHS (I) AND (II) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 15

SUBFACTOR 1-A DESCRIPTION: In awarding points, the reviewer will evaluate the extent to which the applicant has provided the above data that reflects drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems, both in terms of the frequency and nature of the drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems in the HA/development(s) proposed for funding as reflected by information submitted under paragraph (1)(i) (objective data), and (ii) (other data) of this section; and the extent to which such data reflects an increase in drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems over a period of two year(s) in the HA/development(s) proposed for assistance.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (10-15 POINTS):

- A. The applicant provides the best objective data/other data that clearly outlines and provides complete, detailed description, documentation and analysis of the nature and frequency of the drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated drug-related problems and the impact on the site(s) proposed for assistance.

- B. The applicant documents crime statistics by listing types of crime, including drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems, the frequency of the crime, where the crimes are committed with direct statistics for the targeted ha or development site(s) and a comparison of the activities to the community at large.
- C. The applicant clearly defines "drug activity" by including where it was being sold, who was selling, how it is being sold (drive by markets, sales out of units, etc.), how they are operating and when the drug-related activities occur.
- D. The applicant clearly provides and documents additional information such as vandalism costs, school dropout rate, and drug abuse/treatment referrals, high rate of public assistance, high rate of persons under correctional supervision, high vacancy rates, general neighborhood deterioration, etc. The applicant demonstrates a linkage to the drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems.

MEDIUM POINTS (5-9 POINTS):

- A. The applicant provides objective data/other data that outlines a description, documentation and analysis of the nature and frequency of the drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems and the impact on the site(s) proposed for assistance.
- B. The applicant documents crime statistics by listing some of types of crime, including drug-related and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems, the frequency of the crime, where the crimes are committed with statistics for the targeted ha or development site(s) and a comparison of the activities to the community at large.

- C. The applicant defines "drug activity" by including some of the following information: where it was being sold, who was selling, how it is being sold (drive by markets, sales out of units, etc.), how they are operating and when the drug-related activities occur.

- D. The applicant provides some information such as vandalism costs, school dropout rate, and drug abuse/treatment referrals, high rate of public assistance, high rate of persons under correctional supervision, high vacancy, general neighborhood deterioration, etc. that demonstrates limited linkage to the drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated drug-related problems.

LOW POINTS (0-4 POINTS):

- A. The applicant provides limited or no evidence of objective data/other data, describing, documenting and/or analyzing the nature and frequency of the drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems and the impact on the site(s) proposed for assistance.

- B. The applicant provides limited or no evidence of crime statistics by types of crime, including drug-related and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems, the frequency of the crime, where the crimes are committed with direct statistics for the targeted HA or development site(s) and a limited or incomplete comparison of the activities to the community at large.

- C. The applicant did not define "drug activity" by including where it was being sold, who was selling, how it is being sold (drive by markets, sales out of units, etc.), How they are operating and when the drug-related activities occur.

- D. The applicant provides limited or no evidence of additional information such as vandalism costs, school dropout rate, and drug abuse/treatment referrals, high rate of public assistance, high rate of persons under

correctional supervision, high vacancy, general neighborhood deterioration, etc. that demonstrates a linkage to the drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems.

SUBFACTOR 1-B SECTION I.(d)(1)(IV) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 5

SUBFACTOR 1-B DESCRIPTION: In awarding points, the reviewer will evaluate the extent to which the applicant has analyzed the data compiled and has clearly articulated its needs, performance measurements, and strategies for reducing drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems in the HA/development(s) proposed for assistance.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (4-5 POINTS): The applicant has clearly analyzed the data collected regarding drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems and other indicators associated with the proposed site(s) and has drawn conclusions on what needs are to be addressed.

MEDIUM POINTS (1-3 POINTS): The applicant analyzes the data collected regarding drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related with drug-related problems and other indicators associated with the proposed site(s) and has drawn some conclusions on what needs are to be addressed.

LOW POINTS (0 POINTS): The applicant provides no evidence of data regarding drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems and other indicators associated with the proposed site(s).

SUBFACTOR 1-C SECTION I.(d)(1)(V) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 10

SUBFACTOR 1-C DESCRIPTION: In awarding points, HUD will assign points between zero (0) and ten (10) according to the extent and availability of standardized data on the following specific Part I crime activities as defined by the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) system: (1) criminal homicide, (2) forcible rape, (3) robbery, and (4) aggravated assault. This data must cover both the frequency and nature of the crime in the HA/development(s) proposed for assistance. The community data will be taken from current

Uniform Crime Reports (UCRs) of the U. S. Department of Justice (FBI crime data) and will be at the HA/city/county level, when available. The crime data and the point values will be computed by HUD.

SUBFACTOR 1-D SECTION I.(d)(1)(VI) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 10

SUBFACTOR 1-D DESCRIPTION: In awarding points, HUD will assign points between zero (0) and ten (10) according to the extent and availability of standardized data on the following specific Part II crime activities as defined by the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) system: drug abuse violations [state, Tribal and local offenses relating to the unlawful possession, sale, use, growing, and manufacturing of narcotic drugs], in violation of state, Tribal and local law. This data must cover both the frequency and nature of the crime in the HA/development(s) proposed for assistance. The community data will be taken from current Uniform Crime Reports (UCRs) of the U. S. Department of Justice (FBI crime data) and will be at the HA/city/county level, when available. The crime data and the point values will be computed by HUD.

2. **SECOND SELECTIVE CRITERION. THE QUALITY OF THE PLAN TO ADDRESS THE CRIME PROBLEM IN THE PUBLIC HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS PROPOSED FOR ASSISTANCE, INCLUDING THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE PLAN INCLUDES INITIATIVES THAT CAN BE SUSTAINED OVER A PERIOD OF SEVERAL YEARS. MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE POINTS FOR SELECTIVE CRITERION 2: 35 POINTS**

SUBFACTOR 2-A SECTION I.(d)(2)(ii)(A) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 10

SUBFACTOR 2-A DESCRIPTION: The applicant's plan clearly describes the activities that are being proposed by the applicant, including those activities to be funded under this program and those to be funded from other sources, and indicates how these proposed activities provide for a comprehensive approach to reduce/eliminate drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems (as described under Selection Criterion 1, section I.(d)(1), "The extent of the drug-related crime associated with drug-related crime problems" in the HA/development(s) proposed for funding.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (8-10 POINTS): The applicant's plan clearly demonstrates a distinct relationship between the drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems and their strategy (activities) to address the problems. The strategy provides a comprehensive approach of multiple activities encompassing numerous programs, policies, and practices to effectively eliminate drug-related crime at the proposed site(s).

MEDIUM POINTS (4-7 POINTS): The applicant's plan demonstrates some relationship between the drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems and their strategy (activities) to address the problems. The strategy provides an approach that encompasses some combination of programs, and practices to eliminate drug-related crime at the proposed site(s).

LOW POINTS (0-3 POINTS): The applicant's plan demonstrates a limited or no evidence of relationship between the drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems and their strategy (activities) to address the problems. The strategy tends to focus on singular programs to eliminate drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems at

the proposed site(s).

SUBFACTOR 2-B SECTION I.(d)(2)(ii)(B) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 5

SUBFACTOR 2-B DESCRIPTION: The applicant's plan provides a budget narrative with supporting documentation (specifically how costs were determined for each element of each activity in the same format as shown in the application kit) for each activity and describes the financial and other resources (under this program and other sources) that may reasonably be expected to be available to carry out each activity.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (4-5 POINTS): The applicant's plan provides a detailed budget narrative with supporting documentation for each activity that described the financial and other resources that were expected to be available to carry out each activity.

MEDIUM POINTS (2-3 POINTS): The applicant's plan provides a budget narrative for each activity that described the financial and other resources that were expected to be available to carry out each activity.

LOW POINTS (0-1 POINTS): The applicant's plan did not provide a clear budget narrative for each activity that described the financial and other resources that were expected to be available to carry out each activity.

SUBFACTOR 2-C SECTION I.(d)(2)(ii)(C) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 2

SUBFACTOR 2-C DESCRIPTION: The applicant's plan is realistic in terms of time, personnel, and other resources, considering the applicant's timetable for beginning and completing each component of the plan and the amount of funding requested under this program and other identified resources available to the applicant.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (2 POINTS): The applicant clearly demonstrates a realistic plan in terms of time, personnel, and other resources. Each component of the plan addressed the

identified need.

MEDIUM POINTS (1 POINT): The applicant provides a plan in terms of time, personnel, and other resources. Each component of the plan addressed the identified need.

LOW POINTS (0 POINTS): The applicant did not demonstrate in the application a realistic plan in terms of time, personnel, and other resources. Each component of the plan was not documented and address the identified need.

SUBFACTOR 2-D SECTION I.(d)(2)(ii)(D) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 2

SUBFACTOR 2-D DESCRIPTION: As described in the plan, other entities (e.g., Tribal, local and state governments and community organizations) are involved in planning and carrying out the applicant's plan.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (2 POINTS): The applicant clearly documents the involvement of the local community and government participation in the design and of support or other related documentation.

MEDIUM POINTS (1 POINT): The applicant provides some evidence of the involvement of the local community and government participation in the design and implementation of the plan.

LOW POINTS (0 POINTS): The applicant provides no evidence of involvement of the local community and government participation in the design and implementation of the plan.

SUBFACTOR 2-E SECTION I.(d)(2)(ii)(E) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 2

SUBFACTOR 2-E DESCRIPTION: The plan includes activities that can be sustained over a period of years and identifies resources that the applicant may reasonably expect to be available for the continuation of the activities at the end of the grant term.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (2 POINTS): The applicant's plan clearly demonstrates and includes activities that can be sustained over a period of years and identifies resources that the applicant may reasonably expect to be available for the continuation of the activities at the end of the grant term.

MEDIUM POINTS (1 POINT): The applicant's plan includes activities that can be sustained over a period of years and identifies resources that the applicant may reasonably expect to be available for the continuation of the activities at the end of the grant term.

LOW POINTS (0 POINTS): The applicant's plan does not include activities that can be sustained over a period of years and identifies resources that the applicant may reasonably expect to be available for the continuation of the activities at the end of the grant term.

SUBFACTOR 2-F SECTION I.(d)(2)(ii)(F) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 2

SUBFACTOR 2-F DESCRIPTION: The applicant's plan will serve to provide training and employment or business opportunities for lower income persons and businesses located in, or substantially owned by persons residing within the area of the section 3 covered project as defined in 24 CFR part 135 and in accordance with 24 CFR 761.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (2 POINTS): The applicant's plan clearly demonstrates that it will serve to provide training and employment or business opportunities for lower income persons and businesses located in, or substantially owned by persons residing within the area of the Section 3 covered development.

MEDIUM POINTS (1 POINT): The applicant's plan provides for some training and employment or business opportunities for lower income persons and businesses located in, or substantially owned by persons residing within the area of the Section 3 covered development.

LOW POINTS (0 POINTS): The applicant's plan does not clearly state it will serve to provide training and employment or business opportunities for lower income persons and businesses located in, or substantially owned by

persons residing within the area of the Section 3 covered development.

SUBFACTOR 2-G SECTION I.(d)(2)(ii)(G) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 5

SUBFACTOR 2-G DESCRIPTION: The applicant's plan contains a clear description of its process to collect, maintain and analyze specific drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems and workload as defined by the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) system in specific Part I/II crimes as detailed in selection criterion 1, paragraphs I.(d)(1)(v) and (vi) of the NOFA, as well as other police workload data to include all calls for service on the HA/development(s) proposed for funding.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (4-5 POINTS): The applicant's plan clearly demonstrates a clear description of its process to collect, maintain and analyze specific drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems and workload as defined by the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) system in specific Part I/II crimes as detailed in selection criterion 1, section I.(d)(1)(v) and (vi) of the NOFA, as well as other police workload data to include all calls for service on the HA/development(s) proposed for funding.

MEDIUM POINTS (1-3 POINTS): The applicant's plan provides a description of its process to collect, maintain and analyze specific drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems and workload as defined by the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) system in specific Part I/II crimes as detailed in selection criterion 1, section I.(d)(1)(v) and (vi) of the NOFA, as well as other police workload data to include all calls for service on the HA/development(s) proposed for funding.

LOW POINTS (0 POINTS): The applicant's plan does not clearly state a description of its process to collect, maintain and analyze specific drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems and workload as defined by the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) system in specific Part I/II crimes as detailed in selection criterion 1, section I.(d)(1)(v) and (vi) of the NOFA, as well as other police workload data to include all calls for service on the HA/development(s) proposed for funding.

SUBFACTOR 2-H SECTION I.(d)(2)(ii)(H) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 7

SUBFACTOR 2-H DESCRIPTION: The applicant's plan includes an evaluation process with specific performance measurements that demonstrate results relative to crime workload detailed in Selection Criterion 1, section I.(d)(1) of the NOFA, in the HA/development(s) proposed for funding.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (5-7 POINTS): The applicant clearly outlines an evaluation methodology to measure the success of the plan based on specific indicators relating to the assessment and identified needs of the proposed site(s); included in the application was a discussion of the types of information and the methods to be used to gather and analyze this information. The information collected relates the evaluation process to the assessment of the drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems of the proposed site(s).

MEDIUM POINTS (1-4 POINTS): The applicant provides limited evaluation methodology to measure the success of the plan; the information generally collected relates the evaluation process to the assessment of the drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems of the proposed site(s).

LOW POINTS (0 POINTS): The applicant provides no evidence of an evaluation process to measure the success of the plan or described a methodology to measure the success of the plan for data collection and failed to relate the evaluation process to the assessment of the drug-related crime and other criminal drug-related problems of the proposed site(s).

3. THIRD SELECTIVE CRITERION. THE CAPABILITY OF THE APPLICANT TO CARRY OUT THE PLAN. MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE POINTS FOR SELECTIVE CRITERION 3: 15 POINTS

**SUBFACTOR 3-A SECTION I.(d)(3)(i)(A)(B) and (C) OF THE NOFA
MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 2**

SUBFACTOR 3-A DESCRIPTION: The reviewer will determine the extent of the applicant's successful and effective administrative capability to manage its HA, as measured by its performance with respect to operative HUD requirements under the ACC or ACA and the Public Housing Management Assessment Program at 24 CFR part 901. In evaluating administrative capability under this factor, the reviewer will consider, and the application must include in the form of a narrative discussion, the following information: whether there are any unresolved findings from prior HUD reports (e.g. performance or finance), reviews or audits undertaken by HUD, the Office of the Inspector General, the General Accounting Office, or independent public accountants; whether the applicant is operating under court order.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (2 POINTS): The applicant clearly demonstrated a capability to effectively and efficiently manage their housing developments as outlined in reports generated by HUD reviews or audits. For example, under the public housing management assessment program (PHMAP) the housing authority must have an assessment with consistent grades of "A" or "B" only for each of the indicators, as available. (In the case of a Troubled PHA, points awarded may only be in the Medium to Low range.)

MEDIUM POINTS (1 POINT): The applicant demonstrated satisfactory (FAIR) ability to effectively and efficiently manage their housing developments as outlined in reports generated by HUD reviews or audits. Under PHMAP, the assessment must show consistent grades of at least "C" as available. (In the case of a Troubled PHA, the housing authority must be achieving the goals that have been outlined under the MOA.)

LOW POINTS (0 POINTS): The applicant demonstrated a lack of ability to manage their housing developments as shown in HUD reviews and audits through unresolved findings and observations. Under PHMAP, the assessment shows grades of

"D" or lower as available. In the case of Troubled PHAs, the housing authority is meeting only some or none of the goals outlined under the MOA.

SUBFACTOR 3-B SECTION I.(d)(3)(ii) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 3

SUBFACTOR 3-B DESCRIPTION: The application must demonstrate, as authorized by applicable local, state, Tribal, and Federal law, the extent to which the applicant has formed a collaboration with the local, state, Tribal, and Federal law enforcement officials and courts to gain access regarding the criminal conviction records of applicants for, or tenants of, HAs regarding applicant screening, lease enforcement, and eviction. The application must demonstrate the extent to which the applicant has implemented effective screening procedures to determine an individual's suitability for public housing (consistent with the requirements of 42 U.S.C. 3604(f), 24 CFR 100.202, 29 U.S.C. 794 and 24 CFR 8.4 which deal with individuals with disabilities); implemented a plan to reduce vacancies; implemented eviction and lease enforcement procedures in accordance with 24 CFR part 966, subpart B, 25 CFR 950.340 and Section 503 of NAHA; or undertaken other management actions to eliminate drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems in its developments.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (2-3 POINTS):

The applicant has implemented thorough policies, practices and procedures to effectively screen potential residents, reduce vacancies and to evict those residents involved with illegal drug activities. These policies, practices and procedures have demonstrated a significant reduction in drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems in the housing authority developments or has maintained a low level of drug related crime.

MEDIUM POINTS (1 POINT):

The applicant implemented some policies, practices and procedures to screen potential residents, reduce vacancies and to evict those residents involved with illegal drug activities. These policies, practices have demonstrated some measurable reduction in drug-related crime and other

criminal activities associated with drug-related problems in the housing authority developments.

LOW POINTS (0 POINTS): The applicant has not implemented policies, practices and a procedure to screen potential residents, reduce vacancies or to evict those residents involved with illegal drug activities or the applicant's management policies have not shown to have had an impact on the reduction of drug-related crime and other criminal activities associated with drug-related problems in the housing authority developments.

SUBFACTOR 3-C SECTION I.(d)(3)(iii) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 10

SUBFACTOR 3-C DESCRIPTION. The reviewer will ensure the applicant's application has identified the applicant's participation in HUD grant programs (such as CGP, CIAP, youth sports, child care, resident management, PHDEP, HOPE VI, Tenant Opportunities Program (TOP), Family Investment Centers (FIC) grants etc.) within the preceding three years, and discuss the degree of the applicant's success in implementing and managing these grant programs.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (7-10 POINTS): The applicant's previous and/or current (past three years) PHDEP grant(s) have been successfully implemented with major results. The program has demonstrated success through:

- A. Timely execution of contracts with local police authorities for law enforcement services.
- B. Established and tracked indicators to measure program success.
- C. Managed and implemented program(s) on time based on the application timetable.
- D. During the immediate past FY, the applicant, as part of program implementation, has demonstrated resident participation and community involvement/partnerships.

- E. Funds draw downs were obligated and expended consistent with program implementation work plan and time line.
- F. Performance and Financial Reports complete and submitted in a timely manner.
- G. Evaluation reports of previous PHDEPs are detailed and reflect a significant improvement in program goals and/or outcomes crime reduction.

MEDIUM POINTS (4-6 POINTS): The applicant's previous and/or current (past three years) PHDEP grant(s) have been successfully implemented with some results. The program has demonstrated documented some success through:

- A. Execution of contracts with local police authorities for law enforcement services with some results.
- B. Established and tracked indicators to measure program with some documented success.
- C. Managed and implemented program(s) were on time, some of the time, based upon the application timetable. The applicant modified time lines (extension) with some success.
- D. During the immediate past FY, the applicant, as part of program implementation, has demonstrated some resident participation and community involvement/partnerships.
- E. Funds draw downs were obligated and expended most of the time.
- F. Performance and Financial reports were complete with some results and submitted in a timely manner.

LOW POINTS (0-3 POINTS): The applicant's previous and/or current (past three years) PHDEP grant(s) were implemented. The program has demonstrated with difficulty through:

- A. Contract has not been executed with local police authorities for services.
- B. Did not implement the program(s) on time (based upon the application timetable) and requested untimely extensions.

- C. During the immediate past FY, the applicant, as part of program implementation, solicited some resident participation and community involvement/partnerships.
- D. Funds draw downs were rarely obligated and expended on time. There is evidence that grantee rarely draws down from LOCCS, utilizes reserve funds and/or there is evidence of co-mingling of funds.
- E. Performance and Financial reports were completed and submitted most of the time with a lack of performance in results in crime reduction.
- F. Evaluation reports of previous PHDEPs not submitted or were sketchy and reflected no improvement in reduction of drug related crime.
- G. Performance and Financial reports were not submitted.

4. **FOURTH SELECTIVE CRITERION. (SCORED AT THE GRANT APPLICATION PROCESSING CENTER SITE) THE EXTENT TO WHICH TENANTS, THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND THE LOCAL COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND PARTICIPATE IN THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACTIVITIES PROPOSED TO BE FUNDED UNDER THE APPLICATION. MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE POINTS FOR SELECTIVE CRITERION 4: 10 POINTS**

SUBFACTOR 4-A SECTION I.(d)(4)(i) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 3

SUBFACTOR 4-A DESCRIPTION: The application must include a discussion of the extent to which community representatives and Tribal, local, state and Federal government officials are actively involved in the design and implementation of the applicant's plan, as evidenced by descriptions of planning meetings held with community representatives and local government officials, letters of commitment to provide funding, staff, or in-kind resources, or written comments on the applicant's planned activities.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (2-3 POINTS): The applicant clearly documents the extent to which community representatives and local government officials were actively involved in the design and implementation of the applicant's plan, through a summary of the participants involvement, meeting minutes, letters of commitment to provide funding, staff, or in-kind resources, or written comments on the applicants planned activities.

MEDIUM POINTS (1 POINT): The applicant provides some documentation as to the extent to which community representatives and local government officials were involved in the design and implementation of the applicant's plan.

LOW POINTS (0 POINTS): The applicant has no documented evidence of the extent to which community representatives and local government officials were involved in the design and implementation of the applicant's plan.

SUBFACTOR 4-B SECTION I.(d)(4)(ii) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 3

SUBFACTOR 4-B DESCRIPTION: The applicant discussed the extent to which the relevant governmental jurisdiction has met its law enforcement obligations under the Cooperation Agreement with the applicant (as required by the grantee's Annual Contributions Contract with HUD). The application must also include a certification by the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of a state or a unit of general local government in which the developments proposed for assistance are located that the locality is meeting its obligations under the Cooperation Agreement with the HA, particularly with regard to the current level of baseline law enforcement services. If the jurisdiction is not meeting its obligations under the Cooperation Agreement, the CEO should identify any special circumstances relating to its failure to do so. Whether or not a locality is meeting its obligations under the Cooperation Agreement with the applicant, the applicant must describe the current level of baseline law enforcement services being provided to the HA/development(s) proposed for assistance.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (2-3 POINTS): The applicant discussed and provided certifications and clearly documented the activities and obligations currently being met by law enforcement under the cooperation agreement. The application clearly described the current level of law enforcement services being provided to the developments proposed for assistance.

MEDIUM POINTS (1 POINT): The applicant provided certification and limited documentation that obligations are being met by law enforcement services. The application did not clearly described the current level of law enforcement services being provided to the developments proposed for assistance.

LOW POINTS (0 POINTS): The applicant provided certification but no documentation regarding the obligations under the cooperation. The application did not described the current level of law enforcement services being provided to the

developments proposed for assistance.

SUBFACTOR 4-C SECTION I.(d)(4)(iii) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 2

SUBFACTOR 4-C DESCRIPTION: The reviewer must discuss the extent to which HA/development residents, and an RMC, RC or RO, where they exist, are involved in the planning and development of the grant application and plan strategy, and support and participate in the design and implementation of the activities proposed to be funded under the application. The application must include a summary of written resident and resident organization meetings, with supporting documentation that addresses (but is not limited to) subject matter, names of residents on committees, copies of resident surveys and evaluations etc., as required by 24 CFR 761, and the applicant's response to and action on these comments. If there are no resident or resident organization comments, the applicant must provide an explanation of the steps taken to encourage participation, even though they were not successful.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (2 POINTS): The applicant clearly demonstrates and documents the active involvement of residents and resident organizations in the planning and development of the grant application and plan strategy. The applicant provides a clear summary of each written resident and resident organization comments, and the applicant's response to and action on these comments.

MEDIUM POINTS (1 POINT): The applicant provides some evidence of the involvement of residents and resident organizations in the planning and development of the grant application and plan strategy.

LOW POINTS (0 POINTS): The applicant did not demonstrate or document the involvement of residents and resident organizations in the planning and development of the grant application and plan strategy.

SUBFACTOR 4-D SECTION I.(d)(4)(iv) OF THE NOFA MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 2

SUBFACTOR 4-D DESCRIPTION: The reviewer must discuss the extent to which the applicant is already undertaking, or has undertaken, participation in local, state, Tribal or Federal anti-drug related crime efforts, such as Operation Weed and Seed, and Operation Safe Home, and/or has successfully coordinated its law enforcement activities with local, state, Tribal or Federal law enforcement agencies.

RECOMMENDED REVIEWER GUIDE FOR POINT DISTRIBUTION

HIGH POINTS (2 POINTS): The applicant demonstrated that they are already participating in local, State, or Federal anti-drug related crime efforts (such as Operation Weed and Seed, coordinated by the U.S. Department of Justice, Operation Safe Home, or other programs) or is successfully coordinating its law enforcement activities with local, state or federal law enforcement agencies.

MEDIUM POINTS (1 POINT): The applicant demonstrated that they are undertaking, or has undertaken, participation in local, State, or federal anti-drug related crime efforts (such as Operation Weed and Seed, coordinated by the U.S. Department of Justice, or Operation Safe Home or other programs) or is successfully coordinating its law enforcement activities with local, state, Tribal or Federal law enforcement agencies.

LOW POINTS (0 POINTS): The applicant failed to demonstrate that they are already undertaking, or has undertaken, participation in local, State, or Federal anti-drug related crime efforts (such as Operation Weed and Seed, coordinated by the U.S. Department of Justice, or Operation Safe Home or other programs) or is successfully coordinating its law enforcement activities with local, state, Tribal or federal law enforcement agencies.

STEP 2 REVIEW APPLICATION FOR INELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES AND COMMENTS

After you have finished reviewing and scoring all elements of each factor, assure the following:

- o All scoring and comment blocks are filled out. The comments serve as the source for feedback to the

applicants not funded, as well as review by OIG audits.

- o Comment on the following issues, if appropriate, and mark with the appropriate letter in the upper right hand corner of the score sheet:

JOINT APPLICANTS - "J" An applicant may submit only one application under the NOFA. If a joint application has been made note "J" on the first page of the score sheet.

EXCEPTION - "J1." Housing authorities under a single administration (such as one housing authority managing another housing authority under contract or housing authorities sharing a common executive director) may submit a single application, even though each housing authority has its own operating budget. If the applicant is applying under this exemption, place a "J1" on the first page of the score sheet.

INELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES - "I" If you identify any ineligible activities listed in the grant, circle the item in the text. List the activity and page number under "Ineligible Activities" on the score sheet. Deduct the amount of the funding required for the ineligible item from the total requested budget to reflect total approved budget. The Panel Leader will reconcile the amount to be deducted with the second reviewer prior to data entry.

ALCOHOL/PRESCRIPTION DRUGS - "A" OR "P" If the applicant describes its primary substance abuse problem as alcohol or prescription drug abuse, you are to note this on the first page of the application. These activities will be identified as ineligible and deducted as referenced above.

- o Enter grant amount requested minus, if applicable, the amount of any ineligible activities to show a revised recommended grant funding. If there are any activities that are not clear, note them and request clarification prior to recommending funding.

- o Verify all scores with a hand calculator.
- o All score sheets must be signed by the reviewer. The signature certifies completion of the review and scoring process. It also certifies the reviewer did not provide any technical assistance to the applicant, did not discuss the application with anyone who did, and did not have a relationship with the applicant that could be considered a conflict of interest.
- o Give the application package and the completed score sheet to the grant administrator or panel leader. The grant administrator or panel leader will initial the assignment sheet next to the appropriate application to signify the review is complete and the application has been returned to them.