

Addendum to the CDBG Application Process

The purpose of this addendum is to provide clear guidance to CDBG Sub-recipient Applicants regarding the viability of their proposed projects and activities.

Projects should reflect and support the city of Petersburg, Virginia's CDBG five (5) year consolidated plan, HUD's CDBG national objectives (see matrix codes), and citizen comments from the February CDBG Advisory Board Public Hearing of Needs Meeting. Applicants should consider the following:

- o What needs does this project meet from the current Consolidated Plan?
- o How will success be measured?
- o What Matrix Code category or categories does this project fit within?
- o Estimated start and end date?
- o Estimated costs and dates of project completion?

Find CDBG National Objectives at:

https://files.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/CDBG_Guide_National_Objectives_Eligible_Activities.pdf

Find CDBG Matrix Codes at: <https://files.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/Matrix-Code-Definitions.pdf>

City of Petersburg VA Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

Request for Funding Application Guidelines re: the allocation of Federal Funds

The City of Petersburg is now accepting applications for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds from the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD) under Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended. Requests for Funding proposals must address one of three broad national objectives set forth by HUD: benefit low- and moderate-income persons, aid in the elimination of slums and blight, or meet urgent needs which pose a serious threat to the health or welfare of a community (results of an act of nature). The CDBG funds are awarded to public and private non-profit entities, Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs), City departments, other public agencies, and for-profit entities to carry out eligible housing and community development projects for the residents of the City of Petersburg VA.

Planning and Submission:

- **Application availability:** The application is available online at <http://www.petersburg-va.org/990/Community-Development-Block-Grant-Adviso>.
- **General information session:** a CDBG Workshop was hosted in December of 2025.
- **Deadline:** CDBG 2026 Application opened January 23, 2026. The application closes on March 31, 2026. Individuals with special needs should contact the city's CDBG Administrator.
- **Consultation:** Consultation is available over the phone or in person to discuss the application.
- **Application instructions:** Please read the application carefully and respond to all sections. Be sure to review the list of requested attachments and follow the instructions to forward.
- **Application evaluation:** All applications will be reviewed by members of the CDBG Advisory Board. Applications must be in line with the city's five year CDBG Consolidated Plan, which is founded on citizen participation to identify community and development needs. Board members will ensure that proposed projects align with HUD CDBG national objectives and matrix codes.

City Council Review and Adoption: Upon receipt of the CDBG Advisory Board recommendations, City Council will hold a public hearing on the Proposed Use of Funds. Adoption of the Consolidated Plan and/or the Annual Action Plan and the budget is scheduled for the Spring (dates are subject to change).

Date Received By City: _____

Project name: _____

Applicant name: _____

DUNS#: _____ TAX ID#: _____

Unique Entity ID (UEI): _____

MS Forms Application Completed

All Requested Attachments: Each applicant should have emailed **one copy of each of the following in the format of a single .pdf document to the attention of Jennifer Murphy-James @ jmjames@petersburg-va.org**. **Note: applications submitted without this information will be determined to be incomplete.**

- 1. Articles of Incorporation
- 2. Mission Statement
- 3. List of membership of Board of Directors
- 4. IRS Letter of Tax Exemption
- 5. Latest Financial Audit
- 6. Form 990, 990 Post Card, or IRS Tax Statement for previous three years
- 7. Prior Year Budget
- 8. Business License, if applicable.

The organization demonstrates capacity to complete the proposed project

The proposed project and activities are consistent with the Consolidated Plan

The proposed project meets at least one of the CDBG national objectives

Benefiting low- and moderate-income persons

Preventing or eliminating slums or blight

Meeting other community development needs having a particular urgency because existing conditions pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community when other financial resources are not available to meet such needs. Note: urgent need only applies to the following: tornado, earthquake, hurricane, as defined in 24 CFR 570.208.

Which performance objective does the project meet:

Creating Suitable Living Environments

Providing Decent Affordable Housing

Creating Economic Opportunities

Eligible funding activity (matrix code): _____

The project includes collaboration agreements:

Yes

No

Grading Considerations:

Is the proposed project successfully consistent with the priorities of the Consolidated Plan?

AB Review Narrative:

What is the potential community impact of the project?

AB Review Narrative:

Does the organization demonstrate capacity to meet performance measurements and outcomes?

AB Review Narrative:

Does the application document the leveraging of other funding resources to support the project?

AB Review Narrative:

Does the project demonstrate collaboration with other services and resources that support the service area?

AB Review Narrative:

Summary of Complete AB Review Narrative:

GOVERNANCE & DEFENSIBILITY NOTES (Important)

- Keep **HUD compliance** front-and-center
- Allow **policy discretion** without bias
- Separate **eligibility, priority, and penalties**
- This will make scoring easy to defend during audits or public inquiries

CDBG PY26–FY27 SCORING RUBRIC

City of Petersburg, Virginia

Total Possible Score: 105 Points

Recommended use:

- Each application scored independently by reviewers
- Average scores used for ranking
- Minimum passing threshold suggested: **70 points**

APPLICATION INFO

Field **Entry**

Application #

Organization Name

Project Title

Project Type Public Services, or Capital/Housing/Infrastructure

Reviewer Name

Review Date

Funding Recommendation:

- Recommend for Funding
- Recommend with Conditions
- Do Not Recommend

Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer signature: _____

WEIGHTED RUBRIC for PUBLIC SERVICES vs. CAPITAL PROJECTS

This addresses HUD best practice: **different project types should not be evaluated identically.**

A. PUBLIC SERVICES PROJECTS (100 points)

Category	Weight	Actual Score Given
Eligibility & HUD Alignment	20	
Community Need	25	
Project Design	20	
Organizational Capacity	20	
Budget & Cost Reasonableness	10	
Application Quality & Completeness	5	
Total	100	

Emphasis:

- ✓ Community impact
- ✓ Service delivery capacity
- ✓ Measurable outcomes

B. CAPITAL / HOUSING / INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS (100 points)

Category	Weight	Actual Score Given
Eligibility & HUD Alignment	25	
Community Need	20	
Project Design	25	
Organizational Capacity	15	
Budget & Cost Reasonableness	10	
Application Quality & Completeness	5	
Total	100	

Emphasis:

- ✓ Readiness to proceed
- ✓ Feasibility within funding period
- ✓ Compliance risk

Scoring Worksheet for Public Service Projects

1. Project Eligibility & HUD Alignment — 20 Points Total for this section

A. HUD National Objective (10 points Maximum; circle score)

Score Criteria

- 10 Clearly meets HUD National Objective; strong documentation and explanation
- 8 Meets objective; explanation adequate but could be clearer
- 6 Objective selected but weak or unclear justification
- 4 Does not clearly meet a HUD National Objective

B. Category of Eligibility (10 points Maximum; circle score)

Score Criteria

- 10 Project clearly fits selected CDBG eligibility category
- 8 Generally, fits category; minor clarification needed
- 6 Category selection questionable
- 4 Category inappropriate or unsupported

2. Community Need — 25 Points Maximum; circle score

Score Criteria

- 25 Strong, well-documented need; data-supported; clear target population
- 20 Need described adequately; limited data
- 15 General need stated; lacks specificity
- 10 Need poorly defined or unsupported

Considerations:

- Severity of need
- Number of beneficiaries
- Alignment with City priorities
- Impact on LMI populations

3. Project Design — 20 Points

A. Project Description & Outcomes (10 points)

Score Criteria

- 10 Clear scope, timeline, outcomes, and measurable results
- 8 Scope clear; outcomes somewhat measurable
- 6 Vague scope or outcomes
- 4 Project design unclear or unrealistic

B. Feasibility & Timeline (10 points)

Score Criteria

- 10 Project feasible within PY26–FY27 timeframe
- 8 Feasible with minor concerns
- 6 Significant feasibility concerns
- 4 Not feasible within funding period

4. Organizational Capacity — 20 Points Maximum; circle score

Score Criteria

- 20 Strong experience, staffing, financial management, and compliance capacity
- 15 Adequate capacity; minor gaps
- 10 Limited experience or capacity
- 5 Insufficient capacity to manage CDBG funds

Considerations:

- Prior CDBG experience
- Financial systems
- Knowledge of federal compliance
- Past performance

5. Budget & Cost Reasonableness — 10 Points Maximum; circle score

Score Criteria

- 10 Budget detailed, reasonable, and cost-effective
- 8 Budget adequate; minor questions
- 6 Budget lacks detail or justification
- 4 Budget unrealistic or non-compliant

Review for:

- Reimbursement basis acknowledged
- Costs tied to activities
- Other funding sources identified

6. Application Completeness & Quality — 5 Points Maximum; circle score

Score Criteria

- 5 All required sections complete; clear and well-written
- 3 Minor omissions or clarity issues
- 1 Several incomplete sections
- 0 Application incomplete

PRIORITY POINTS (+5) — HIGHEST-NEED AREAS

Purpose: Allow the City to elevate projects that most strongly align with community priorities **without distorting base scores.**

Priority Points (Added After Base Score)

Maximum Priority Points: +5

Priority Criterion	Points
Project serves a HUD-designated LMI area with $\geq 51\%$ LMI population	+2
Project addresses a documented high-need issue (housing instability, homelessness, infrastructure deficiency, blight, public safety, disaster recovery)	+2
Project aligns with an adopted City plan or priority (Consolidated Plan, Strategic Plan, HUD CAPER priorities, etc.)	+1
Maximum Priority Points	+5

Rules:

- Added **after** base score (out of 100)
- Final score cap: **105**

PENALTY DEDUCTIONS — INCOMPLETE OR NON-RESPONSIVE APPLICATIONS

Purpose: Preserve fairness while discouraging incomplete submissions.

Documentation & Compliance Penalties

Maximum Penalty: -15 points

Issue	Deduction
Missing required document(s) in PDF	-5
Uploaded documents not combined into one PDF	-3
Required narrative section missing or blank	-3
Budget missing or incomplete	-3
Application submitted after deadline (if allowed for tracking only)	-5
Maximum Total Penalty	-15

Rules:

- Penalties applied **after scoring**
- Applications deemed “substantially incomplete” may still be rejected administratively
- Penalties should be **noted in reviewer comments**

Scoring Worksheet for CAPITAL / HOUSING / INFRASTRUCTURE Projects

1. Project Eligibility & HUD Alignment — 25 Points Total for this section

A. HUD National Objective (20 points Maximum; circle score)

Score Criteria

- 20 Clearly meets HUD National Objective; strong documentation and explanation
- 15 Meets objective; explanation adequate but could be clearer
- 10 Objective selected but weak or unclear justification
- 5 Does not clearly meet a HUD National Objective

B. Category of Eligibility (5 points Maximum; circle score)

Score Criteria

- 5 Project clearly fits selected CDBG eligibility category
- 3 Generally, fits category; minor clarification needed
- 1 Category selection questionable
- 0 Category inappropriate or unsupported

2. Community Need — 20 Points Maximum; circle score

Score Criteria

- 20 Strong, well-documented need; data-supported; clear target population
- 15 Need described adequately; limited data
- 10 General need stated; lacks specificity
- 5 Need poorly defined or unsupported

Considerations:

- Severity of need
- Number of beneficiaries
- Alignment with City priorities
- Impact on LMI populations

3. Project Design — 25 Points

A. Project Description & Outcomes (20 points)

Score Criteria

- 20 Clear scope, timeline, outcomes, and measurable results
- 15 Scope clear; outcomes somewhat measurable
- 10 Vague scope or outcomes
- 5 Project design unclear or unrealistic

B. Feasibility & Timeline (5 points)

Score Criteria

- 5 Project feasible within PY26–FY27 timeframe
- 3 Feasible with minor concerns
- 1 Significant feasibility concerns
- 0 Not feasible within funding period

4. Organizational Capacity — 15 Points Maximum; circle score

Score Criteria

- 15 Strong experience, staffing, financial management, and compliance capacity
- 10 Adequate capacity; minor gaps
- 5 Limited experience or capacity
- 0 Insufficient capacity to manage CDBG funds

Considerations:

- Prior CDBG experience
- Financial systems
- Knowledge of federal compliance
- Past performance

5. Budget & Cost Reasonableness — 10 Points Maximum; circle score

Score Criteria

- 10 Budget detailed, reasonable, and cost-effective
- 8 Budget adequate; minor questions
- 6 Budget lacks detail or justification
- 4 Budget unrealistic or non-compliant

Review for:

- Reimbursement basis acknowledged
- Costs tied to activities
- Other funding sources identified

6. Application Completeness & Quality — 5 Points Maximum; circle score

Score Criteria

- 5 All required sections complete; clear and well-written
- 3 Minor omissions or clarity issues
- 1 Several incomplete sections
- 0 Application incomplete

PRIORITY POINTS (+5) — HIGHEST-NEED AREAS

Purpose: Allow the City to elevate projects that most strongly align with community priorities **without distorting base scores.**

Priority Points (Added After Base Score)

Maximum Priority Points: +5

Priority Criterion	Points
Project serves a HUD-designated LMI area with $\geq 51\%$ LMI population	+2
Project addresses a documented high-need issue (housing instability, homelessness, infrastructure deficiency, blight, public safety, disaster recovery)	+2
Project aligns with an adopted City plan or priority (Consolidated Plan, Strategic Plan, HUD CAPER priorities, etc.)	+1
Maximum Priority Points	+5

Rules:

- Added **after** base score (out of 100)
- Final score cap: **105**

PENALTY DEDUCTIONS — INCOMPLETE OR NON-RESPONSIVE APPLICATIONS

Purpose: Preserve fairness while discouraging incomplete submissions.

Documentation & Compliance Penalties

Maximum Penalty: -15 points

Issue	Deduction
Missing required document(s) in PDF	-5
Uploaded documents not combined into one PDF	-3
Required narrative section missing or blank	-3
Budget missing or incomplete	-3
Application submitted after deadline (if allowed for tracking only)	-5
Maximum Total Penalty	-15

Rules:

- Penalties applied **after scoring**
- Applications deemed “substantially incomplete” may still be rejected administratively
- Penalties should be **noted in reviewer comments**