

## Flood Hazard Risk Reduction Grant Scoring

Instructions: Please rate all items below, considering how the proposal addresses the key aspects noted for each.

**Project Title:**

**Organization(s) Applying:**

**Requested funds: \$**

<b>EVALUATION</b> <b>(Please circle one or enter value in Rating cell)</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<p><b>1. IN FLOODPLAIN</b></p> <p>Does the proposal include mitigation of flooding to FEMA-defined Repetitive Loss (RL) and Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL) properties that are located within the area to be benefitted by the project? Current RL and SRL property information for the entire county or municipality can be requested in writing from the Bureau of Flood Plain Management. Please be aware that the RL and SRL property information is protected by FEMA Privacy Policy and can be used for flood hazard mitigation identification and planning purposes only. The applicant must confirm the total amount of the county and municipal RL and SRL properties that are located within the proposed area of project mitigation. (Application Section III.B.11)</p> <p>Less than 100 Repetitive Loss and Severe Repetitive Loss properties            1 point            100 – 500 Repetitive Loss and Severe Repetitive Loss properties            3 points            Greater than 500 Repetitive Loss and Severe Repetitive Loss properties    5 points</p> <p>Comments:</p>	
<p><b>2. SEA LEVEL RISE</b></p> <p>Does the proposal include mitigation of flooding to properties predicted to be affected by Sea Level Rise? So DEP can evaluate this factor, the applicant <i>must</i> include color copies of the area benefitted by the project, including structures, with overlays of the NOAA Sea Level Rise Tool at the year 2050 interval using all four predictive scenarios (i.e., low, intermediate-low, intermediate-high, and high). (Application Section III.B.16.)</p> <p><u>Number of properties affected by Sea Level Rise that will benefit</u></p> <p>NOAA “low” scenario shows more than 100 properties affected            4 points            NOAA “intermediate-low” scenario shows more than 100 properties affected    3 points            NOAA “intermediate-high” scenario shows more than 100 properties affected    2 points            NOAA “high” scenario shows more than 100 properties affected            1 point            No NOAA scenario shows at least 100 properties affected                    0 points</p> <p>(These categories are mutually exclusive. A project cannot get two points for “intermediate-high” plus one point for “high”; it would just be awarded the two points for “intermediate-high.”)</p> <p>Comments:</p>	
<p><b>2. CONSTRUCTABILITY</b></p> <p>To what degree has the applicant demonstrated the constructability of the project:</p> <p>Does the project have construction drawings, including designs and specifications for the proposed project, prepared by a licensed engineer?            2 points            (Application Section III.B.19)</p> <p>Have permits been applied for?            1 point            (Application Section III.B.20)</p> <p>Have community outreach or information sessions occurred?            1 point            (Application Section III.B.22)</p> <p>Has a Federal environmental and historical review been completed on this project    1 point            (Application Sections III.E.1 &amp; 2)</p> <p>[Maximum possible points: 5]</p> <p>Points received:</p> <p>Comments:</p>	
<p><b>3. COST BENEFIT RATIO/ANALYSIS</b></p>	

Using the FEMA Benefit-Cost Analysis Toolkit Version 5.0 (<https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/92923>), determine the Benefit-Cost Analysis (BCA). Points will be given for projects based on BCA ratios as follows:

- Benefit – Cost Analysis ratio greater than 3.0; 15 points
- Benefit – Cost Analysis ratio greater than 2.5 and less than or equal to 3.0; 12 points
- Benefit – Cost Analysis ratio greater than 2.0 and less than or equal to 2.5; 9 points
- Benefit – Cost Analysis ratio greater than 1.5 and less than or equal to 2.0; 6 points
- Benefit – Cost Analysis ratio greater than 1.0 and less than or equal to 1.5; 3 points

(Application Sections III.B.3,4,5,6,7,10, 17, &18)

Projects with a Benefit – Cost Analysis 1.0 or less are not eligible for funding.

Points received:

Comments:

**4. NATURE-BASED INFRASTRUCTURE**

Does the proposed project incorporate nature-based infrastructure? (Application Sections III.B.5,6,&7)

- 0 – 10% of project cost                      0 points
- 10.01% - 25% of project cost              1 point
- 25.01% - 50% of project cost              2 points
- Greater than 50.01% of project cost      3 points

Comments:

**5. CAPABILITY**

Has the applicant demonstrated its ability to manage and complete the project successfully, by implementing construction projects of a similar size and scope, or by proposing a specific project team and a well-conceived approach to implementation? (Application Sections III.D.2 & 3)

YES – 2 points    NO – 0 points

Comments:

**6. PLANNING**

Does the proposed project implement an improvement clearly identified in a local/county hazard mitigation plan, an asset management plan, five-year master plan, five-year capital improvement plan, or other similar plan approved by a State agency? (Application Section III.B.23)

YES – 2 points    NO – 0 points

Comments:

**7. CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION**

Will this project protect Critical Infrastructure? Critical infrastructure is discussed in Section 2.4 of the Action Plan for the Second Allocation of CDBG-DR funds and includes energy, water, wastewater, transportation, and public transit infrastructure. (Application Section III.B.12)

- No 0 points
- Protects 1-3                      3 points
- Protects more than 3          5 points

Comments:

**8. SCHEDULE**

Has the applicant provided a project schedule that meets the requirements specified in the application? In considering this criteria, NJDEP will consider whether the schedule captures all components of the construction project (i.e. permitting and other approvals, site prep., mobilization, material purchase, equipment and supply transportation, phases of construction, etc.) and whether the schedule uses the critical path method showing a minimum and maximum time interval. (Application Section III.C.2)

YES – 2 points NO – 0 points

Comments:

**9. BUDGET**

Has the applicant provided a budget that meets the requirements specified in the application? In considering this criteria, NJDEP will consider whether the budget itemizes all materials, labor, and other costs needed for the project, whether the budget identifies the cost units (i.e. lump sum, hours or quantity), whether the unit prices are provided, and whether the budget reflects the cost totals on a per item basis. (Application Section III.C.1.)

YES – 2 points NO – 0 points

Comments:

**10. LEVERAGE**

Applicants that are able to leverage other Non-CDBG funding sources to complete their projects will receive points as follows:

Non-CDBG-DR and non-federal funds are less than 5% of total development costs; 0 points

Non-CDBG-DR and non-federal funds are 5.01-20% of total development costs;  
1 point

Non-CDBG-DR and non-federal funds that comprise 20.01-40% of total development costs;  
2 points

Non-CDBG-DR and non-federal funds that comprise 40.01-60% of total development costs;  
3 points

Non-CDBG-DR and non-federal funds are 60.01-80% of total development costs;  
4 points

Non-CDBG-DR and non-federal funds are greater than 80% of total development costs;5 points.

(Application Section III.C.4)

Points received:

Comments:

**TOTAL (out of 50 possible points)**

**TIEBREAKER: If two projects have tied scores and only one can be selected for funding, the following will be used as tiebreakers to select the funded project in the order given below:**

- 1. Higher Benefit Cost Analysis score**
- 2. Greater amount of leveraged funds**
- 3. Higher floodplain score**
- 4. Higher sea level rise score**
- 5. Higher capability score**