Introduction:

Fresno COG's REAP 2.0 scoring committee is tasked with assessing applications against a variety of criteria. Fresno COG staff will average the scores assigned by each of the committee members to rank and prioritize projects.

Fresno COG seeks to develop a scoring committee comprising individuals representing organizations that are eligible applicants to the REAP 2.0 program, but who are not submitting applications. Fresno COG will also work to ensure the scoring committee included diverse geographic coverage of the region.

Fresno COG will submit an application that includes all projects recommended for funding in Fresno County to the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and its REAP 2.0 partners. The suite of projects must satisfy a variety of criteria, including geographic equity and a blend of planning vs. implementation projects. Accordingly, individual projects may be brought forward if the top scored applications do not meet the overall program requirements. This may also result in project selection not adhering completely to the assigned scores. The REAP Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC) will review the project scores and make recommendations to the Fresno COG Board regarding geographic equity and the blend of project types. Fresno COG's Board of Directors will review the scoring committee and RTAC's work and have final approval of all projects to be included in Fresno COG's application to HCD. HCD and its partners will review Fresno COG's process to approve or seek changes to the application.

Projects will be scored in three areas: REAP 2.0 objectives, primary factors, and secondary factors. Each is described below.

REAP 2.0 Objectives

The REAP 2.0 program has three objectives that each project must satisfy. The application scoring process will determine the degree to which each respective project satisfies each objective. The objectives include the following and questions that should be considered when scoring applications are provided.

Accelerating Infill Development that Facilitates Housing Supply, Choice, and Affordability

1. Does the project accelerate infill development near jobs and other key destinations to support housing choice and affordability that effectively reduces VMT and greenhouse gas emissions?

2. Is the project at an infill site and does it have affordability components that serve low- and moderate-income households?

3. Is the project for affordable housing development programs – which may involve predevelopment costs (studies, land acquisition, entitlements, etc.), that accelerate the supply of long-term affordable housing for lower and moderate-income households?

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH)

1. Does the project combat discrimination, overcome patterns of segregation, and foster equitable and inclusive communities?

2. Does the project include meaningful actions to address disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity, replace segregated living patterns with balanced living patterns, and transform racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity?

3. Does the project support regional and local efforts to work toward ensuring all people have full and equal access to opportunities enabling them to lead healthy lives?

4. Does the project:

   a. Enhance housing mobility strategies that remove barriers to housing, housing-supportive infrastructure, increased transportation options, and affordability in areas of high opportunity and outside areas of concentrated poverty; or

   b. Improve place-based strategies to encourage community revitalization; or

   c. Protect existing residents from displacement and preserve housing choices and affordability in areas of lower- or moderate-opportunity and concentrated poverty?

5. Is the project materially inconsistent with AFFH?

6. Geographic equity – will be addressed post initial scoring.

7. Does the project target funding to benefit disadvantaged and historically underserved communities?

8. Unique equity priorities – weighting of scores addresses unique equity priorities.

Reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

1. Does the applicant explain how the proposed use promotes development and aligns housing production in infill locations consistent with the state's climate targets and goals discussed in the California Climate Change Scoping Plan?

2. Is the project consistent with the region's sustainable communities strategy (SCS) through:

   a. Land use planning, polities, and investment strategies by infill development that facilitates housing supply, choice, and affordability and is serviced by existing and planned expansions of a multimodal transportation system; or

   b. Transportation planning, policies, and investment strategies by increasing travel options to homes, jobs, services, and other key destinations that provide, support, or enhance multimodal communities and reduce the number or length of vehicle trips?

3. Does the project support new housing development and shift travel away from driving by implementing or supporting pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and other alternative transportation programs?

Primary Factors:

The primary factors represent factors from the REAP 2.0 guidelines. In addition to providing a primary factor score, the application narratives associated with the primary factors may inform scoring for the REAP 2.0 objectives portion of the scoring matrix. Each primary factor is described below.

Housing Element Compliance
1. Does the project support compliance with a jurisdiction's housing element?

Transformative Planning and Implementation Activities
1. Does the project provide for housing, planning, or infrastructure investments supporting infill housing, and other actions that enable meeting housing goals that also result in per capita vehicle miles traveled reductions, including accelerating infill development, supporting residents through realizing multimodal communities, shifting travel behavior through reducing driving, and increasing transit ridership?

Public Outreach
1. Did the proposed project arise from or go through a public process to solicit community input?

2. If this is a planning project, does the scope of work include a public process?

Benefit to Disadvantaged Populations
1. Does the project target funding to benefit disadvantaged and historically underserved communities?

Significant Beneficial Impacts
1. Does the project lead to substantial changes in land use patterns and travel behaviors, demonstrated by:
   a. A rate of change compared to the baseline; or
   b. The magnitude of impact relative to variables or targets; or
   c. The proportion of need achieved; or
   d. The impact relative to past trends, policies, and practices?

California Planning Priorities
1. Does the project promote infill development and equity by rehabilitating, maintain, and improving existing infrastructure that supports infill development and appropriate reuse and redevelopment of previously developed, underutilized land now served by transit, streets, water, sewer and other essential services, particularly in underserved

areas, and to preserve cultural and historic resources?

2. Does the project protect environmental and agricultural resources by preserving and enhancing the state's most valuable natural resources, including working landscapes such as: farm, range, and forest lands; natural lands such as wetlands, watersheds, wildlife habitats, and other wildlands; recreation lands such as parks, trails, greenbelts, and other open space, and; landscapes with locally unique features and areas identified by the state as deserving special protection?

3. Does the project encourage efficient development patterns by ensuring that any infrastructure associated with development, other than infill development, supporting new development that does all of the following:

   a. Uses land efficiently; and

   b. Is built adjacent to existing developed areas to the extent consistent with #2, above; and

   c. Is located in an area appropriately planned for growth; and

   d. Is served by adequate transportation and other essential utilities and services; and

   e. Minimizes ongoing costs to taxpayers?

Secondary Factors:

A variety of secondary factors can be considered in the scoring process. These are not tied directly to the REAP 2.0 program but demonstrate the application's thoroughness and project deliverability.

Project Scope of Work and Budget
1. Is a project scope of work and budget provided that demonstrates an understanding of the work and financial considerations required to deliver the project?

Project Risk Assessment
1. Has the applicant thoroughly considered risks associated with delivering the project consistent with the scope of work and budget?

2. Has the applicant demonstrated realistic means for mitigating risk associated with delivering the project?

3. How has the applicant demonstrated reasonable assurance that the project can meet REAP 2.0 statutory deadlines (June 30, 2025)?

Risks alone should not result in a deficiency, but should be considered if they are unmitigated, not fully understood, or unmanageable.

Local Support: Inclusion in Plan and Letters of Support

Projects proposing to construct something typically are drawn from adopted plans. While planning projects are also an REAP 2.0 eligible use, they cannot be held to the same scrutiny. If a project proposing to construct something does not indicate inclusion in an adopted plan, this should be considered in the risk assessment and public outreach sections of the scoring matrix.

Letters of support are not an application requirement. They can influence scores to the extent that they add value to any other response.

<u>Scoring:</u>

Scores should be assigned on a 1 to 5 basis. Scoring committee scores will be averaged and converted to project rankings. Therefore, consistency is necessary for each scorer, but not the scoring committee as a whole.

- **5:** <u>Exceptional</u> evidence of meeting or exceeding requirements

- **4:** <u>Strong</u> evidence of meeting requirements

- **3:** <u>Suitable</u> evidence of meeting requirements

- **2:** <u>Limited</u> evidence of meeting requirements

- **1:** <u>Weak</u> evidence of meeting requirements

- **0:** <u>No</u> evidence of meeting requirements (= automatic project disqualification for any REAP objective)

<u>Weighting</u>
The REAP 2.0 program requires public input received during the outreach process to influence the project selection process. This is accomplished through the weighting of scoring categories.

Scoring Factor	Weight (%)	Max. Score
REAP 2.0 Objectives		
1. Accelerating Infill Development	0.27	27
2. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing	0.23	23
3. Reducing VMT	0.25	25
Subtotal	0.75	75
Primary Factors		
1. Housing Element Compliance	0.02	2
2. Transformative Planning and Implementation Activities	0.04	4
3. Public Outreach	0.03	3
4. Benefit to Disadvantage Populations	0.05	5
5. Significant Beneficial Impacts	0.04	4
6. California Planning Priorities	0.02	2
Subtotal	0.20	20
Secondary Factors		
1. Scope of Work and Budget	0.03	3

2. Project Risk Assessment	0.02	2
Subtotal	0.05	5
Total	1.00	100

Subsequent Steps:

The project selection process will involve three steps. This document focuses primarily on the first step.

1. The scoring committee assigns scores to each application. The scores for each project are averaged.

2. The averaged scores will be presented to RTAC. RTAC will work to ensure geographic equity and the split between planning and capital projects is incorporated into the projects recommended for funding. RTAC will make a formal recommendation to Fresno COG's Board of Directors.

3. Fresno COG's Board of Directors will consider the scoring committee and JTAC and approve the suite of projects selected in the full application.