

Winter 2026-2027 NOFA
Community Development
Projects Evaluation

Training Agenda

10:00 AM	Introduction & NOFA Background
10:10 AM	Community Development Scoring Breakdown
10:40 AM	Evaluation Sheet Demo
10:45 AM	Reviewer Recommendations
10:50 AM	Conclude/Questions

Winter NOFA FY 26-27

Purpose: Invite community partners to apply for activities to further develop and sustain our community through the following actions:

- Development of new affordable housing
- Rehabilitation of current and natural occurring affordable housing
- Rehabilitation of public facilities that serve board
- ***Public Services***
- ***Economic Development***
- ***Minor Home Repair***
- ***Shelter Services and Operations***
- Homeless Rapid Rehousing

Winter NOFA FY 26-27

FUNDING SOURCE	ACTIVITY	AMOUNT
HOME	HOUSING REHAB/DEV/ACQ.	\$2,306,592.27
HOME (CHDO SET ASIDE)	HOUSING REHAB/DEV/ACQ.	\$410,442.84
CDBG	HOUSING REHAB/DEV/ACQ. AND/OR PUBLIC FACILITY DEV/IMPROVE	\$599,974.93
CDBG	PUBLIC SERVICES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	\$434,697.97
CDBG	MINOR HOME REPAIR	\$550,000.00
CITY OF EPA	MINOR HOME REPAIR	\$100,000.00
FED ESG, CA ESG	SHELTER SERVICES & OPERATIONS	\$510,535.15
FED ESG CA ESG	HOMELESS RAPID REHOUSING	\$143,479.50

WinterNOFA FY 26-27 Milestones

Application Due Date	January 15, 2026
Document Review & Threshold Review Period	January 16 – January 27, 2026
Scoring & Evaluation Period	January 29 – February 19, 2026
Evaluation and Draft Slides/Information Due	February 19, 2026
Final Recommendation Meeting	February 24, 2026
Housing and Community Development Committee Meeting Study Session	March 4, 2026
Housing and Community Development Committee Public Hearing	March 12, 2026

Community Development – Evaluation Process

Responsibility: Reviewer 1 & Reviewer 2

Goal 1: Complete scoring rubric to gather data that will be displayed to general public and Housing Community Development Committee (HCDC)

Goal 2: Score the project with 2 reviewers to avoid bias and determine status of whether or not the project being reviewed receives funding

SCORING CRITERIA

GOAL: Determine an objective score of the project based on the NOFA scoring criteria to assist in final recommendations of funding to HCDC

Community Development – Evaluation Criteria

County staff review proposed projects and evaluate them against the following criteria:

- 1. Funding Priority**
- 2. Applicant Capacity/Capability**
- 3. Project Feasibility/Readiness**
- 4. Cost-Effectiveness**
- 5. Leveraging**

1. Funding Priority:

Extent to which the proposed activity addresses one of the NOFA funding priorities listed in Exhibit 1 of this NOFA, which is also provided in a separate document, County of San Mateo FY 2026-27 Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) Funding Priorities, available at www.smchousing.org.

**Reviewers use 2 subsections to determine final
score
(6 points)**

Section 1. Funding Priority:

Subsection a. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#4. Provide a one sentence project summary.

#11. Project Specific Narrative.

SMC ONLY Question #2. Detailed scope of work

Application Attachments:

N/A

County of San Mateo Funding Priorities: [download](#)

Scoring Recommendation:

If projects meets a priority - **3 points**, if it does not – **0 points**

Section 1. Funding Priority:

Subsection b. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#11. Project Specific Narrative.

#12. Assessment of Need.

#17. Project Beneficiaries.

#18. Populations Served.

Application Attachments:

N/A

Scoring Recommendation:

Extremely-Low Income – **3 points**

Extremely-low to Very-Low Income – **2 points**

Very-Low Income to Moderate Income – **1 point**

Moderate Income – **0 points**

2. Applicant/Sponsor Capacity and Capabilities:

Capacity of applicant (AKA, project sponsor) to carry out proposed activity/program, including demonstrated positive outcomes (i.e., housing homeless clients), demonstrated ability to complete administrative requirements (i.e., performance reports, CDS and/or HMIS data entry, reimbursement requests), and satisfactory performance on any past and/or current contracts with the County. Applicant capacity/capability will also include financial solvency. Exhibit 7 – sample attestation of financial compliance, should be included with the organization's agency budget.

**Reviewers use 4 subsections to determine final score
(12 points)**

Section 2. Applicant/Sponsor Capacity and Capabilities:

Subsection a. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#14. Evaluation.

#16. Impact.

#19a. & #19b. Demographics.

Application Attachments:

N/A

Tips for Applicant/Sponsor Capacity and Capabilities - *Subsection a.*

Connect/Reach out to identified Contract Administrator for applicant experience/capacity of applicant in performing and undertaking proposed services/work.

Scoring Recommendation:

0 Points: If they have no demonstrated positive outcomes (i.e., housing homeless clients) with this type of project/work or have missed performance targets by more than 50% in previous County funded projects

1 OR 2 Points: if they have demonstrated positive outcomes with related work or if they have met 50-75% of performance targets in previous projects; New applicants will likely be scored at 1 or 2.

3 Points: if they have a demonstrated positive outcomes with this exact project type and have met 75%+ performance targets

Section 2. Applicant/Sponsor Capacity and Capabilities:

Subsection b. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#11. Project Specific Narrative

#14. Evaluation.

#16. Impact.

Application Attachments:

N/A

Scoring Recommendation:

0 Points: if they have no process/ ability

1 OR 2 Points: if they have *some*.

3 Points: if they have a very well defined process/ability

Section 2. Applicant/Sponsor Capacity and Capabilities:

Subsection c. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#13. Timeline.

#16. Impact.

Application Attachments:

N/A

Tips for Applicant/Sponsor Capacity and Capabilities -*Subsection c.*

Connect/Reach out to identified Contract Administrator for applicant experience and background information regarding administrative abilities

Scoring Recommendation:

0 Points: If they have no direct or related experience

1 Point: If they have direct experience that is not good or if they have related experience

2 Points: If they have direct experience that is OK

3 Points: If they have direct and positive experience

Section 2. Applicant/Sponsor Capacity and Capabilities:

Subsection d. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#20. Leveraging.

Application Attachments:

Attachment 7. Financial Documents (Audit & Management Letters)

Exhibit 7 – Sample Attestation of Financial Compliance

Scoring Recommendation:

0 Points: If there are concerns in their audit

1 OR 2 Points: If they seem to be operating based on their reserves

3 Points: If their income matches or exceeds annual expenses

3. Project Feasibility/Readiness:

Reasonableness of proposed timeline for implementing and completing the activity. Requests for funding to support community or public service programs must be for programs to be implement in the upcoming fiscal year. Review of any features of potential impediments or contribution to the activity's success or impact.

**Reviewers use 5 subsections to determine final score
(15 points)**

Section 3. Project Feasibility/Readiness:

Subsection a. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#11. Project Specific Narrative.

#13. Timeline.

#16. Impact.

SMC Only Question #2. Detailed scope of work

Application Attachments:

N/A

Tips for Feasibility/Readiness - *Subsection a.*

For New Applicants/Activity, utilize application sections highlighted.

Google search or website information **cannot** be used as a method for scoring this section and subsection.

Scoring Recommendation:

0 Points: If not yet launched

1 Points: If launched within past 3 months

2 Points: If launched within past 6 months

3 Points: If launched 7+ months ago

Section 3. Project Feasibility/Readiness:

Subsection b. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#11. Project Specific Narrative.

#13. Timeline.

SMC Only Question #2. Detailed scope of work

Application Attachments:

N/A

Scoring Recommendation:

0 Points: If it will start after Oct 1, 2026

1 Points: If it will start by Sep 1, 2026

2 Points: If it will start by Aug 15, 2026

3 Points: If it will start by July 2026 or is an ongoing project

Section 3. Project Feasibility/Readiness:

Subsection C. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#11. Project Specific Narrative.

#13. Timeline.

#14. Evaluation.

#16. Impact.

Application Attachments:

N/A

Scoring Recommendation:

0 Points: If they have never received County support of any kind

1 Points: If they have received local support from a city

2 Points: If they have received federal support from another city/county

3 Points: If they have received San Mateo County support

Section 3. Project Feasibility/Readiness:

Subsection d. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#11. Project Specific Narrative.

#13. Timeline.

#15. Collaboration.

SMC Only Question #2. Detailed scope of work.

Application Attachments:

N/A

Scoring Recommendation:

0 Points: If done alone

1 OR 2 Points: If done in partnership/collaboration with at least 1-2 other entities

3 Points: If done with an ecosystem of partners/collaborators

Section 3. Project Feasibility/Readiness:

Subsection e. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#11. Project Specific Narrative.

#15. Collaboration.

#16. Impact.

#20. Leveraging.

SMC Only Question #2. Detailed scope of work.

Application Attachments:

N/A

Scoring Recommendation

0 OR 1 Points: If impedes success

2 OR 3 Points: If will contribute to success/impact

4. Cost Effectiveness:

Extent to which the activity is cost effective in serving new or additional clients for Federal CDBG and federal/state ESG funding and the extent to which the activity is cost effective in serving all clients (not just new or additional) for CA ESG, PLHA and City of East Palo Alto funding. Additional review of methodology for costing and/or budgeting.

**Reviewers use 1 subsection to determine final score
(3 points)**

Section 4. Cost Effectiveness:

Subsection a. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#11. Project Specific Narrative.

#16. Impact.

#17. Project Beneficiaries.

#20. Leveraging.

Proposed Budget Narrative (under Table)

Application Attachments:

Budget Attachments

Tips for Cost Effectiveness – *Subsection a.:*

Subsection a. is somewhat subjective/project specific (i.e., Food Pantry vs. Housing Location Services)

Connect with Reviewer 1 to discuss this subsection.

Utilize comment box to explain final scoring. Scoring Recommendation

Scoring Recommendation:

0 Points: If it does not seem reasonable

3 Points: If it seems very reasonable

Section 4. Cost Effectiveness:

Subsection b. (Reference Only)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

SMC Only Question #2. Detailed scope of work.

Application Attachments:

Budget Attachments

Tips for Cost Effectiveness – *Subsection b.:*

Review the total number of people served by the entire program. Did the applicant provide a thorough narrative that explains their costing methodology?

Meet and discuss with Review 1, may require follow up with applicant.

Utilize comment box for explanation/details

For reference only

not scored

5. Leveraging:

Extent to which other funding sources have been sought and committed to the activity or program. At the time of application submission, estimated leveraging amounts will need to be shared. At the end of the first year of the contract term, actual leveraging amounts will need to be reported.

**Reviewers use 3 subsection to determine final score
(9 points)**

Section 5. Leveraging:

Subsection a. (Reference Only)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#20. Leveraging.

Additional Funding Table (after SMC Only question #2)

Application Attachments:

Budget Attachments

For reference only

not scored

Section 5. Leveraging:

Subsection b. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#20. Leveraging.

Application Attachments:

N/A

Scoring Recommendation

0 Points: If it is unclear

1 OR 2 Points: If it seems relatively soon (within 6 months)

3 Points: If there is evidence that it will be received prior to 6 months from now

Section 5. Leveraging:

Subsection c. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#20. Leveraging.

Application Attachments:

N/A

Scoring Recommendation

0 Points: If you believe it is unlikely

1 OR 2 Points: If it seems relatively likely

3 Points: If there is evidence that it is highly probable

Section 5. Leveraging:

Subsection d. (3 points total)

Community Dev Projects

Application Sections:

#20. Leveraging.

Application Attachments:

N/A

Scoring Recommendation

0 Points: If 100%

1 Points: If 75%

2 Points: If between 51-75%

3 Points: If $\leq 50\%$

Evaluation Sheet Demo

[TEMPLATE - Comm Dev Public Services Checklist and Scoring Sheet FY26-27.xlsx](#)



Reviewer 1 will be responsible for contacting the applicant for missing documents and/or information.

- **All contacts will be tracked in the: [Application Q&A.xlsx](#)**
 - Please use the Eval Q&A Review and Response Tab
 - Reduces redundancy of the same questions being asked
 - Applicants will be allowed 48 hours to answer questions from Staff

Final Tips & Recommendations

- During your evaluation and scoring, recommended to have following documents open:
 - Community Development NOFA Guidelines - <https://www.smcgov.org/media/156969/download?inline=>
 - Application being reviewed
 - This slide deck
- For scoring Section 2. Applicant/Sponsor Capacity and Capabilities and Section 3. Project Feasibility/Readiness, connect with Reviewer 1 about the Contract Administrator for returning applicants.
- Use the comment box (Column G) in the scoring sheet to explain rating/score for subsections.
- Utilize check-ins with Reviewer 1 to discuss potential questions for applicants, clarifications and scoring discussions.

Questions?