

261—200.6(15J) Application scoring and determination of benefits. For each applicant that meets the requirements of rule 261—200.5(15J) and that has submitted an application during the annual filing window as described in subrule 200.4(3), the board will evaluate and score the proposed district plan according to the criteria and process described in this rule.

200.6(1) Scoring criteria and plan evaluation. Each proposed district plan will be given a numerical score between 0 and 100. The higher the numerical score, the more likely the proposed district will be approved for designation and funding under the program. The scoring process will necessarily involve a subjective assessment of the quality of each proposed district plan as well as a consideration of how each proposed district plan compares to the plans proposed by other applicants. The criteria used to score each application and the maximum number of points that may be attributed to each criterion are as follows:

a. Uniqueness: 25 points. The program requires that the projects proposed to be undertaken must be of a unique nature. Therefore, the proposed district plan will be evaluated on this criterion in order to quantify the extent to which the projects in the proposed district plan are of a unique nature. The more unique the projects are, the more points will be received under this criterion.

b. Economic impact: 25 points. The program requires that the projects proposed to be undertaken must have a substantial beneficial impact on the economy of the state and the economy of the municipality. Therefore, the proposed district plan will be evaluated on this criterion in order to quantify the extent to which the projects in the proposed district plan will benefit the economy. The greater the economic impact of the proposed district plan, the more points will be received under this criterion.

c. Project feasibility: 10 points. The program requires that funding sources for projects must be feasible. Therefore, the proposed district plan will be evaluated on this criterion in order to quantify the extent to which the funding sources of the proposed projects are feasible. The more feasible the funding sources for the proposed projects are, the more points will be received under this criterion.

d. Capital investment: 10 points. The program requires that at least one project with a capital investment of \$10 million or more be proposed. To the extent that the proposed district plan exceeds this minimum level of capital investment, more points will be received under this criterion.

e. Funding leverage: 10 points. The program limits the amount of new tax revenues that can be received to 35 percent of the total cost of all proposed projects in the proposed district plan. To the extent that a proposed district plan includes a financing plan in which the percentage of new tax revenues to be received is less than 35 percent of the total cost, more points will be received under this criterion.

f. Nonretail focus: 10 points. The program limits the amount of proposed capital investment in the district related to retail businesses to 50 percent of the total capital investment for all proposed projects in the proposed district. To the extent that a proposed district plan includes projects that provide cultural amenities, tourist attractions and accommodations, infrastructure, or quality of life improvements, more points will be received under this criterion.

g. Additional factors: 10 points. The program allows the board to establish additional criteria for the program. Therefore, in addition to the other criteria listed in this subrule, the board will consider the following additional factors:

(1) Readiness for development. The closer a municipality is to beginning development on a proposed district plan, the more points may be received under the additional factors criterion.

(2) Geographic diversity. To the extent that a proposed district is located in a region of the state not already funded under the program, more points may be received under the additional factors criterion. A proposed district plan that would create an additional district within a municipality or a request to increase the maximum benefit amount of an already approved district will not be viewed as enhancing geographic diversity and may receive fewer points under the additional factors criterion.

(3) Funding need. To the extent that a funding gap exists in the proposed district plan's financing, more points may be received under the additional factors criterion.

200.6(2) Scoring process and funding recommendations. Proposed district plans will be scored by an evaluation committee consisting of members appointed by the director. Members of the committee will include authority staff and not more than five members of the board. Each member of the evaluation committee will judge the proposed district plan according to the scoring criteria, and then the scores of all

members of the committee will be averaged together to reflect one numerical score between 0 and 100. The evaluation committee will not make a funding recommendation.

After all applications are scored, a copy of the proposed district plan and the results of the scoring will be referred to the due diligence committee, which will consider the quality of the proposed district plans and make funding recommendations to the board. The due diligence committee will take into account the requested funding levels, but will also attempt to establish maximum benefit amounts that seem most appropriate to both the quality of the proposed district plans and the total demand for program funding.

The scoring results will not be negotiated and, while both the board and the due diligence committee will consider the scoring results of the evaluation committee, those results are not binding on either the due diligence committee or the board.

200.6(3) *Minimum score required.* To receive funding under the program, a proposed district plan must receive an average score of 70 or more points under the criteria listed in subrule 200.6(1).

200.6(4) *Funding not guaranteed.* The program is subject to a total aggregate limit on the amount of new tax revenues that may be approved. Therefore, a proposed district plan that meets the required minimum score is not guaranteed funding if the board's funding decisions for other, higher scoring proposed district plans cause the program's total aggregate limit to be reached.

200.6(5) *Final action taken by board.* The final decision on whether to approve the designation of a proposed reinvestment district and the determination of the amount of maximum benefit to award an applicant rest entirely with the board. The recommendations of the evaluation committee and the due diligence committee with respect to the proposed district plans are of an advisory nature only.

200.6(6) *Availability of scoring results.* The board and the authority will keep records of the scoring process and make those records available to applicants.

200.6(7) *Denial of plans and resubmission.* If a proposed district plan is denied, the board will state the reasons for the denial. Reasons for denial may include a failure to meet filing deadlines, a failure to meet the basic requirements for eligibility, a failure to meet the required minimum score, or a lack of available funding. A municipality whose application is denied may resubmit the application at the next annual filing window provided there is funding available, but a resubmission must be rescored with all other applicants that apply during that filing window.

200.6(8) *Provisional nature of preapplication process.* The preapplication process described in rule 261—200.4(15J) will result in provisional scores and provisional funding decisions for applicants. However, these provisional scores and funding decisions are subject to change pending the final approval process described in rule 261—200.7(15J).

[ARC 1175C, IAB 11/13/13, effective 12/18/13]