



2025 Neighborhood Economic Development Grant Report

This document summarizes the 2025 Neighborhood Economic Development (NED) application process. The NED grant program (formerly ACCBO), provides \$720,000 of CDBG funds toward community based organizations providing economic development in City neighborhoods. The Office of Management and Budget's Community Development Division administers this grant according to HUD and City regulations. This document accompanies the 2025 NED Advisory Committee recommendations in the attached legislation and provides a background for the decision-making process.

The NED Advisory Committee recommended the following organizations for funding:

Organization	Request	Award
Amani Christian Community Development Corporation	\$40,000.00	\$35,000.00
Brightwood Civic Group	\$40,000.00	\$35,000.00
Fineview Citizens Council	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00
Hazelwood Initiative	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00
Hill Community Development Corporation	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00
Hilltop Alliance	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00
Oakland Planning and Development Corporation	\$40,000.00	\$35,000.00
Operation Better Block	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00
Pennsylvania Affordable Housing Corporation	\$40,000.00	\$35,000.00
Perry Hilltop Citizens Council	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00
Pittsburgh Hispanic Development Corporation	\$40,000.00	\$35,000.00
Rebuilding Together Pittsburgh	\$40,000.00	\$35,000.00
Rising Tide Partners	\$40,000.00	\$35,000.00
Uptown Partners of Pittsburgh	\$40,000.00	\$35,000.00
Hill District Collaborative (Year 1 of 4)	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00
Beltzhoover Consensus Group (Year 2 of 4)	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00
Charles Street Area Corporation (Year 3 of 4)	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00
Carrick Community Council (Year 4 of 4)	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00

Program Overview

The NED program funds organizations at two levels:

General NED Grant	Capacity Building NED Grant
• Grant Award: Up to \$40,000 • Term: One year • Applicants: Organizations of any size • Projects funded: Economic development in CDBG-eligible neighborhoods	• Grant Award: Up to \$50,000 annually • Term: Four, one year terms • Applicants: Smaller organizations (>\$75,000 in revenue and expenses each annually) • Projects funded: Economic development in CDBG-eligible neighborhoods

The NED program was split into two different grants in 2021 to better serve smaller organizations. Since then, one applicant has been selected each year to receive a four-year renewable Capacity Building award. Manchester Citizens Corporation received the first award in 2021 and since then Carrick Community Council, Charles Street Area Corporation, and Beltzhoover Consensus Group have been selected. In 2025, the Capacity Building program is running at full force with four organizations at various stages. Each Capacity Building organization will also receive support from a capacity building consultant.

The budget for the NED program for 2025 is \$720,000 which is the same as last year, but is \$220,000 more than two years ago. This increase will better meet demand for the program which has increased since 2019 from \$839,000 in requests to \$1.26 million requested this year.

NED Committee Members

This year the NED Advisory Committee consisted of twelve members with two representatives from the Mayor's Office, City Council Budget Office, and City Planning; two representatives from Urban Redevelopment Authority; and the remaining four being economic and community development professionals representing organizations other than City government

1. Darius Wallace	Mayor's Office
2. Jan Raether	Mayor's Office
3. Peter McDevitt	Council Budget
4. Kiersten Walmsley	Council Budget
5. Shoshana Davidson	City Planning
6. Melissa Hill	City Planning
7. Brandon Wilson	Urban Redevelopment Authority
8. Talia O'Brien	Urban Redevelopment Authority
9. Joseph Costa	ACTION Housing
10. Meredith Maverro	Hillman Family Foundations
11. Simone McMeans	Allegheny County Economic Development
12. Chris Rosselot	Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group

Application Process

All applications were submitted online through the Bridgeway platform. The same application was used for General NED and Capacity Building programs; however, organizations seeking the Capacity Building award were required to complete a few additional questions. Organizations eligible for Capacity Building awards are also automatically considered for General NED awards. After collecting all applications, the Community Development Division reviewed all the applications for eligibility and shared our review with the NED Committee. The NED Committee reviewed the list of eligible applicants and selected 20 to invite for second round interviews. The interviews consisted of a 20 minute presentation and 5-10 minutes for committee questions. These presentations were held virtually over two weeks and were recorded for the benefit of NED Committee members that could not attend the meetings live. See 2025 NED Application in Appendix A and NED Schedule in Appendix B.

Outreach

The NED application was open July 1, 2025 – July 28, 2025. The Community Development Division notified more than 1,000 people through our email list. We also asked City Planning to email the list of Registered Community Organizations about this funding opportunity as well.

To make sure applicants were aware of changes to the NED program, Community Development released a video explaining the NED program and hosted two Q&A sessions. The video was posted on the application webpage on July 1, 2025. The two virtual Q&A sessions were held on July 15 and July 16. Questions and answers were posted afterwards on the application EngagePGH page.

Applicants

By the grant deadline on July 28, 2025, the Community Development Division received 34 applications requesting \$1,266,350 in total. Seven of those applicants were seeking

Capacity Building funds. The applicant pool is similar to the number of applications last year.

Score Criteria

When the application was launched, the Community Development Division also shared the scoring criteria. NED Committee Members reviewed and approved the scoring rubric they would use ahead of the application period. The scoring rubric is used for both Capacity Building and General NED. The rubric was updated this year to further clarify what a 1 - 5 score looks for each question, in an attempt to receive a larger dispersion of scores from NED committee members. Two new scores were added this year for Capacity Building applicants only.

The General NED score adds up to 45 points with 30 points coming from committee members and 15 points coming from the demographics of the applicant's proposed service area. The Capacity Building score adds up to 46 points with 36 points coming from committee members and 10 points coming from the demographics of the applicant's proposed service area.

The points based on service area consists of demographic data representing low/moderate income populations, single-parent household populations, and the URA's Market Analysis Map. Committee members scored the remaining 30 (36 for Capacity) points on qualitative measures according to prompts written and voted on by Committee members. NED scoresheet in Appendix C.

NED Allocation Meeting

On September 23, 2025 six of the twelve NED Advisory Committee members met to determine the recommendation to City Council for the NED 2025 General grant and Capacity Building grant. Members who could not attend the meeting voted via email afterwards. The Community Development Division collected each NED Committee member's scores prior to this meeting. The final score for each interviewed applicant was determined by the average of these committee scores.

OMB staff presented the scores as shown in Appendix D. Upon review of these scores, the NED Advisory Committee voted to recommend Hill District Collaborative for the \$50,000 Capacity Building award as it received the highest score. Beltzhoover Consensus Group, Carrick Community Council, and Charles Street Area Corporation are continuing to be funded through the Capacity Building award.

The Committee also selected fourteen applications for the General NED award. The applications were selected for funding through their score from the rubric. The Committee decided to fund the organizations at their full grant request based on the score:

- Score 34.00 and higher: Fully fund grant request or \$40,000 (6 organizations)
- Score 31.00-33.99: Fund at \$35,000 (8 organizations)

Appendix

- Appendix A - Application
- Appendix B – Application Schedule
- Appendix C - Scoresheet
- Appendix D - Applicant Scores

APPENDIX A - Application

The Applicant

Contact Information		
Organization	Primary Contact	Alternate Contact
1. Organization's Legal Name This name must match your filings with the IRS.	5. Primary Contact's Name Please note, this is the individual who will be managing grant funds, not necessarily the person filling out the application.	9. Alternate Contact's Name
2. Organization's Public Facing/DBA Name If this is the same as your legal name, then enter "N/A".	6. Primary Contact's Title 	12. Alternate Contact's Email
3. Mailing Address 	7. Primary Contact's Phone Number 	
4. Zip Code 	8. Primary Contact's Email 	

Financial Information	
13. Does your organization have IRS 501(3)(c) tax-exempt status? *Fiscal sponsors are not allowed	18. Does your organization currently have general liability insurance?
14. Which of the following applies to the organization? 	19. Does your organization have paid staff?
15. Federal Tax ID Number (EIN) 	20. Does your organization currently have workers compensation insurance? Organizations without paid staff are exempt from obtaining workers compensation insurance.
16. Unique Entity ID (UEI) Number All applicants must have a Unique Entity ID (UEI). This replaces the DUNS number required in previous Public Service applications. To obtain a UEI, please visit SAM.gov. If you are in the process of receiving your UEI, then please enter "pending".	21. Please describe the type of financial management system your organization utilizes. Be specific, but brief. Examples might include: bookkeeper on staff, financial consultant, computerized system, board member, etc.
17. Do you have an active SAM.gov registration? Obtaining an active SAM.gov registration is a separate process than having a UEI.	22. Are you applying for the Capacity Building Grant?

The Project

Project Scope
1. Project Title
2. Project Description
3. List the main neighborhood(s) your organization serves
4. List the census tracts served by the project specifically Click here to view the most up-to-date map of eligible census tracts
5. Which eligible activity or activities will this grant fund?

Success Factors
6. How will the success of your program be measured?
7. Estimated number of small businesses supported
8. Estimated number of properties returned to use
9. Estimated number of units created
10. Estimated number of units preserved
11. Estimated number of residents engaged

Finances

NED Grant Request

1. Which of the following expense categories will you use?

Project expense type

Description

Expense amount

Other (Please specify)

Project expense type

Description

Expense amount

Other (Please specify)

2. Total NED Grant Request

For the general NED grant, your request must be between \$10,000 and \$40,000. If you are applying for the Capacity Building grant, put \$50,000. You will still be considered for a regular NED grant at \$40,000 or less. Fill out this section only for one year. There will be an opportunity later in the application to describe your four-year budget and plan.

Project Funding

3. Total project budget

4. Describe what, if any, other funding has been secured for this project

Enter 'N/A' if not applicable.

Community Engagement

Descriptions

1. Briefly describe your community engagement strategy. Be sure to mention how you engage with minorities, historically marginalized populations, and community members with language or accessibility barriers.

2. Is your organization participating in a neighborhood plan? If so, describe how your proposed activities correlate with the plan.

3. Briefly describe how your organization has determined the community needs your activities will meet.

Collaboration

4. Please list organizations you will be collaborating with on this project.

Enter 'N/A' if not applicable.

5. Does your organization have any inclusivity policies for encouraging community participation or organizational financial expenditures? Please describe, for example, any measures your organization takes to ensure the demographics of your Board of Directors matches the demographics of your service area, or to spend money with Minority- or Women-Owned Businesses.

Capacity Building

*Only complete if your organization is seeking the Capacity Building grant

1. Please list your organization's total expenses for the last three completed financial years.

Use the amount calculated for tax returns. Only list years your organization has filed tax returns. List expenses broken out by year, not as one total expense (i.e. 2022: \$60,000, 2021: \$62,000, 2020: \$59,000)

Year

Total Expenses

2. Please list your organization's total revenue for the last three completed financial years.

Use the amount calculated for tax returns. Only list years your organization has filed tax returns. List revenues broken out by year, not as one total expense (i.e. 2022: \$60,000, 2021: \$62,000, 2020: \$59,000)

Year

Total Revenue

Plans and Goals

3. Briefly describe your four-year plan for the Capacity Building grant. Be sure to include at least one measurable goal the funding would allow your organization to achieve.

4. Describe any differences between your one-year and four-year NED funded plans.

5. Does the leadership team of your organization commit to working with a technical assistance consultant over the course of this grant term? The time commitment will average 5 hours per quarter.

Technical assistance is a key component of the Capacity Building grant, therefore active participation in the process is required.

File Attachments**Required Attachments**

Incomplete

IRS 501(3)(c) letter

Incomplete

Articles of Incorporation

Incomplete

Organization Bylaws

Incomplete

Most Recent IRS Form 990, 990-N, or 990-EZ

Incomplete

Board Resolution or Meeting Minutes affirming approval of this application

Incomplete

RCO letter/letter(s) of support

Incomplete

As an authorized representative of this organization, I verify that all of the information provided is true and correct.**Optional Attachments**

Empty

RCO letter/letter(s) of support (2)

Empty

RCO letter/letter(s) of support (3)

APPENDIX B - Schedule

2025 Neighborhood Economic Development (NED) Schedule	
May	
05.15.25	NED Advisory Committee meeting
July	
07.01.25	NED 2025 APPLICATION OPEN
07.15.25	Tuesday live application Q&A 5:00-6:00 PM
07.16.25	Wednesday live application Q&A 12:00-1:00 PM
07.28.25	NED 2025 APPLICATION DEADLINE
August	
08.12.25	NED Committee meeting: review eligible and ineligible applications and presentation logistics / AFTER COMMITTEE MEETS: Send eligibility decision/schedule interviews 8/25 - 9/05
08.15.25	Deadline for presentation sign ups
September	
08.25.25 - 09.05.25	Presentations
08.29.25, 09.05.25	Optional weekly meetings summarizing interviews for NED Committee members
09.12.25	NED Committee DEADLINE to Submit Scoresheets
09.23.25	Final NED Committee meeting: Scoring and Allocation Recommendation
October	
10.06.25	Submit NED recommendation to City Council
10.15.25	NED-CB Mid Program Review (Charles Street Area Corp) - NED Conference
November/December	Begin contract process with NED 2025 awardees
Updated: 04.14.2025	

APPENDIX C - Scoresheet

QUESTIONS: ALL APPLICANTS		Total Points Possible
1. Project proposal has measurable, appropriate goals related to identified community challenges. Identified goals are reasonable and based in data (Keep in mind NED grant might only be covering a portion of entire project).		5
1 Points	Group failed to propose reasonable, practical, effective solution to identified problem. Proposed project will have little to no impact on the community. Proposed project does not address identified community challenges.	
2 Points	Proposal is somewhat reasonable, somewhat appropriate response to identified neighborhood issues. Project proposal might be thoughtful, measurable, or effective, but is lacking depth, measurable goals, or there are concerns with how effective the project may be at addressing identified community concerns and challenges. Proposal is lacking clear metrics, could face implementation challenges that were not addressed in the application or presentation.	
3 Points	Proposed project has a goal or goals based on data of community needs or challenges. Goals are measurable and achievable.	
4 Points	Proposed project is reasonable, appropriate response to identified community concerns or challenges. Project proposal is very thoughtful, measurable, and effective.	
5 Points	Organization has clear metrics to measure success, has thought deeply, creatively, and strategically. Proposal is backed by data and has an implementation timeline.	
2. Does the project proposal show potential for long-lasting impact?		5
1 Points	Proposed project is not sustainable/will not happen without NED funding OR cannot reasonably expect a quantifiable long-term (3+ year) impact	
2 Points	Proposed project appears at least moderately sustainable but does not demonstrate a clear connection between NED funding and long-lasting positive changes	
3 Points	Proposed project shows potential for long-lasting impact in terms of creation/preservation of affordable housing; vacancy reduction; or main street revitalization	
4 Points	Proposed project has proven to provide long-lasting impact, or substantially increases organization's sustainability	
5 Points	Project increases organization's impact and capacity, allows organization to leverage additional funding, and project shows high impact, long lasting positive change in their community.	
3. Organization clearly articulates the role NED funding will play in supporting the project. If organization did not include a slide on their budget, subtract one from the score you would otherwise give.		5
1 Points	Organization has little to no explanation of how grant funding will actually be spent to accomplish project proposal, and provides little to no explanation of the role grant funding plays in budget as a whole	
2 Points	Organization does not provide a clear connection between the grant funds and their project goals, or does not address funding gaps	
3 Points	Organization provides a clear explanation of how NED funding will be used in pursuit of their project goals	
4 Points	Organization gives a clear explanation of how NED funding fits into their organization budget as a whole, but lacks a detailed plan on how to leverage outside funds	
5 Points	Organization explains in detail how NED funding will be used within their budget and how it will leverage other funds.	
4. Applicant prioritized community engagement and demonstrates capacity and willingness to engage their community to build community consensus..		5
1 Points	Organization does not explain their community engagement process, or has poorly attended meetings with little to no online presence. No plan for improvement is offered	
2 Points	Organization has somewhat consistent meetings but is making minimal efforts to improve outreach, meeting attendance, and/or online engagement. Organization is aware of the importance of community engagement, but does not have strong plan to improve their engagement.	
3 Points	Organization demonstrates a clear understanding of the importance of community engagement, has regular, well-publicized and attended meetings, and/or adjust plans according to community consensus	

4 Points	Organization has a strong community presence with regular, well-publicized and attended meetings, adjust plans according to community consensus, and actively works to improve engagement with community members	
5 Points	Organization holds consistent, well attended, well-advertised community meetings. CDC has demonstrated capacity to elicit community feedback. Organization strives for robust community engagement, via in person meetings and/or online. Board members work to empower community engagement and expand community leadership and participation through consistent board turn over and competitive elections.	
5. Organization understands their community's concerns, pressing needs, and vision. Community challenges, needs, or concerns are clearly identified and are supported by data.		5
1 Points	Identified community challenges are not well thought-out, do not affect the majority of residents in the neighborhood, or are not based in data or community feedback.	
2 Points	Organization has a general idea of community concerns and pressing needs, but may be missing details or has not demonstrated data collection through surveys or other mechanisms, or lacks robust plans to collect data.	
3 Points	Organization is operating based on data of community needs and/or in line with a neighborhood plan	
4 Points	Organization conducted robust outreach to gather data on community needs and clearly explained the process	
5 Points	Organization can go into details of existing and most pressing challenges in their community and how challenges affect existing residents, new residents, and vulnerable populations. Organization demonstrates community outreach and/or data to support proposal.	
6. Applicant actively seeks to build partnerships and works well in collaboration with other organizations, entities, and government		5
1 Points	Organization has no partnerships, does not have interest or any priorities to build partnerships. Organization has reputation of being difficult to work with.	
2 Points	Organization has some partnerships, but partnerships are not robust, and do not directly address community challenges and project goals.	
3 Points	Organization has a reasonable number of active partnerships and works well in collaboration with other entities	
4 Points	Organization is a key part of a coalition of similar organizations working towards larger goals	
5 Points	Organization has strong, active partnerships that provide substantial support through technical or monetary assistance (organization and/or partners benefit from partnership). Partnerships directly address community challenges or aide in accomplishing project goals.	
QUESTIONS: CAPACITY BUILDING APPLICANTS ONLY		Total Points Possible
1. Applicant is serving an area with limited other resources		3
1 Points	Applicant is operating in a neighborhood with multiple groups with similar mission statements and not collaborating with any of these groups	
2 Points	Applicant is operating in a neighborhood with limited similar groups OR is collaborating (shared mission) with most of the similar groups in the neighborhood	
3 Points	Applicant is the only group operating in their neighborhood OR is in close collaboration (shared projects/staff) with the majority of similar groups	
2. Applicant has a clear vision of a four-year plan		3
1 Points	Applicant did not specify long-term plans OR does not have a plan beyond year one	
2 Points	Applicant's four-year plan is the exact same activities for four years	
3 Points	Applicant has a clear four-year plan describing how capacity will be built	
	AUTOMATICALLY CALCULATED	
	Single parent head of household population concentration in projected service area	5
	Low/Moderate income (LMI) population concentration of projected service area Project LMI %*5 (ONLY for GENERAL NED AWARD)	5

	URA Market Index A = 0.5 B = 1 C = 1.5 D = 2 E = 2.5 F = 3 G = 3.5 H = 4 I = 4.5 J = 5	5
	GENERAL NED SCORE	45
	CAPACITY BUILDING NED SCORE	46

APPENDIX D - Applicant Scores

NED Applicants Ranked on General NED Score:

Applicant Organization	General NED Score	Capacity Building Score
Hilltop Alliance	35.49	
Fineview Citizens Council	35.40	
Hill Community Development Corporation	35.24	
Hazelwood Initiative	35.03	
Perry Hilltop Citizens Council	34.31	
Operation Better Block	34.00	
Amani Christian Community Development Corporation	32.91	
Rising Tide Partners	32.91	
Uptown Partners of Pittsburgh	32.39	
Pennsylvania Affordable Housing Corporation	32.31	
Pittsburgh Hispanic Development Corporation	31.94	
Rebuilding Together Pittsburgh	31.77	
Brightwood Civic Group	31.44	
Oakland Planning and Development Corporation	31.32	
Hill District Collaborative (Capacity Building)	30.41	31.11
Bloomfield-Garfield Corporation	27.74	
Sojourner House MOMS	27.34	
Main + Elm Development Corporation	27.21	
Community Alliance of Spring Garden East Deutschtown	26.83	
East Liberty Development Inc	26.50	