

Tanya Andheasen : staff score

CAHAB composite

Community Housing Fund Scoring Sheet For Use By CAHAB / Community Development	52	50.74 49.94 120.8% 119%
---	----	--

Date: 6/25/2020

Project Name: HRDC

Amount of Funding Requested: \$240,000

Rank the project based on the following criteria:

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Score</u>
Alignment with Community Housing Action Plan: (1 to 5) (5=Well aligned, 3= Neutral, 1= Not Aligned)	5 .24
Ability of this project to address a community need: (1 to 5) (5 = addresses a pressing community need, 4 = addresses a significant community need, 3 = addresses a current community need, 2 = addresses a low priority community need, 1 = Does not address a community need)	5 .23
Target Income of those benefiting from proposal: (1 to 5) (Score on the basis that below 60% of AMI = 5 points and each 10% increase of AMI results in a 1 point decrease in the number of points allotted.)	4 .13.5
Opportunity Cost: (1 to 5) (Consider urgency of need: 1)will this opportunity go away or be severely diminished if funding is not provided at this time; 2) Is the urgency of this request based on an opportunity that recently became available or is the urgency due to inefficient planning; 3) Why is this request being presented now – would it be better if executed at a different time)	4 .20
Level of partnership with other organizations: (1 to 5) (5 = Partners Participating, 3 = Partners contacted but not Participating or Proposal doesn't lend itself to including partners, 1 = Possible Partners not contacted)	4 .16
Alternate funding sources have been secured / solicited: (1 to 5) (5 = Other Funders Participating, 3 = Other Funders contacted but not Participating or Proposal doesn't lend itself to including other Funders, 1 = Other Possible Funders not contacted)	5 .18
Funds Availability: (1 to 5)	3 .21

5.161

(Would providing funds for this project limit the ability to provide funding for future projects that may be a better investment of Community Housing Funds? 5 = No, 3 = to a moderate degree, 1 = Yes)

Willingness to be flexible in grant / loan request: (1 to 5)

(5 = Very flexible, 3 = Neutral, 1 = Not flexible – based on answers to Type of Funding question)

3 .11

Thoroughness of the application / budget: (1 to 5)

(5= Detailed and understandable, 3 = Neutral, 1 = Lacking detail or hard to decipher)

4 .2223

Viability of the proposed project: (1 to 5)

(Score based on the level of perceived risk – 5=No risk, 4= Low Risk, 3= Average Risk, 2 Medium Risk, 1 = High Risk)

5 .22

42

Scope of project in terms of # of community housing units built / preserved: (1 to 5)

(Score based on 5 units or fewer = 1 points. Each increment of 5 additional units generates 1 additional point up to the maximum of 5 points)

2 11.2 10

Project's generation of long-term or permanently affordable housing: (1 to 5)

(Score on a scale of 5 year affordability = 1 point, each additional 5 year increment of affordability generates another point. Permanent affordability = 5 points)

5 25

Requested investment of Community Housing funds per unit: (1 to 5)

(Rate on a declining scale of \$1,000 per unit. \$1,000 per unit or less = 5 points, \$2,000 per unit = 4 points, continuing to \$6,000 or more = 0 points)

0 3 58.2

Ongoing project affordability: (1 to 5)

(Provide points for Climate sensitive design, low maintenance, low or no HOA fees, low or no Land Trust fees, etc.)

3 19

Total Points:

52 (248.7)

A minimum of 30 points is required for a proposal without dwelling units to be considered for funding.

A total of 42 points is required for a proposal that includes dwelling units to be considered.

$\frac{248.7}{5} = 49.74$
 $\frac{49.74}{42} = 119\%$

CAHAB's Composite Score →

Section 1: $\frac{191.5}{5} = 38.3$

Section 2: $\frac{58.2}{5} = 11.64$

$\frac{38.3}{30} = 127.7\%$

$\frac{11.64}{12} = 97\%$