

Low Income Housing Tax Credit Prioritization Scoring Criteria

All proposals to be considered for Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) prioritization will be scored according to the following criteria, with consideration weighted toward how the proposals implement the adopted Housing Policy Goals and approved area strategies.

Scoring Criteria:

- A. Housing Policy Implementation:** Proposal directly assists in implementing the adopted 2007-2011 Consolidated Plan. Activities are directed toward the creation or delivery of affordable housing for low and moderate income persons, with a potential for a long-term positive impact on the area.

20 = Stated goals clearly meet 2007-2011 Consolidated Plan objectives.

10 = Stated goals to some extent meet 2007-2011 Consolidated Plan objectives.

0 = Stated goals do not meet 2007-2011 Consolidated Plan objectives.

- B. Project Financial Viability:** Proposal includes preliminary funding sources and uses analysis, preliminary budgets, and a description of the project's long-term financial viability, including an estimate of City funding requested.

20 = Proposal shows strong evidence of long-term financial viability.

10 = Proposal lacks some evidence of financial viability, but the overall project appears viable with additional technical assistance and/or support.

0 = Proposal does not show evidence of financial viability.

- C. Developer/Sponsor Financial Capacity:** Proposal includes the developer's/sponsor's most recent independent financial audit and the developer's/sponsor's current annual operating budget including all funding sources and uses. The proposal includes an explanation if significant changes in the annual budget are anticipated within the funding cycle.

20 = Evidence/history indicates the developer's/sponsor's strong financial capacity.

10 = Evidence/history indicates the developer/sponsor lacks some financial capacity.

0 = No evidence or history is provided to indicate that the developer/sponsor has the financial capacity to provide the proposed services.

- D. Developer/Sponsor Administrative Capacity and Oversight:** The proposal should include a detailed description of the developer's/sponsor's administrative staff, management and administrative structures, monitoring and oversight methods, and past history providing similar services. The application should also contain a copy of any other relevant documents supporting organizational capacity.

- 20 = Evidence/history indicates the applicant's strong administrative capacity
- 10 = Evidence/history indicates the applicant lacks administrative capacity in at least one area listed above in this section,
- 0 = No evidence or history is provided to indicate that the applicant has the administrative capacity to provide the proposed services.

E. Cost/Benefit Effectiveness: Proposal demonstrates that the project meets or exceeds reasonable standards of cost/benefit effectiveness.

- 20 = Evidence indicates the proposal exceeds reasonable standards when subjected to cost/benefit analysis.
- 10 = Evidence indicates the proposal meets reasonable standards of cost/benefit effectiveness.
- 0 = Evidence indicates the proposal does not meet reasonable standards of cost/benefit effectiveness.

F. Leverage Tax Credit funding with other financing and/or rental assistance. The project maximizes the impact of tax credit funding through leveraging.

- 10 = 50% or more of the tax credits are leveraged.
- 8 = 40-49% of the tax credits are leveraged.
- 6 = 30-39% of the tax credits are leveraged.
- 4 = 20-29% of the tax credits are leveraged.
- 2 = 10-19% of the tax credits are leveraged.
- 0 = Project does not leverage other governmental and/or private funding.

G. Partnership/Community Support: Proposal shows partnership/community support including the active involvement of neighborhoods, community stakeholders, and community leaders.

- 10 = Proposal shows clear evidence of community support and participation.
- 5 = Proposal does not document community support and participation in some areas but does show nominal evidence of general community support.
- 0 = Proposal does not show any evidence of community support

H. Neighborhood Stabilization/Improvement: The proposal should assist in achieving neighborhood stabilization/improvement.

- 10 = Proposal helps achieve neighborhood stabilization/improvement.
- 5 = Proposal to some extent helps achieve neighborhood stabilization/improvement.
- 0 = Proposal does not show an evidence of neighborhood stabilization/improvement.

I. Project Enhancement: Proposal enhances other publicly financed plans or projects.

10 = Evidence indicates the proposal strongly enhances other publicly financed plans or projects.

5 = Evidence indicates the proposal somewhat enhances other publicly financed plans or projects.

0 = No evidence is provided to indicate the proposal enhances other publicly financed plans or projects.

J. Maintains/Expands Affordability: Proposal maintains or expands affordable/workforce housing units and/or creates a mixed-income development.

10 = Evidence indicates the proposal creates additional affordable/workforce housing units or creates a mixed-income development.

5 = Evidence indicates the proposal maintains existing affordable/workforce housing units or maintains a mixed-income development.

0 = Evidence indicates the proposal does not maintain existing affordable/workforce housing units or maintain a mixed-income development.