



Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee

The role of Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee is to advise City of Eugene staff on: the development of goals and programs related to the use of Affordable Housing Trust Fund resources, the allocation of Affordable Housing Trust Fund resources, and review of specific project proposals to be supported by the Affordable Housing Trust Fund resources.

Agenda

November 13, 2023, 12:15 – 1:20 p.m.

Sloat Conference Room, Atrium Building, 99 W. 10th Avenue

<https://eugene-or-gov.zoom.us/j/82238589983>

Passcode: AHTFAC2023

Phone: 1-971-247-1195 or 877-853-5257 (Toll Free)

Meeting ID: 822 3858 9983

I.	Welcome and Introductions	Information	5 minutes
II.	Public Comment	Information	5 minutes
III.	Minutes Approval	Action	5 minutes
IV.	2023 Request for Proposals Criteria	Information/Discussion	45 minutes
V.	Good of the Order	Discussion	5 minutes

Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee Members:

Jason Lear (Chair) · John Barofsky · Ibrahim Coulibaly · Alan Evans · Pete Knox · Kaarin Knudson · Sarah Pishioneri · Carmel Snyder · Jennifer Volem

Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee Staff:

Laura Hammond, City of Eugene • 541-682-5502 • LHammond@eugene-or.gov

Ellen Meyi-Galloway, City of Eugene • 541-682-5532 • EMeyi-Galloway@eugene-or.gov

This meeting is open to the public and is wheel-chair accessible. American Sign Language or Spanish interpretation can be provided with 48-hour notice prior to the meeting. For the hearing impaired, assistive listening devices are available with 48 hours' prior notice. The agenda and all background materials can be provided in alternative formats or Spanish with 48-hour notice prior to the meeting. To arrange for any of these services please contact Laura Hammond, LHammond@eugene-or.gov or 541-682-5502.

El lugar de la reunión es accesible para personas con discapacidad. A las personas sordas o con dificultades auditivas les ofrecemos intérpretes o sistemas FM de asistencia auditiva con 48 horas de anticipación. También se ofrecen intérpretes de español con 48 horas de anticipación. Materiales en formatos alternativos están disponibles a solicitud. Para disponer de estos servicios o para mayor información, comuníquese con el personal de Laura Hammond, LHammond@eugene-or.gov or 541-682-5502

For information about minutes, agendas, or materials, please contact Laura Hammond, LHammond@eugene-or.gov or 541-682-5502. Mail inquiries can be directed to City of Eugene Planning and Development Department, 99 W. 10th, Eugene, OR 97401.

MINUTES

Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee
Wednesday, October 16, 2023 - 12:00 - 1:30 p.m.
Hybrid Meeting-In-person and Virtual Meeting via ZOOM
Eugene, Oregon

October 16, 2023
Noon

PRESENT: Jason Lear (Chair); Jennifer Volem (Co-Chair), John Barofsky, Ibrahim Coulibaly, Alan Evans, Pete Knox, Kaarin Knudson, Sarah Pishioneri

ABSENT: Carmel Snyder

CITY OF EUGENE

STAFF: Laura Hammond, Ellen Meyi-Galloway

I. Welcome and Introduction

Mr. Lear called the Affordable Housing Trust Fund (AHTF) meeting to order and those present introduced themselves.

II. Public Comment

There was no one wishing to speak.

III. Minutes Approval (April 27, 2023)

MOTION: Mr. Barofsky, seconded by Ms. Volem, moved to approve the April 27, 2023, meeting minutes as presented. The motion passed, 8:0.

IV. Old Business: Committee Co-Chair Election

NOMINATION: Mr. Barofsky nominated Ms. Volem for the position of committee Co-Chair.

Ms. Volem was unanimously elected Co-Chair.

V. Program Update

Ms. Hammond used a slide presentation to provide a program update. Highlights included:

- Program activities
 - \$2.3 million in development awards, leveraging about \$45 million, to fund the construction of five affordable housing developments containing 178 new units. Developments included Peace Village, Williams Place, The Coleman, Bridges on Broadway and Grant Street Grow Homes.
 - \$282,000 in direct services funds to homebuyer assistance, four households with incomes below 80% area median income received down payment assistance to date.
 - \$100,000 in direct services funds to rental assistance services for education and outreach to renters related to new Renter Protections Ordinance passed by City Council

- \$290,000 intergovernmental agreement with Lane County for emergency rent relief through the Human Services Commission to assist up to 110 Eugene households to maintain housing.

Ms. Hammond reminded the committee that income for the AHTF came from a Construction Excise Tax (CET) on new construction in Eugene, with money collected in one fiscal year and used in the next fiscal year. In FY23 approximately \$720,000 in residential and \$345,000 in commercial CET was collected. The City Council also approved \$500,000 in General Funds for the AHTF, resulting in approximately \$1.5 million in FY23 income for use in FY24. Of that total, 75 percent was allocated for housing development and 25 percent allocated for direct services for renters and homeowners.

Mr. Barofsky noted the split between development and direct services was at the direction of the City Council. He also remarked that the City was experiencing a difficult budget cycle with ongoing deficits anticipated; therefore, advocacy for a General Fund contribution to the affordable housing trust fund would be important.

Ms. Knudson commented that the City's General Fund contribution provided stability to the AHTF during times when there was less construction activity. She agreed that advocacy for the funds was important and the amount of additional dollars that the AHTF leveraged should be highlighted.

Ms. Meyi-Galloway said the General Fund contribution schedule might be changed permanently from being considered in the December supplemental budget to the spring supplemental budget.

Mr. Evans, citing several factors, observed that given the current economic cycle it was possible that CET funds could decrease as construction slows.

Ms. Hammond welcomed new committee member Alan Evans.

Ms. Hammond noted the AHTF two-year program review included in the agenda packet would be provided to the City Council once it was finalized. A section that analyzed recent trends was part of the review. She emphasized the importance of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program's acquisition of land that could be offered with affordable housing funds; that combination significantly helps affordable housing development reach completion. Staff are exploring potential use of AHTF dollars for land acquisitions, although any proposed changes to any allocations would need to be approved by the City Council. Staff welcomed input from the committee as well.

In response to a question from Mr. Barofsky, Ms. Meyi-Galloway said the five-year Consolidated Plan for CDBG funds identified a goal of acquiring two pieces of property during that period. It was the third year of that plan and no property had yet been acquired, although one was under option and going through the required due diligence process. She said the length of time required for a purchase using CDBG funds and other factors presented a challenge during the current sellers' market.

Mr. Barofsky asked about the potential to use AHTF dollars to either purchase land or purchase an option on land to shorten the length of time involved, then reimburse the AHTF with CDBG funds. Ms. Meyi-Galloway explained CDBG funds cannot be used as reimbursement, and that federal requirements for options and acquisitions would still need to be followed if CDBG funds were eventually used. She noted that because option payments for property were not refundable, the City already uses a source other than CDBG for the option payment in case the purchase did not proceed. She said the length of time needed for a purchase was one of several factors that made land acquisition with CDBG funds challenging.

Ms. Knudson asked if outreach to property owners was being conducted. Ms. Meyi-Galloway described how property owners were contacted. She said it was challenging to find available land that was a good fit for affordable housing. Staff reviewed maps and reached out to owners when there appears to be vacant lots with potential for affordable housing development. Larger lots are rare, and staff are targeting qualified census tracts that could receive bonus points at the state level for funding. Smaller properties have also been considered since the City's middle housing code was developed.

Mr. Evans commented that residential transactions typically closed as quickly as 60-90 days but purchase of commercial properties could take a much longer period of time.

In response to a question from Ms. Pishioneri, Ms. Meyi-Galloway said in general the City's land acquisition search was for vacant land for new construction instead of repurposing existing structures such as a hotel.

Ms. Meyi-Galloway said that similar to the current land acquisition program, the City would conduct due diligence, acquire a property, and prepare it for development. An AHTF request for proposals (RFP) could then offer the property, along with development funds, as a package. The Council could then select a proposal and the land and development funds would then be provided to the developer.

The committee and staff discussed the difficulty of accruing sufficient AHTF dollars to acquire commercial properties and options to acquire more land. Options discussed included purchasing smaller properties, amending the CDBG acquisition process and seeking more flexible funding sources for affordable housing development. Ms. Meyi-Galloway said that the federal process to use CDBG funds for acquisition could not be amended locally. There was agreement to revisit the topic at future meetings.

Mr. Barofsky and Ms. Pishioneri encouraged members to voice their advocacy for affordable housing to the City Council. Staff indicated that they would notify members when the AHTF program review document was sent to Council.

VI. 2023 Request for Proposals Criteria

Mr. Lear said the discussion would focus on criteria for proposals.

Mr. Barofsky asked members who had served on the previous proposal review committee had any observations about which criteria were helpful in identifying projects for recommendation to the City Council.

1. Project Concept and Design

Ms. Knudson noted that one goal was to assure that affordable housing developments were long-term assets to the community both in terms of additional housing and spatially to the neighborhood in which they were located. She said some proposals and site planning raised questions about the buildings' orientation and relationship to the public realm. She said site design was very important in terms of a project's influence on the surrounding area. She hoped there was a way to incorporate those considerations in the evaluation criteria. She said projects to date had met the City's siting requirements, but they were residential projects in neighborhoods and often the first redevelopment to happen in an area. She wanted them to set a good example for future projects in an area.

Mr. Lear asked if the requirement to demonstrate readiness to acquire the property and/or start construction

within 12 months from the date of award was reflective of requirements for other state and federal funding sources as that timeline seemed somewhat short. Ms. Hammond said the AHTF program had imposed that timeline to assure that AHTF dollars were used in a timely way, although there was some flexibility in that period; it could be extended for good cause. Ms. Meyi-Galloway added that the idea was to keep the pipeline flowing by focusing on the readiest projects first. The 12-month timeline was imposed in the HOME RFP and although AHTF was more flexible, the focus on the most ready projects first is still important. A timeline of 15 or 18-months could be considered.

Ms. Pishioneri felt that the existing criteria had produced impressive projects to date and diversity had been prioritized.

2. Site Feasibility

Mr. Barofsky expressed concern about the preference for proposals that minimized on-site surface parking capacity to the greatest extent possible.

Ms. Knudson said the preference clarified the hope that projects would focus on dollars going into the development of housing and not expand parking whenever feasible for the developer.

Regarding parking, Mr. Lear said communities were concerned about parking in neighborhoods when development occurred.

3. Income-qualified Population and Services

Ms. Hammond said the general categories were retained and some language updated in last year's RFP.

In response to a question about providing services, Ms. Meyi-Galloway responded that affordable housing projects may provide services to support a variety of residential needs; AHTF projects were not required to provide onsite services. Access to services could be provided through making a contact person available, or staff available onsite to provide information and referrals.

4. Cost Benefit

Ms. Knudson asked if the City had requirements regarding use of local developers, contractors and consultants. Ms. Meyi-Galloway said a requirement to use local businesses was not allowed, but she would check to see if a preference, rather than a requirement, could be added to the criteria.

Ms. Pishioneri asked if a community benefits agreement that prioritized paying prevailing wages could be given preference. Ms. Meyi-Galloway said affordable housing projects were exempt from paying prevailing wages.

Mr. Lear expressed concern about placing constraints, such as paying prevailing wages or using local businesses, on developers in the current challenging construction environment.

Ms. Knudson asked that the cost benefit information be presented in a way that was easily captured by staff and understood by the public, particularly the amount of funds the project would leverage. Ms. Meyi-Galloway said that could be done.

Mr. Barofsky asked staff to establish a method for tracking when any of the preferred criteria, such as a

longer affordability period, high number of units or lower payments, was offered on a project and then utilized, since checking any of those items would give a proposal an advantage.

Mr. Lear said the difference between preferred and required items should be clarified to avoid ruling out some developers who were not devoted exclusively to affordable housing.

Regarding affordability, Ms. Pishioneri said one reason such really great and diverse projects had been proposed was because applicants were dedicated to affordable housing.

5. Financial Feasibility

Ms. Volem said it would be helpful to have a section on the application to evaluate the percentage of the rent to the target AMI.

Mr. Evans felt the preference to demonstrate at the time of application financial resources that were firmly committed, not just with a letter of interest, would be a challenge for many developers.

Ms. Volem said the program had been successful to date with applicants having solid funding sources before applying for AHTF dollars.

Ms. Meyi-Galloway said applicants were in a variety of stages when applying, and some applicants had firm funding commitments or had some commitments and a plan for financing a project; AHTF awards were often used to leverage state funds. Having funding commitments also spoke to an applicant's readiness to proceed and may result in preference to those close to starting.

6. Organizational Experience and Performance

Ms. Pishioneri said applicants were happy with the outcomes achieved by the criteria.

In response to a comment from Mr. Lear, Ms. Hammond agreed that the language had been modified last year to require that the development team include someone with affordable housing experience, rather than requiring that of the developers themselves.

Mr. Barofsky reiterated his interest in being able to track project compliance with required and preferred criteria.

Mr. Lear said a developer might not always have a property management team in place at the time of submitting a proposal. Ms. Meyi-Galloway indicated that the RFP could also ask for an applicant to describe the characteristics that would be required for a property management team and how a property management team would be selected and utilized.

Mr. Lear asked committee members to send any additional questions and suggestions to staff.

VII. Good of the Order

Mr. Barofsky welcomed Mr. Evans to the committee and said his expertise would be an asset to the committee's work.

Ms. Meyi-Galloway said there was a current RFP for the HOME program, which was a federal

development resource; \$1 million was available in Eugene and about \$400,000 available in Springfield.

Ms. Hammond said there was also a current System Development (SDC) Charge Exemption RFP for affordable rental or home ownership housing. Applications were due November 8, 2023, and were limited geographically to the City of Eugene.

Mr. Barofsky recommended that a member of the AHTF Advisory Committee participate on the HOME RFP proposal review committee. Ms. Meyi-Galloway said that the Evaluation Committee was set for this year but that could be considered in the future.

Mr. Lear adjourned the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)



MEMORANDUM

Date: November 8, 2023
To: Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee
From: Community Development Staff
Subject: Affordable Housing Trust Fund 2024 RFP Criteria

Background

For 2024, \$1,056,545 in Affordable Housing Trust Funds (AHTF) is available for affordable housing development projects to be awarded through a Request for Proposals (RFP) process.

The open, competitive RFP process allows project proposals to be scored and ranked to choose the strongest proposal(s) to receive funding. The difficult part of the RFP process is that many projects are strong and worthy of funding. The Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee (AHTF-AC) makes a recommendation to staff about the RFP criteria that would prioritize proposals. RFP Criteria serve several purposes in project selection:

1. inform applicants of the minimum standards for projects.
2. inform applicants of project characteristics that are most desirable.
3. narrow what kinds of projects would be prioritized through the RFP.
4. develop parameters so that projects can be more fairly compared.

The AHTF-AC defines criteria so that the evaluation subcommittee can compare and score proposals and the whole AHTF-AC can determine which proposal(s) should be recommended for funding. RFP criteria can be altered from year to year, to target funds to current priorities. For example, one year the RFP could focus on housing solutions for unhoused populations; another year the RFP could target new homeownership development. RFP criteria can differentiate between required components and preferred components. The RFP criteria are an important tool in selecting the most appropriate use of public funds.

RFP Components

The City of Eugene has a general outline for its RFP processes. The application requests information to ensure that the projects are realistic, the public funds requested are necessary and reasonable, and the proposal will result in timely creation of housing for income-eligible residents. The process includes opportunities for public comment. The AHTF RFP process is as follows:

1. When the RFP document is ready for release, it is posted on the City's website, sent to various lists of interested parties, and advertised via a press release to local media outlets.
2. Potential applicants usually have approximately 60 days to submit responses to the RFP.
3. Once proposals are submitted, they are posted on the City website and publicly noticed with an announcement of a public hearing.

4. A 3 to 5-member Evaluation subcommittee of the AHTF-AC and staff review the proposals in depth. The Evaluation Committee holds a public hearing for comments on the proposals and scores the proposals based on the RFP criteria.
5. The Evaluation subcommittee discusses the proposals with the full AHTF-AC. The AHTF-AC determines the rankings of the proposals to provide to staff as a recommendation for City Council.
6. Staff present the proposals to City Council with the AHTF-AC ranking. Council makes the final funding decisions.

There are three parts to the RFP:

- The RFP document itself includes a description of the process, the amount of resources available, and the RFP criteria explaining how proposals would be scored and prioritized.
- The application document is where prospective developers describe the project proposal in detail.
- The proforma is a spreadsheet explaining the financing proposal in detail.

Developing the RFP Criteria

During the AHTF-AC fall meetings, staff will work with the AHTF-AC to develop the RFP criteria to integrate into the 2024 RFP.

At the October and November meetings, the AHTF-AC may consider the following types of issues for the 2024 RFP Criteria:

- development needs in the community
- thoughts from the 2023 RFP process that could affect the 2024 RFP
- priorities for types of projects
- priorities for income levels and populations
- site considerations
- preference to provide more than required units for people with physical and sensory disabilities

Based on discussions in October and November, staff will draft the RFP criteria and finalize the RFP in December.

Attachment A includes questions raised by AHTF-AC members and staff responses as well as the draft criteria with potential changes identified at the AHTF-AC meeting on October 16, 2023.

Action Requested

Discussion and updates for 2024 AHTF RFP criteria.

Attachments

- A. Questions from Committee with Responses and RFP Criteria with potential edits based on October 16 AHTF-AC meeting

Attachment A
Questions from the Committee

Can the RFP require or provide a preference for the use of local contractors?

No. Staff checked with the City's Purchasing Office and the City of Eugene can't specify that contractors use local contractors or offer a preference in the evaluation process for local contractors.

Can the RFP require prevailing wage or include a community benefit agreement that requires prevailing wage?

No. Staff checked with the City's Purchasing Office and the City of Eugene can require prevailing wage only if the project is a public improvement (infrastructure) being built with City funds. The City does not have community benefit agreements.

Which preferred criteria have been utilized the most by ATHF RFP applicants?

Staff can review previous evaluation results to see if this can be determined and report back.

In the evaluation process, can we see the proposed rents compared to the income level of the specified income limit that is being served?

Yes. Staff can include a table for developers to fill out in the application that quickly shows information which may be buried in the proforma. That information is also in the summary evaluation materials provided to the Evaluation Sub-Committee.

AHTF 2023 DRAFT RFP CRITERIA FOR PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Summary:

The City of Eugene invites proposals from affordable housing developers for the creation of housing affordable to low and moderate-income households.

FUNDING PRIORITIES

AHTF resources available through this RFP will be prioritized for creation of housing demonstrating significant innovation or benefit through the project design, financing, or management structure (examples include cooperatives, community land trusts, shared equity homeownership, Single Resident Occupancy shared housing, multi-generational housing, and more.) Proposals will be accepted that include at least 4 dwellings.

Additional priorities are for proposals designed to transition people out of homelessness; projects serving populations disproportionately impacted by housing cost burden and historically excluded from housing opportunities such as BIPOC and LGBTQI+ residents/communities, and high priority special needs populations as outlined in the [2020 Consolidated Plan](#). It is preferred that proposals include more than 5% of units for people with mobility challenges and commit to maintaining affordability longer than the required 20-year period.

Scoring

All proposals will be reviewed by staff and evaluated by the Evaluation Committee. Proposals will be evaluated in six categories described below using a seven-point scoring system with up to three additional

bonus points in each category. Each proposal has the potential to receive a score of 60. Scores will be recorded, discussed with the Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee, and reflected in materials presented to City Council. In instances of tie scores, proposals will be compared against each other in order to determine which proposal uses the requested resources most efficiently and provides the greatest community benefit while meeting the City goals.

7	Exceptional - An exceptional proposal (a score of "7") will reflect all acceptable and most exceptional standards set forth in the criteria outlined in the evaluation worksheet have been met and shows significant innovation or benefit. No elements of the proposal need improvement.
6	Very Good - A very good proposal (a score of "6") will reflect all acceptable and some exceptional standards set forth in the criteria outlined in the evaluation worksheet have been met and shows some innovation or benefit. No elements of the proposal need improvement.
5	Good - A good proposal (a score of "5") will reflect all acceptable and either some exceptional standards set forth in the criteria outlined in the evaluation worksheet have been met or shows some innovation or benefit. No elements of the proposal need improvement.
4	Acceptable - An acceptable proposal (a score of "4") will reflect all acceptable standards set forth in the criteria outlined in the evaluation worksheet have been met. No elements of the proposal need improvement.
3	Needs Improvement - A score of "3" means the proposal does not meet the standards set forth in the criteria outlined in the evaluation worksheet, but could be modified to meet the standards.
2	Needs Significant Improvement - A score of "2" means the proposal does not meet the standards set forth in the criteria in the evaluation worksheet, and would need to be significantly modified to meet those standards.
1	Unacceptable - A score of "1" means the proposal does not meet standards set forth in the criteria outlined in the evaluation worksheet and cannot be readily modified to meet the standards.

Bonus Points

1-3	1, 2, or 3 Bonus points may be awarded in each category if the proposal meets a number of preferred criteria or meets any criteria in an especially innovative way or to a significant extent.
-----	--

Proposed changes

Notes on proposed changes

Criteria for Proposal Evaluation

1. Project Concept and Design

Proposals are required to:

- a) Present a well-developed design that is suitable for the targeted population(s) and project location
- b) Comply with the applicable City Code
- c) Increase the existing number of units, through new construction, adaptive re-use, or rehabilitation
- d) Include a minimum of 4 units/ dwellings
- e) Demonstrate readiness to acquire the property and ~~or~~ start construction within 12 months from the date of award - Consider increasing to 15 months?
- f) Demonstrate innovation or benefit through the project design, financing, or management structure. (Examples include cooperatives, community land trusts, shared equity homeownership, Single Resident Occupancy shared housing, multi-generational housing, and more.)

- g) Include at least 5% of units for people with mobility challenges (such as a wheelchair) and sensory challenges (such as blindness or deafness), rounding up, and one unit as a minimum.
- h) For homeownership proposals, the project must either utilize a Community Land Trust or Limited Equity Cooperative model to ensure long term affordability or present a well-documented plan that is ready for implementation to meet long term affordability and income qualification requirements. - proposed to address accountability needs for long term affordability requirements

Preferred proposals:

- a) Include more than 5% of units for people with mobility challenges (such as a wheelchair) and sensory challenges (such as blindness or deafness).
- b) Demonstrate use of cost-effective green building measures and strategies
- c) Demonstrate more than one innovative measure in project design, financing, or management structure.
- d) Demonstrates a site design that supports the public realm (for example: the architectural design of the development fits with the existing neighborhood, contributes to a welcoming streetscape, and/or supports public spaces as well as pedestrian accessibility, safety, and comfort). - proposed to address site design and public realm

2. Site Feasibility

The applicant must have site control or an option to purchase at the time of application. Proposals are required to:

- a) Demonstrate that the designated project site is suitable for affordable housing and the targeted population(s)
- b) Be free of adverse environmental conditions that cannot be mitigated. (Examples of ineligible sites include but are not limited to sites with, toxic contamination, proximity to above-ground storage of explosive materials, and designated wetlands.) If a site has an environmental condition such as noise proximity, buildings older than 45 years, or land in the 100-year flood plain, it must be possible to mitigate the condition through reasonable measures.
- c) Have appropriate zoning for the type of development proposed and demonstrate consistency with the City's [Housing Dispersal Policy](#).
- d) Cover moving costs and expenses for households displaced by the development proposal.

Preferred proposals:

- a) Are located near schools, parks, grocery stores, commercial areas (pharmacy, public services, job opportunities) and public transportation.
- b) ~~Minimize on-site surface parking capacity to the greatest extent possible.~~ Prioritize land for housing and common areas to reduce surface parking uses, especially on the street frontage. - consider removing or using updated language?
- c) Offer preference for housing in the new development to any eligible, displaced households if displacement occurs (in addition to covering moving costs and expenses as required).

3. Income-qualified Population and Services

Proposals are required to:

- a) Provide housing opportunities for households earning no more than 100% of the area median income.

Preferred proposals:

- a) Transition people into housing stability from homelessness.

- b) Target at least one of the following income levels:
 - a. households with extremely low incomes (30% AMI or less)
 - b. households with moderate incomes (60% AMI – 80% AMI, an income range which has few subsidies available)
 - c. a designated mix of income levels, targeting units at various area median income levels
- c) Designate some units for a high priority special needs population as identified in the [2020 Consolidated Plan](#).
- d) Demonstrate a significant innovation or benefit through serving populations disproportionately impacted by housing cost burden and historically excluded from housing opportunities such as BIPOC and LGBTQI+ residents/communities.
- e) Provide services for residents.

4. Cost Benefit

The proposal's per unit overall cost, and public subsidy per unit will be evaluated. Proposals are required to:

- a) Provide units and resident payments levels that justify the requested resources
- b) Leverage other resources (at least 50% of total development cost)
- c) Meet minimum 20-year affordability period requirements.

Preferred proposals:

- a) Create a high number of affordable units, a high number of bedrooms (and/or greater number of residents served) for the amount of subsidy provided.
- b) Create lower resident payments/ greater affordability levels because of the requested resources.
- c) Have a significant amount of leverage (**60% or more**) ~~greater than 50%~~ of total development cost. **- consider being more specific or removing this criterion?**
- d) **Commit to a longer affordability period than required (increments of 5 or 10 years). - consider removing?**

5. Financial Feasibility

Acceptable proposals must provide a complete financial pro forma (sources, uses, income, and expenses). Proposals are required to:

- a) Propose resident payments that are affordable to the target population.
- b) Demonstrate that all proposed funding sources for construction and long-term operations are possible to obtain and can be committed within a reasonable schedule.
- c) Show a proforma with financial stability throughout the 20-year affordability period with a minimum debt coverage ratio of 1.15.

Preferred proposals:

- a) **Demonstrate at the time of application financial resources that are firmly planned or committed not just with a letter of interest. - Consider updated language that acknowledges it may be early for many financial commitments?**
- b) Include an innovative financing model that relies less on competitive public resources.

6. Organizational Experience and Performance

Proposals are required to:

- a) Demonstrate that a development team member or members have experience with housing development.

- b) Demonstrate that a development team member or members, property management team, or partner organization have experience in serving the targeted population(s).
- c) Demonstrate their marketing and outreach plan to increase access to housing opportunities for BIPOC residents/communities, and to affirmatively further fair housing for all protected classes.
- d) ~~Demonstrate the ability of the proposed property management team efficiently maintains the property/asset.~~ Demonstrate the ability of the proposed property management team to efficiently maintain the property/ asset, or if the property management team is not yet selected, what characteristics and experience will be required in the process to select the property management team. - Consider updated language that acknowledges that property management team may not be selected at time of application?
- e) Demonstrate that the organization has a viable plan to be able to manage unexpected costs that could arise during development.

Preferred proposals:

- a) Demonstrate partnerships with organizations serving BIPOC households. Some examples include the following (but it is not expected that a single project would incorporate all these examples):
 - a. development, sponsorship, or management of the property by a culturally specific or culturally responsive organization with a diverse and representative leadership. (Culturally specific organizations are led by individuals of the community being served; culturally responsive organizations are designed to meet the needs of individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds and experiences.)
 - b. an ongoing service partnership with a culturally specific or culturally responsive organization.
 - c. agreements with service providers to engage in culturally appropriate services.