

2006 HOME Housing RFP #6257

Proposal Review & Funding Recommendations

Approved by Urban County: 3/28/06

Funds Available:

FY 2006-07 CHDO Operating Funding: \$ 33,707

Method for Scoring:

1) A "+1" score signifies that the proposal/ proposing organization meets or exceeds the expectations of the criterion.

2) A "0" score signifies that the proposal/ proposing organization is neutral to determine if they meet the criterion.

3) A "-1" score signifies that the proposal/proposing organization does not meet the expectations of the criterion.

Following is a description of how the funds will be allocated. A review form will be completed by each evaluator for each CHDO proposal. The total score for all of the CHDO's will be added together to determine the total points available. The score of each CHDO will be divided into the total points available to determine the proportion of funds available for that CHDO. For example: if \$33,707 available

points % of total \$ amount

CHDO A: 6 points 40% \$13,482

CHDO B: 5 points 33% \$11,123

CHDO C: 4 points 27% \$9,100

Total points: 15 100% \$33,707

Method for Decision Making:

1) A team of Community Development staff members will tally the results using this scoring method, make funding recommendations, and present the recommendations to the Urban County Executive Committee for a final decision.

2) The Urban County Executive Committee will make the final decisions on the winning bid (s).

2006 HOME CHDO Proposals- RFP #6257

NOTE: No agency may obtain funding through this RFP without CHDO Certification.

Ranking Criteria	Rating (-1, 0, or +1, based on County knowledge of Organization & Information Provided in Application)				
	Avalon	CHA	HCLT	MAP	WAHC
Adequate financial management & stability	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Adequate staff capacity	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Adequate record keeping	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Timeliness and ability to complete projects within budgets	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	0.00	-1.00
Adequate progress on current HOME projects	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	0.00	-1.00
New HOME project application pending or planned	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Demonstrated ability to leverage other resources	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Demonstrated willingness to address Identified management/capacity issues	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Total Score	0.00	4.00	3.00	0.00	3.00
FY 2005-06 HOME Funds	\$0	\$34,221	\$0	\$0	\$0
FY 2006-07 HOME Funds	\$0	\$13,483	\$10,112	\$0	\$10,112

Notes: The final scores for ranking were determined by averaging the scores from the three County staff members that ranked each of the proposals using the ranking instructions.

Organization Name	Brief Description of Services	Pros/ Cons of Proposal	Questions for Organization	What do grant \$ pay for?	Amount of Request	# Proposed to Serve
Avalon Housing Inc.	Rental Development (A2 City)	n/a: request for City of Ann Arbor Funding Only	n/a: request for City of Ann Arbor Funding Only	n/a	\$0	n/a
Community Housing Alternatives	Homeownership Development: Acquisition/Rehab / Resale (YT)	Pros: Plans to complete projects in UC/HC for coming year; neighborhood revitalization plans; other sources of funding. Cons: Focused on only one neighborhood of the Urban County.	1. Do you have a plan for addressing recommendations listed in CHDO certification letter? 2. Plan for fundraising. 3. What is your greatest need for technical assistance & training?	Salary & Fringes	\$34,221	8+ units
Homeplace Community Land Trust	Homeownership Development: New Construction (PT)	Pros: Plans to develop permanently affordable homeownership stock in Urban County and City of Ann Arbor. Cons: Limited other sources of funding & risk for organizational start-up.	1. Plan for fundraising. 2. What is your greatest need for technical assistance & training? 3. Do you have a plan for addressing recommendations listed in CHDO certification letter?	Salary & Fringes	\$20,000	17 units
Michigan Ability Partners	Rental Development (A2 City)	n/a: request for City of Ann Arbor Funding Only	n/a: request for City of Ann Arbor Funding Only	n/a	\$0	n/a
Washtenaw Affordable Housing Corporation	Rural Homeownership Development	Pros: Plans to develop homeownership opportunities in rural areas of the Urban County with USDA funding and subsidized loans- new activity. Cons: Limited sources of operating funding; Operating deficit on Gateway property; learning curve for new type of development.	1. Plan for fundraising. 2. What is your greatest need for technical assistance & training? 3. Do you have a plan for addressing recommendations listed in CHDO certification letter?	Salary & Fringes	\$15,000	6 units